BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, May 7, 2009

5:30 P.M. CLOSED SESSION
6:00 P.M. REGULAR SESSION

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

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. 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 the meeting or prior to the Consent Agenda being heard.

- 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.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), those requiring accommodations for this meeting should notify the Board Secretary’s Office 48 hours prior to the meeting at (408) 321-5680 or e-mail: board.secretary@vta.org or TDD (408) 321-2330. VTA’s Home page is on the Web at: www.vta.org

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

1. ROLL CALL

2. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

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

   Name of Case: Mary Strong McClure vs. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   WCAB #s SFO 397991, SFO 397992

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

   Name of Case: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority vs. Blackburn Farms III, L.P.
   Santa Clara County Superior Court No. 1-06-CV-068888 (Eminent Domain)

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

   VTA Designated Representatives:
   Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer
   Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
   Robert L. Escobar, Human Resources Manager

   Employee Organizations:
   American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
   Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265
   Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Local 521
   Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA), Local 21

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

   Property: 10,616 square foot parcel owned by VTA at the intersection of North First and St. James Streets in downtown San Jose, CA

   Negotiators for VTA: Bijal Patel, Deputy Director, Property Development & Management
   Negotiators for Santa Clara County Courthouse: Gary Graves, Acting County Executive, County of Santa Clara

   Under negotiation: Price and terms of payment for sale of Property

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION
3. CLOSED SESSION REPORT

4. ORDERS OF THE DAY

5. AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS

Employees of the Month for May 2009.

Recognize Christine Nelson, Office Specialist II, Chaboya Administration; Terry Russell, Coach Operator, Cerone Division; and Felipe Vera, Transit Mechanic, Cerone Division, as Employees of the Month for May 2009.

6. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

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.

7. REPORT FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER (Verbal Report)

8. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON (Verbal Report)

9. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Chairperson’s Report (Tebo)


CONSENT AGENDA

11. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of April 2, 2009.

12. ACTION ITEM - Adopt the updated Congestion Management Program - Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines.

13. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to amend the contract with Parsons Brinkerhoff for design services for the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project through final design and implementation. The amendment will increase the approved contract by $1,715,315 for a revised contract value not to exceed $2,000,000.

14. ACTION ITEM - Ratify the appointments to the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) of Richard Ruh as the City of Monte Sereno representative and Paul Goldstein as the alternate representative of the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition.

16. **ACTION ITEM** - Recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 798 (Nava), which creates the California Transportation Financing Authority to assist local and regional agencies in obtaining financing through the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of improvements to the state’s transportation infrastructure. This bill also allows the authority to permit local and regional agencies, as part of the financing plan for their projects, to impose tolls for the use of the facilities constructed.

17. **ACTION ITEM** - Recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 338 (Ma), which allows local officials to divert property tax increment revenues to pay for new bonds for infrastructure within transit village development districts.

18. **ACTION ITEM** - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Siemens Building Technology, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $307,096 for the Laser Intrusion Detection System at Light Rail Stations, pending approval by FTA for a waiver to the Buy America requirements. This contract is 100% funded by a combination of Federal Transit Security, Federal Department of Homeland Security and State Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

19. **ACTION ITEM** - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Cupertino Electric, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $524,920 for the Closed Circuit Television Phase 1, 2 and 3 Project. This contract is 100% funded by a combination of Federal Transit Security, Federal Department of Homeland Security and State Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

20. **ACTION ITEM** - Adopt a Resolution upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Directors finding that a competitive sealed bid process does not constitute a method of procurement adequate for VTA's needs and directing the use of competitive negotiation for the purchase of up to 107 low-floor diesel electric hybrid 40-foot buses, as required by Public Contract Code Sections 20216 and 20217.

### REGULAR AGENDA

21. **ACTION ITEM** - Endorse the Regional High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Network legislative framework for AB 744 (Torrico) proposed by MTC as described in the memorandum.

22. **ACTION ITEM** - Adopt the 2009 VTA Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan.

23. **ACTION ITEM** - Approve a waiver of VTA’s pre-qualification requirement for the advertisement of the Kato Road Flood Control Improvements contract.
OTHER ITEMS

24. INFORMATION ITEM – Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011 Recommended Biennial Budget.

25. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

26. MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE HISTORY MATRIX

27. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM STANDING COMMITTEES
   A. Administration and Finance Committee
   B. Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee
   C. Transit Planning and Operations Committee
   D. Audit Committee

28. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES
   A. Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA)
   B. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC)
   C. Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
   D. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
   E. Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

29. REPORTS FROM JOINT POWERS BOARDS (JPBs) & REGIONAL COMMISSIONS
   A. Peninsula Corridor JPB
   B. Capitol Corridor JPB
   C. Dumbarton Rail Corridor Policy Committee
   D. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)
   E. Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority

30. REPORTS FROM VTA POLICY ADVISORY BOARDS (PABs)
   A. Vasona Light Rail PAB
   B. Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor & BART Warm Springs Extension PAB
   C. Downtown East Valley PAB
   D. Highway PAB South

31. ANNOUNCEMENTS

32. ADJOURN
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Employees of the Month for May 2009

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Christine Nelson, Office Specialist II in the Administration department at Chaboya, is the Administration Award Winner for May. She is known by her coworkers as a supportive team player who is always willing to help others when needed. Christie’s extensive knowledge of the Operator payroll system was instrumental to her recent cross-training of several employees at the division. Her accurate and thorough work is noted by her management as being consistent with VTA’s commitment to quality work performance. Christie, who joined VTA in 2006, is a valued member of her team and her exceptional level of professionalism is worthy of recognition.

Congratulations to Christine Nelson, Administration Employee of the Month for May!

Terry Russell, Cerone Division Coach Operator, is our May Operations Award Winner. Terry has been with VTA since 1987, and also serves as a Safety Steward for the Amalgamated Transit Union, assisting VTA in providing and maintaining a safe work environment. Terry consistently meets the high performance standards of his job and goes above and beyond to help his fellow Operators. He has received positive customer feedback for providing courteous service to his riders, with one passenger complimenting Terry for “being very patient with elderly passengers.” Recognized by his supervisors for attention to safety, excellent driving skills and a great attitude, Terry contributes to the positive working environment at Cerone Division. Congratulations to Terry Russell, Operations Employee of the Month for May!

Felipe Vera, Transit Mechanic at Cerone Division, is our Maintenance Employee of the Month for May. Felipe’s career with VTA spans over 27 years. In his current assignment as a Transit Mechanic, Felipe performs skilled mechanical work to help ensure that VTA coaches are kept in excellent condition. He is well-liked by his fellow mechanics and is willing to lend a hand and share his expertise whenever needed. Upholding VTA’s value of Dependability, Felipe responds timely to mechanical problems, showing a genuine commitment to providing reliable service for VTA’s customers. Recognized by his supervisors for being a self-starter who exhibits superb
work performance, Felipe is a valuable asset to the Cerone Maintenance Division and to VTA. Congratulations to Felipe Vera, Maintenance Employee of the Month for May!

Prepared By: Mitsuno Baurmeister
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Board of Directors was called to order by Chairperson Sandoval at 5:35 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding 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>Nora Campos</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Casas</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Caserta</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Chu</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gage</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Herrera</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Kalra</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoriko Kishimoto</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Kniss</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Livengood</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pyle</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Reed</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sellers</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shirakawa</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yeager</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Sandoval</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alternates do not serve unless participating as a Member.

A quorum was present.

2. RECESSED TO CLOSED SESSION at 5:36 p.m.

A. Anticipated Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel

    Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54956.9: (Three cases)
B. Conference with Labor Negotiators
   [Government Code Section 54957.6]
   VTA Designated Representatives:
   Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer
   Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
   Robert Escobar, Human Resources Manager
   Employee Organizations:
   American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees
   Service Employees International Union, Local 521

C. Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
   [Government Code Section 54956.9 (a)]
   Name of Case: Peggy Shaffer vs. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   WCAB #s SAL 106923, SAL 106927, SAL 108061, SAL 108062

RECONVENED TO OPEN SESSION at 6:00 p.m.

3. CLOSED SESSION REPORT
   A. Anticipated Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
      Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54956.9: (Three cases)
      There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.

   B. Conference with Labor Negotiators
      [Government Code Section 54957.6]
      VTA Designated Representatives:
      Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer
      Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
      Robert Escobar, Human Resources Manager
      Employee Organizations:
      American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees
      Service Employees International Union, Local 521
      There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.

   C. Existing Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel
      [Government Code Section 54956.9 (a)]
      Name of Case: Peggy Shaffer vs. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
      WCAB #s SAL 106923, SAL 106927, SAL 108061, SAL 108062
      There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.
4. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Chairperson Sandoval noted Agenda Item #27, Receive Sustainability Update, would be moved under Agenda Item #7, Report from the General Manager.

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Orders of the Day were accepted.

5. AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS

Employees of the Month for April 2009 and Supervisor of the Quarter

Chairperson Sandoval recognized Robert Irby, Coach Operator, Chaboya Division; and Ethan Winston, Public Communication Specialist II, River Oaks Administration, as Employees of the Month for April 2009.

Chairperson Sandoval noted Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager, would be honored as Supervisor of the Quarter at the next Board of Directors meeting.

6. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Jerry Grace, Interested Citizen, expressed appreciation for being able to attend and participate in VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting.

7. REPORT FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, reported the following:

- VTA system-wide average weekday ridership for February 2009 increased by 4.5 percent as compared to February 2008. Bus average weekday ridership increased by 4.6 percent and light rail average weekday ridership increased by 4.1 percent compared to the same period last year.

- Budget Development second quarter receipts decreased by 11 percent from the previous year. Staff is projecting a six percent decrease for the third quarter. Budget for the fiscal year is estimated to decline by seven to eight percent. Staff projects a $28 million budget deficit for FY2010 and $50 million budget deficit for FY2011. Strategies to address budget issues would be discussed at the April 24, 2009 Board of Directors Workshop and Administration and Finance Committee meetings.

- The Regional Transportation Plan was deferred by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission for a month because of revised sales tax revenue projections provided by VTA.

- Caltrain Board unanimously approved the Memorandum of Understanding with the California High Speed Rail Authority.
Report by VTA Federal Lobbyists

Vic Fazio, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP., reported funding for transportation would be available on the next traditional reauthorization of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU). He noted the Stimulus Bill may be an additional source of funding. He stressed the importance of endorsing regional projects to receive funding through the Appropriations Bill. He noted staff is working hard with their group to secure funding for projects.

Susan Lent, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP., reported there is a lot of competition in Washington to secure funds for new starts projects such as the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT). She noted staff is working with the Congressional Delegation and Federal Transportation Administration in promoting projects with positive land use, economic development, job creation, and protects the environment. She noted the following projects are getting a lot of attention in Washington: 1) Express Lanes; 2) Congestion pricing; and 3) Sales tax measure. She stressed the importance of focusing on the appropriation and reauthorization process to secure the maximum amount of funding for VTA projects.

Board Member Caserta inquired on actions necessary to compete for funding. Ms. Lent responded to secure funds, criteria for projects should be met and a strategy involving the community should be developed. Mr. Fazio added support for local representatives who endorse transportation is also essential.

Board Member Kniss inquired on the criteria for projects to receive funding. Ms. Lent noted the current Administration’s direction toward transportation projects are as follows: 1) Regional in scope; 2) High speed rail and freight movement; 3) New starts projects; and 4) Reward local funding.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo inquired if the Board’s presence in Washington is essential. Ms. Lent responded it is important to have the Board’s presence in Washington to present the projects for funding. Mr. Fazio added it is also important to organize different community groups in the region to effectively express the need to fund regional projects.

Board Member Sellers inquired if there are programs available for revenue generating projects. Ms. Lent responded they closely monitor programs being announced and direct them to staff. She noted their focus is not limited on transportation programs. They also explore other programs such as energy and work force training.

Progress Report on Joint Workforce Initiative

Michael Hursh, Deputy Director of Maintenance, provided a report highlighting the metrics between Joint Workforce Investment (JWI) and non-JWI on the following sections of bus operators and maintenance personnel: 1) Absenteeism; 2) Employee retention; 3) Grievances per bus operator; 4) Complaints per bus operator; and 5) Mechanical road calls per bus operator.
Mr. Hursh stressed on the success of the program and its positive effects on the workplace solutions, career development and public service. He also acknowledged the leadership of Tom Fink and Ed Dolores, Amalgamated Transit Union Local 265 (ATU), which was instrumental to the success of the program.

The Agenda was taken out of order.

27. Sustainability Program Update

Tom Fitzwater, Environmental Planning Manager, announced the Change a Light Change the World Program was made possible through the partnership of VTA and the City of San Jose. He also announced the bags provided to the Board were made out of recycled plastic bottles.

Mr. Fitzwater provided a presentation on the Sustainability Program highlighting the following: 1) Background; 2) Goal; 3) First year annual report; 4) Program management; 5) Program focus; 6) Collaborative spirit; 7) Public outreach and employee education; 8) VTA consumption of natural resources (FY08); and 9) Waste reduction.

Mike Hursh, Deputy Director of Maintenance, provided a presentation highlighting the following: 1) Water conservation; 2) Energy efficiency; 3) Cerone solar project; 4) Alternative fuels; 5) Green lawn mowers at Cerone; 6) FY08 and FY09 budget status; 7) Annual operating savings; 8) Return on investment; and 9) Future projects and goals.

Alternate Board Member Moylan suggested informing the public on the proper disposal of compact fluorescent light bulbs because it contains mercury.

Board Member Reed inquired on the rebates received from Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E). Mr. Hursh responded the rebates received go in the VTA general fund.

Board Member Reed recommended utilizing the rebates from PG&E on other energy efficiency projects.

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Board received the Sustainability Program Update.

Jerry Grace, Interested Citizen, expressed concern on High Speed Rail activities happening at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

Board Member Kishimoto took her seat at 7:09 p.m.

Eugene Bradley, Santa Clara VTA Riders Union Founder and Local Transit Advocate, requested to receive specific ridership figures. He inquired if a study was conducted to determine cost savings in riding public transportation versus the use of private vehicles. He expressed concern on tax money used by VTA for the Federal lobbying group. Staff provided Mr. Bradley with the ridership figures and a response would be prepared to address his other concerns.
Ross Signorino, Interested Citizen, suggested developing an economical plan for the SVRT project to make it competitive for Federal funds.

8. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON

Chairperson Sandoval announced and invited the Board to the ribbon cutting of the Mary Avenue Bridge on Thursday, April 30, 2009 at 3:00 p.m.

9. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Chairperson’s Report

Noel Tebo, CAC Chairperson, expressed appreciation for the informal briefing regarding transit funding in Washington by Susan Lent for Advisory Committee members. He acknowledged Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager, and Greta Helm, Chief External Affairs Officer, for arranging the briefing session.

Mr. Tebo reported the CAC strongly supports AB 266 (Carter), which requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to do an assessment of the State’s unmet transportation needs every five years.


Chuck Page, PAC Vice Chairperson, provided a report from the PAC meeting on March 12, 2009 highlighting the following: 1) Presentation from the City of Gilroy; 2) Recommends the Board approve the Joint Development Program policy framework; 3) Recommends the Board approve the programming of FY 09-10 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager funds to various projects in the county; and 4) Received an update on the PAC Advisory Committee Enhancement Subcommittee.

CONSENT AGENDA

11. Workshop Minutes of February 27, 2009

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to approve the Board of Directors Workshop Minutes of February 27, 2009.

12. Regular Meeting Minutes of March 5, 2009

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of March 5, 2009.


M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to review and accept the 2000 Measure A Program Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2008.

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

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to review and accept the audited Financial Report for the Congestion Management Program for Fiscal Year 2008.

15. **Internal Audit Program Goals and Objectives**

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to approve the goals and objectives for the internal audit program at VTA, as proposed by the Auditor General.

16. **Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment**

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to ratify the nomination of Erik Larsen to the Citizens Advisory Committee, representing the South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council.

17. **Bill Position: AB 266 (Carter)**

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to adopt a support position for AB 266 (Carter), which requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to do an assessment of the State’s unmet transportation needs every five years.

18. **BART Plus Ticket Program Agreement**

Jerry Grace, Interested Citizen, expressed concern on the legal issue BART is facing because of the shooting incident, and its impact on the SVRT project.

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute an agreement to continue the BART Plus multi-agency ticket program in cooperation with BART and nine other Bay Area transit agencies through December 2009 with the option to extend up to three years in annual increments.

19. **Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Board accepted the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report.

20. **CDT Planning Grant Awards**

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to recommend the programming of $500,000 in Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Planning Grants.

21. **2009 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager Fund**

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to approve the programming of FY 2009/10 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager (TFCA 40%) funds to projects as shown in Attachment A.

22. **April 2009 Service Changes**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Board accepted the April 2009 Service Changes.
23. **Bus Wash Replacement (Chaboya)**

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute a lump-sum time-and-materials contract with Air and Lube Systems Incorporated of Sacramento, CA, the lowest bidder, for the replacement of all related equipment for two Revenue Vehicle Fleet Wash System Tunnels at the Chaboya Operating Division. The total amount of this contract is $610,034. This contract is 80% federally funded.

24. **Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Grant Program**

M/S/C (Caserta/Herrera) to adopt a resolution authorizing the filing and execution of grants with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for funding under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

25. **Revised Joint Development Policy**

Bijal Patel, Deputy Director for Property Development and Management, provided a report highlighting the following: 1) Why do joint development?; 2) Transit-oriented development; 3) Transit agencies with joint development programs; 4) Increased ridership; 5) Revenue; 6) Joint Development program efforts; 7) Revised Joint Development Policy framework; 8) Goals of Joint Development program; 9) Asset management tools; 10) Comprehensive process; 11) Organizational supports; and 12) Next steps.

Alternate Board Member Moylan inquired if the Board has the ability to acquire properties. Ms. Patel responded the Board has the authority to acquire new properties. It would undergo an evaluation process to determine its benefits.

Board Member Kniss queried about the developers forum. Ms. Patel responded the developers’ forum would address the following: 1) Developers’ inquiries regarding the status of projects, and 2) Outreach effort to preview the inventory of assets.

Board Member Kniss expressed concern local agencies and jurisdictions may not support a particular development. Ms. Patel responded staff would be conducting multiple levels of review and would be working closely with local jurisdictions and the Board regarding site developments.

Board Member Sellers inquired on the process of prioritizing site developments. Ms. Patel responded outreach efforts with local jurisdictions would be conducted to determine their goals and objectives. Findings from the meetings would then be presented to the Board.
Board Member Sellers inquired on the impacts of the High Speed Rail to project development. John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer, stated the impacts of the High Speed Rail would be determined within 18 months to two years.

Board Member Gage left the meeting at 7:54 p.m.

Board Member Kishimoto requested to receive a spreadsheet supporting the projections of future revenues on the properties.

Board Member Reed left the meeting at 7:55 p.m.

Board Member Kalra inquired on the flexibility of the Joint Development Policy. Ms. Patel responded there is flexibility in the process which enables the Board to take advantage of opportunities and unforeseen issues. She noted mechanisms were incorporated in the implementation plan which facilitates the evaluation of assets.

Board Member Caserta and Ex-Officio Board Member Yeager left their seats at 7:59 p.m.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo inquired how the assets were acquired. Ms. Patel stated staff is currently in the process of researching this information. She noted majority of the assets were purchased for capital projects.

M/S/C (Pyle/Herrera) to approve the proposed Joint Development Program policy framework.

M/S/C (Kniss/Kishimoto) to reconsider approving the proposed Joint Development Program policy framework.

Eugene Bradley, Interested Citizen, expressed concern on other agencies with Joint Development policy. He inquired how sites for development are determined under the Joint Development program. Michael T. Burns, General Manager, stated a written response would be provided for Mr. Bradley.

Jerry Grace, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding the availability of parking spaces on development sites.

M/S/C (Pyle/Herrera) to approve the proposed Joint Development Program policy framework.

26. **Annual Transit Service Plan**

Jim Unites, Deputy Director for Operations, provided a report highlighting the following:
1) Annual Transit Service Plan; 2) Public outreach; 3) Performance standards-bus service; 4) Core routes; 5) Ridership performance core service; 6) Major service change proposals, Core and local service; 7) Major service change proposals, Express service; 8) Major service change proposals, Community bus; 9) Great America Shuttle; 10) Minor service change proposals; 11) Community bus studies; 12) Deferred service improvements; and 13) Upcoming studies.
Vice Chairperson Liccardo inquired when changes to the Community Bus routes would be implemented. Mr. Unites responded changes would take effect in a few months. He added discussion with local jurisdictions would be conducted before route changes are implemented.

Board Member Pyle inquired if there is going to be less service in the future. Mr. Unites responded it is possible to see less service due to constrained resources. He explained services from non-performing routes were relocated to routes which demanded additional service. He noted a reasonable level of service was retained on routes where service was decreased.

Torrance Phillips, Interested Citizen, expressed appreciation for the changes made to Line 37. He recommended extending the route of Line 37 to West Valley College. He expressed concern regarding the decreased service for Lines 61 and 62.

Eugene Bradley, Interested Citizen, expressed concern on the reduction of service on Line 88 that serves the Veterans Administration (VA) Hospital in Palo Alto. Michael T. Burns, General Manager, responded Line 88 is a non-performing route. Instead of eliminating service, staff recommends reducing service to a reasonable level. Mr. Unites stated an option for commuters is the Stanford Marguerite shuttle which serves the VA Hospital.

Jerry Grace, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding the proposed changes to Line 181 and Great America shuttle.

M/S/C (Sellers/Kniss) to adopt the 2009 Annual Transit Service Plan and the recommended service changes.

OTHER ITEMS

27. (This Item was moved under the Report from the General Manager)
   Receive Sustainability Program Update.

28. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION
   There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

29. MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE HISTORY MATRIX
   On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Monthly Legislative History Matrix was accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
30. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Administration and Finance Committee

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 19, 2009 Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee Minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.

B. Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 19, 2009 Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee Minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.

C. Transit Planning and Operations Committee

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 19, 2009 Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee Minutes were accepted as contained on the dais.

31. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA)

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 11, 2009 Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.

B. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC)

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 11, 2009 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.

C. Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 11, 2009 Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.

D. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 12, 2009 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
E. **Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 12, 2009 Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.

32. **REPORTS FROM JOINT POWERS BOARDS (JPBs) & REGIONAL COMMISSIONS**

A. **Peninsula Corridor JPB**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Summary Notes from the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board were accepted as contained on the dais.

B. **Capitol Corridor JPB**

There was no report from the Capitol Corridor JPB.

C. **Dumbarton Rail Corridor Policy Committee**

There was no report from the Dumbarton Rail Corridor Policy Committee.

D. **Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Summary Notes from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) were accepted as contained on the dais.

E. **Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority**

There was no report from the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority.

33. **REPORTS FROM VTA POLICY ADVISORY BOARDS (PABs)**

A. **Vasona Light Rail PAB**

There was no report from the Vasona Light Rail PAB.

B. **Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor and BART Warm Springs Extension PAB**

There was no report from the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor and BART Warm Springs Extension PAB.

C. **Downtown East Valley PAB**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the March 5, 2009 Downtown East Valley PAB (DTEV) Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda Packet.
D. Highway PAB South

There was no report from the Highway PAB South.

34. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairperson Sandoval made the following announcements: 1) Cinco de Mayo Celebration on Tuesday, May 5, 2009, 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m., at the O&R Building in Cerone; and 2) Mary Avenue Bridge ribbon cutting on Thursday, April 30, 2009 at 3:00 p.m.

35. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael DiareSCO, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: CMP Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines Update

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the updated Congestion Management Program - Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines.

BACKGROUND:

As the Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County, VTA is responsible for preparing and maintaining a uniform database and computer simulation model for evaluating transportation impacts of land-use decisions and for highway and transit project planning. The VTA has developed a Countywide Transportation Model (Countywide model) that is based on and consistent with the MTC Regional Model with several key improvements. Member jurisdictions can use either the Countywide model or develop their own in-house models to examine transportation and land-use impacts. Since local jurisdictions are primarily interested in local street and intersection impacts, oftentimes a finer level-of-detail is required than is possible with the larger Countywide model. Thus VTA actively encourages local jurisdictions to prepare more detailed local models to serve their specific analysis needs. As part of the CMP statute, VTA is required to review and approve computer models used by local jurisdictions.

DISCUSSION:

To ensure that the local jurisdictions develop models consistent with the procedures used to develop the Countywide model, VTA has developed the Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines. This document describes in detail the process by which the local jurisdictions should develop their local models and also describes the process by which the VTA will evaluate and certify that local models are consistent with the Countywide model. The
current guidelines were adopted by the VTA Board in January 1995. VTA staff has recently completed a revision to the existing guidelines to include clarifications and new information such as changes to the model structure (e.g., traffic analysis zones - or TAZs) and software. The updated guidelines, provided in Attachment A, have been reviewed with the Systems Operations and Management (SOM) Working Group of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board may elect to defer adoption of the updated Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee had questions regarding how the countywide model deals with bike trips, Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) resulting from large projects, and the cost of the software recommended in the guidelines. Staff addressed these questions and the committee unanimously recommended the VTA Board adopt the updated Congestion Management Program Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines.

Prepared by: George Naylor
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

LOCAL TRANSPORTATION MODEL
CONSISTENCY GUIDELINES

(Final)

April 1, 2009
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Introduction

On January 1, 1995, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) was designated as the County’s Congestion Management Agency. The Congestion Management Program (CMP) legislation requires that congestion management agencies develop a uniform database and model for evaluating transportation impacts of land-use decisions consistent with the regional model and databases, and that the CMAs approve any computer models use by the member jurisdictions for these purposes. The Santa Clara VTA has developed a Countywide Transportation Model (Countywide Model) that is consistent with the methodologies used by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Regional Travel Demand Models and databases, and therefore meets the intent of the Congestion Management Program (CMP) requirements in Santa Clara County. This document presents the process to be used by member agencies to develop local (subarea) transportation models that are consistent with the Countywide Model and to describe the process used by the VTA to evaluate and certify local model consistency. Local jurisdictions are required to complete a consistency finding if the local models are to be used for CMP facility transportation impact analysis in Deficiency Plan analysis. If a local jurisdiction is developing a travel demand model that includes a traditional four-step process to evaluate landuse and transportation changes to forecast General Plan updates and other major development/roadway impacts (which could also have inter-jurisdictional implications), the VTA will require a consistency finding. Local jurisdictions that develop local traffic models using vehicle trip-generation rates to evaluate local intersection impacts not with the typical four-step modeling process will not be required to develop a model consistency finding.

It should be understood that local transportation models are not expected to exactly replicate the results of the Countywide models, just as the Countywide model is not expected to replicate the MTC Regional models. Instead, local models must be developed using information and techniques consistent with those used by the Countywide models, and the results of the local models must be reasonably consistent with the Countywide models. One of the most important reasons for differences between the local and Countywide models is that the local models typically include much finer detail in the transportation networks and socioeconomic databases. Thus the local models will be more effective in evaluating certain local conditions, such as intersection level-of-service and arterial roadway operations, than the larger Countywide models.
Therefore, the VTA encourages local jurisdictions to prepare more local subarea models to address local transportation planning needs and issues.

The purpose of this document is to describe the process the local agencies should consider in order to develop models consistent with the VTA Countywide models, and the steps that will be required to certify model consistency. It should be noted that local jurisdictions can use the VTA Countywide models directly by requesting the data and model application scripts prepared by VTA modeling staff and then running the models in-house. However, this would primarily represent a useful starting point, as the local jurisdictions may want to add more network and model detail in order to accomplish local-level analysis. In addition, there would still be a requirement that the local jurisdictions prepare and provide documentation to VTA staff in order to document model consistency.
Chapter 1. VTA Transportation Model and Database Requirements

1.1 Definitions

A transportation model is an analytical tool that predicts travel patterns based upon spatial relationship between socio-economic characteristics of population and employment locations, tripmaking and economic-related activities in those areas and interconnecting transportation facilities, including roadways, transit and bicycle and pedestrian modes of travel.

The databases are comprised of input data that is used by the transportation models to generate travel demand. For the Countywide models, there are three basic types of input data:

- Land use and socioeconomic data in each traffic analysis zone (TAZ), including population, households, employed residents and jobs by category,
- Characteristics of the transportation system, such as number of lanes, speed, capacity, transit stops and frequencies,
- Pricing characteristics such as parking costs, transit fares and auto operating costs.

Since the database consists of the basic input data required by the transportation models, the database and model together are oftentimes simply referred to as the transportation model.

1.2 Statutory Requirements

The CMP statute, specifically California Government Code 65089 (c), states the following:

*The agency, in consultation with the regional agency, cities, and the county shall develop a uniform database on traffic impacts for use in a countywide transportation computer model and shall approve transportation computer models of specific areas within the county that will be used by local jurisdictions to determine the quantitative impacts of development on the circulation system that are based on the countywide modeling assumptions and conventions.*

*The computer models shall be consistent with the modeling methodologies adopted by the regional planning agency. The databases used in the model shall be consistent with the databases used by the regional planning agency. Where the regional agency has jurisdiction over two or more counties, the databases used by the agency shall be consistent with the database used by the regional agency.*

The statue implies two levels of consistency. First the countywide models and databases must be consistent with the MTC regional models and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) socioeconomic databases. And second, the local transportation models and databases must be consistent with the VTA Countywide models.
In addition to developing a countywide model for the VTA, the CMP statute requires that the CMA approve computer models used by the local jurisdictions to determine transportation impacts of land-use decisions on the CMP system. In order to be approved by the VTA, local transportation models must meet consistency tests with respect to the VTA Countywide model and databases. It is important to keep in mind that consistency is not defined as replication. There may be valid reasons for local models to use assumptions and methodologies that differ from those used by the VTA Countywide models. However, assumptions that differ from those used by the Countywide model must be documented and identified as characteristics specific to the local jurisdiction model. Prior to the use of different local model assumptions, it is recommended that the local jurisdictions coordinate with VTA modeling staff to discuss specific local assumptions and ensure there are valid reasons for applying such assumptions.

1.3 Model Consistency Requirements

In order to assure the consistency of a local transportation model with the VTA model, the following basic elements must be followed:

- The transportation models must be of a form that can produce the following:
  1. Person trip productions and attractions by traffic analysis zone,
  2. Person trip distribution,
  3. Mode choice (or mode split factoring, if applicable), and
  4. Vehicle assignments.

- The transportation models must be able to produce AM and PM peak hour (or 3-hour or 4-hour peak period) vehicle volumes from the assignment process.

Including all of these elements at a minimum will ensure that a consistent evaluation of the local transportation models can be provided.

1.4 Database Consistency Requirements

In order to assure the consistency of a local transportation model database with the VTA model database, the following basic elements must be followed:

- The socioeconomic databases used by the local jurisdiction in the local models are required to be consistent with the VTA databases for areas outside of the local jurisdictions sphere-of-influence. Within the local jurisdiction, different socioeconomic data assumptions can be used provided there is adequate documentation.

- The transportation network database used by the local jurisdiction model must be consistent with the VTA CMA system of roadways, at a minimum, outside of the local
jurisdiction sphere-of-influence. Within the local jurisdiction, additional network detail can be added provided there is adequate documentation.

- Local models should be validated with existing count data for a base year.

Including all of these elements at a minimum will ensure that a consistent evaluation of the local transportation databases can be provided.
Chapter 2. VTA Transportation Model and Databases

This section describes the VTA Countywide model and databases. It also outlines how the VTA model may be used by local jurisdictions to develop the local transportation models.

2.1 VTA Model Documentation

The VTA Countywide models have been recently updated and will be formally documented in a Technical report to be produced in the first quarter of 2009. This document will be made available to local jurisdictions as a reference manual regarding model methodologies, data inputs and model outputs. This document will summarize the traffic analysis zone system, socioeconomic data inputs, network assumptions and model outputs summarized in a format for use by the local jurisdictions in the development of the local transportation models. In addition to VTA model documentation, local jurisdictions are encouraged to obtain and review MTC model documentation.

2.2 Socioeconomic and Network Databases

The VTA produces electronic versions of the Countywide model socioeconomic databases and transportation networks and distributes these elements to local jurisdictions regularly. Socioeconomic data and network data is distributed to local jurisdictions free of charge when requested. Currently, VTA maintains socioeconomic databases developed from ABAG Projections 2007 series datasets allocated to the smaller traffic analysis zones in Santa Clara County. VTA works with the local jurisdictions to verify, and if required modify the allocations of socioeconomic inputs within each jurisdiction received from ABAG. VTA currently maintains zonal socioeconomic data for the years 2005, 2015, 2030 and 2035 reflecting ABAG Projections 2007 datasets. These files exist in DBF formats and in GIS shapefiles, and are distributed to local jurisdictions upon request. It should be noted that VTA implements biennial updates of the socioeconomic databases as the new ABAG projections become available. Once the ABAG Projections 2009 datasets have been incorporated into the VTA model structure, forecasts years will be expanded to include 2005 through 2035 in 5 year increments, consistent with ABAG.

Transportation networks used by the VTA are consistent with assumptions made by MTC, with some refinements to reflect local conditions, particularly for the transit networks. These networks are continually reviewed and updated and are available for the years 2005, 2015, 2030 and 2035, and are consistent with assumptions made by both MTC and VTA to include projects funding in the Regional Transportation Plan and VTP 2035. These data sets can be distributed in DBF format, shapefile format or in the CUBE network format.
2.3 Use of the VTA Model Data in Local Jurisdiction Models

The VTA Countywide model is implemented in the CUBE Voyager software package. While it is not a requirement that local jurisdictions use the CUBE software, there are many advantages to implementing local models in CUBE. The VTA Countywide model input data and actual model data files can be used by local jurisdictions when developing local transportation models. In some cases, local jurisdictions may use the VTA Countywide model files (for example networks and trip tables for highway assignments) directly if no additional detail is required for certain analysis. However, if additional detail is required in the local models, the VTA Countywide model files and model scripts can be purchased at a nominal fee for direct use by the local jurisdictions. This price does not include purchase of the CUBE software package, which must be purchased separately by the local jurisdiction. Since there are a variety of options that can be pursued by the local agencies when developing a local transportation model, it is recommended that the local agencies consult with VTA staff prior to actual model development.
Chapter 3. Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines

This section describes the guidelines to be followed by the local jurisdictions when developing local models to ensure as reasonably practical that the local models are consistent with the VTA Countywide models and apply basic standard modeling methodologies. These guidelines will be used by the VTA to evaluate and approve the local transportation models.

3.1 Land Use and Socioeconomic Databases

The local models must use land use and socioeconomic databases consistent with the databases published and used by the VTA. VTA currently uses the ABAG Projections 2007 data series, allocated to the 1490 VTA Countywide model traffic analysis zones from the larger 366 Santa Clara County MTC regional model zone structure. However, local jurisdictions are free to use earlier versions of ABAG Projections series subject to documentation of such use. Local jurisdictions must respect the Sphere-of-Influence (SOI) control totals of population, households and jobs as documented by ABAG Projections for adjacent jurisdictions. However, within the jurisdiction SOI, for local modeling and planning purposes, the local jurisdictions are free to update the local areas with updated socio-economic data (population, households, jobs, etc.) if the updates to base year data can be verified with ground truth information, i.e., actual counts of housing units and jobs and verification through the base year model validation results. Local jurisdictions can split VTA traffic analysis zones, however, these new local zones must nest within VTA traffic analysis zones. Local jurisdictions can aggregate VTA Countywide model zones outside of their respective jurisdictions (provided socioeconomic data control totals are preserved) if required, however, this may require recalibration of the trip distribution and mode choice models, which must be documented.

3.2 Transportation Networks

The local models must use roadway and transit networks consistent with those published and used by the VTA. The local transportation model must include all elements of the CMP networks and network attributes both within the jurisdiction and with Santa Clara County, however, network detail may be aggregated outside of Santa Clara County. The local model must at a minimum distinguish between the following roadway types:

- Freeways,
- Expressways,
- Freeway ramps (metered and un-metered),
- Arterials, and
- HOV facilities.

Additional roadway categories deemed appropriate may be added by the local jurisdiction.
If transit networks are to be developed, the local model must at a minimum distinguish between the following transit submode types and use VTA Countywide model coding conventions (coding conventions will be provided in the model documentation):

- Heavy rail,
- Commuter rail,
- Light rail,
- Express bus,
- Local bus,
- Community bus, and
- Free shuttles.

Supporting transit subnetworks for walk-access and drive-access links also must follow VTA Countywide model coding conventions.

### 3.3 Trip Purposes

The local models must separately represent and describe internal trip purposes. The Countywide models use the following trip purposes:

- Home-based Work,
- Home-based Shop/Other,
- Home-based Social-Recreational,
- Home-based Grade school,
- Home-based High school,
- Home-based College/University,
- Air-passenger to San Jose Mineta International Airport, and
- Non-home-based

The local jurisdictions are free to recommend additional internal trip purposes or combine trip purposes (with the exception of home-based work trips) if they are felt to be important components of local travel, however, these additions must be documented. External trips made to and from outside of the 13-County VTA model region should be consistent with those assumptions used by the VTA Countywide models.

### 3.4 Trip Generation

Trip generation models estimate the magnitude of trip productions and trip attractions, or trip-making activity, made within each TAZ. The local transportation model must provide an estimate of person trip productions and attractions for each trip purpose, and these must be estimated by using the VTA trip generation equations. The local jurisdiction can recommend use of different trip generation equations, however, justification and documentation will be required. Local models are not required to adhere to trip generation production and attraction control totals.
that precisely match the VTA Countywide model totals, but rather, the resulting local model productions and attractions should be a function of the socioeconomic data inputs.

3.5 Trip Distribution

Trip distribution models are used to determine the direction of travel, or flows, of person trips made between each TAZ. The local models shall provide separate trip distribution models for each trips purpose. Home-based work trip distribution shall use congested travel times as the measure of impedance, or a combination of peak and off-peak travel times weighted to peak times. Non-work trip distribution models will use either off-peak travel times as the impedance measure or a combination of peak and off-peak travel times, weighted to off-peak times. Trip attractions shall be balanced to trip productions. If applicable and practical, the local jurisdictions shall report County-to-County and MTC superdistrict-to-superdistrict summary tables of trips by purpose from the trip distribution models. The use of and values of any trip distribution k-factors used in the local models will also need to be documented.

3.6 Mode Choice/Mode Split

Mode choice models split out the person trips into the different modes of travel, including drive-alone, carpools, transit bike and walk modes. The local models must at a minimum split out the total person trips into the various modes of drive-alone auto, shared-ride 2 person auto, shared-ride 3+ person auto, transit, bike and walk. Local models are free to use either mode split factors derived from the VTA Countywide models to develop trips by mode, or use the VTA Countywide model mode choice model equations. Any mode choice constant recalibration shall be documented by the local jurisdictions. Local jurisdictions should report trips by mode developed from the local models at the County-level for comparison to the VTA Countywide model results.

If mode choice models are implemented by the local jurisdictions, travel input parameters used in mode choice must be consistent with the VTA Countywide models, including at a minimum the following elements for base and forecast years:

- Auto operating and maintenance costs,
- Auto terminal times,
- Parking costs,
- Transit fares, and
- Tolls

3.7 Time-of-Day Factors

Time-of-day factors are used to split out the daily trips into the vehicle trips used in the assignment process. Local models should at a minimum develop peak hour vehicle trips for the
AM and PM peak hour time periods. The local jurisdictions should use the VTA Countywide model time-of-day factors, however, these may be adjusted in order to achieve more reasonable local validation results. Any revisions to the VTA Countywide model time-of-day factors must be documented.

3.8 Highway Assignment

Peak hour or peak period vehicle trips shall be assigned to the roadway networks using an equilibrium capacity restraint method. Local models should use the VTA Countywide model speed, capacity and volume-delay functions for the highway assignment, however, more local methods may be used if this results in improved validation results. Any departure from the VTA Countywide model assumptions must be documented. The local models should report output vehicle-miles of travel by facility type and selected screenline volumes for comparison to the assignment results of the VTA Countywide models. At a minimum, volume comparisons should be provided for facilities at the Santa Clara County line Screenlines and for a cordon around the local jurisdiction SOI boundaries.

3.9 Transit Assignment

If applicable, transit pathbuilding and assignment procedures used by the local models shall be consistent with methods used in the VTA Countywide models. Daily transit boardings by line for the VTA system should be reported by the local models for comparison to the VTA Countywide model results, if applicable.

3.10 Model Validation

Local jurisdictions must provide a base year validation of both highway and transit volumes, if transit assignments are applicable. VTA will not prescribe validation targets or goals for local models, however, VTA encourages local jurisdictions to apply best practices and follow national (Federal Highway Administration) and/or local (Caltrans and VTA) validation guidelines.
Chapter 4. Local Model Review: Evaluation and Acceptance Procedure

This section describes the procedure for a local jurisdiction to submit the local transportation model for review and approval by the VTA, and describes the evaluation and approval process.

4.1 Model Submission

In order to be evaluated for consistency with the VTA Countywide models and databases, a report must be submitted to the CMA on the local transportation model. The local model report shall include the following information at a minimum:

- Overall structure of the local model and the traffic analysis zone system,
- Trip purposes defined in the model,
- Methodology for the development of land-use and socio-economic databases for the models, and the horizon years presented in the modeling scenarios,
- Development of the transportation networks,
- Methodology and output for trip generation,
- Methodology and output for trip distribution,
- Methodology and output for mode choice or mode split,
- Assumptions for time-of-day factors,
- Methodology and output for vehicle assignments,
- Methodology and output for transit assignments, if applicable,
- Model validation summaries and comparisons to observed data for the base year model,
- Model forecast results, and
- Description and justification for significant differences between the local model and the VTA Countywide models

4.2 Evaluation by VTA CMA Staff

VTA staff will prepare a staff review of the local transportation model report. Working in consultation with local agency staff prior to finalization of the local model review, the findings of the VTA staff review will subsequently be presented at a meeting of the Systems Operations Management Working Group (SOMWG). The SOMWG will make a report to the VTA Technical Advisory Committee, recommending approval or rejection of the submitted model including explicit reasons for the recommendation.

4.3 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Review

The TAC will consider the model report submitted to the VTA, the results of the staff review and the report of the SOMWG. The TAC will recommend appropriate action regarding consistency
findings of the submitted model. The TAC may recommend that acceptance of the local model be placed on the consent calendar of the next CMA Board of Directors meeting.

4.4 VTA Board of Director Action

Acceptance of the local transportation models may be placed on the consent calendar of the VTA Board of Directors for action.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors - Amendment to Design Contract

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to amend the contract with Parsons Brinkerhoff for design services for the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project through final design and implementation. The amendment will increase the approved contract by $1,715,315 for a revised contract value not to exceed $2,000,000.

BACKGROUND:

At the December 11, 2008 Board Meeting, the Board took the following actions:

(1) Approved the Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program (Program);

(2) Approved allocation of up to $6,000,000 from the Local Program Reserve funds for implementation of SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors and for continuation of environmental documentation and engineering for the SR 85 & US 101 Express Lanes, and

(3) Directed staff to return within 90 days with an update on funding options for the completion of the Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program.

This memorandum seeks authorization to amend the contract with Parsons Brinkerhoff for design services for the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors, the near-term project identified in the Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program.

In total, the Parsons Brinkerhoff contract will utilize about $2,000,000 of the allocated $6,000,000 approved from the Local Program Reserve funds to implement the SR 237/I-880
Express Connectors. The initial phase of the contract was for the amount of $284,685.

Staff is recommending deferring the update on funding options for the entirety of the Program to September 2009. Two significant factors for deferring the funding options update are the continuing volatile and under-performing nature of the financial markets and the ongoing discussions with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) on the proposed regional Bay Area Express Lanes system.

DISCUSSION:

The SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project will implement a congestion pricing system to allow for the use of unused, available capacity on the carpool direct connectors at the SR 237/I-880 interchange to provide congestion relief in the peak commute periods. The congestion pricing system will allow solo commuters to use the available capacity on the carpool connector ramps for a fee. The fee would change dynamically in response to the existing congestion levels and the available capacity on the carpool connector ramps. The SR 237/I-880 Express Connector project is scheduled to open in 2010. This implementation of dynamic roadway pricing would be one of the first of its kind in the Bay Area.

Given the proposed expedited delivery timeline, staff has initiated work on the project. Parsons Brinkerhoff (PB) was selected from the January 5, 2006 VTA Board of Directors approved Consultant List for Highway Program Planning and Engineering Services to provide consulting services for the project.

The following are the reasons for selecting PB:

- PB staff is knowledgeable and experienced with pricing and tolling related to Express Lanes and other similar facilities (e.g., PB conducted initial evaluations of Express Lanes for the I-680 Express Lanes under construction, and is MTC's consultant on their regional Express Lanes study);
- PB staff is knowledgeable and experienced with Bay Area transportation and Caltrans;
- PB staff is knowledgeable and experienced with Santa Clara County and VTA; and
- PB staff is available to begin immediately to meet the proposed project schedule.

A contract was executed with General Manager approval for $284,685 to start the initial phase of work. Preliminary design work began in February. The scope under this initial phase of work includes data collection, including traffic counts, and preliminary engineering for the development of the congestion pricing system. The contract amendment adds the following scope:

- Prepare traffic operations analyses for the existing circulation patterns, project alternatives, and future circulation patterns in the corridor. Travel demand and revenue forecasting will also be conducted.
- Develop the concept of operations, including the Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) and systems integration requirements for the toll collection system.
- Contractor will assist VTA in the development of the scope of work for systems integration.
- Assist in procurement of a systems integrator.
• Provide technical management oversight of the systems integrator during design and implementation of the toll system.
• Prepare a Categorical Exemption/Categorical Exclusion for environmental approval for the project.
• Prepare plans, specifications and estimates (PS&E) for the necessary roadway improvements to implement the project.
• Provide assistance in securing the encroachment permits from Caltrans for both systems integration and the construction phase.
• Provide project oversight and coordination during agency approval, engineering services during construction.
• Provide marketing and public outreach consultation and assistance as needed.
• Provide a cost-benefit assessment with respect to congestion relief and revenue generation.

This work will result in the issuance of two additional contracts separate from the Parsons Brinkerhoff contract: the first will be granted through an RFP to provide an electronic toll system vendor/integrator to provide the final toll collection system design and to implement and operate the Express Connectors; and the second will provide a roadway construction contractor using the standard low-bid construction procurement to install the necessary roadway infrastructure (signing, striping and lighting) to operate the connectors as Express Connectors.

The proposed funding for the fully amended Parsons Brinkerhoff contract is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[2] VTA Local Program Reserves</td>
<td>$1,510,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board of Directors may elect to have staff solicit competitive proposals for the performance of this work, which is possible but would likely result in implementation late in 2011 rather than in 2010.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize up to $2,000,000 for roadway design work for the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project. There is sufficient appropriation for this expenditure in the FY09 Adopted VTP Highway Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. This contract is funded by a Federal allocation for HOT Lanes and Local Program Reserves.

**DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PARTICIPATION:**

VTA is complying with Federal requirements that the advertisement and award of this contract utilize race-neutral provisions, as this contract will have Federal Financial assistance. There was no DBE contract goal established. DBE participation was not a condition of contract award.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee heard this item on April 16, 2009. The CMPP Committee unanimously recommended that VTA Board of Directors authorize the General Manager to amend the contract with Parsons Brinkerhoff for design services for the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project through final design and implementation. The amendment will increase the approved contract by $1,715,315 for a revised contract value not to exceed $2,000,000. It was also discussed that staff would undertake preliminary work related to preparation of a benefit/cost analysis prior to finalizing on the implementation of the project.

Prepared by: Murali Ramanujam, Leo Scott
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: BPAC Appointments

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Ratify the appointments to the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) of Richard Ruh as the City of Monte Sereno representative and Paul Goldstein as the alternate representative of the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition.

BACKGROUND:

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

The BPAC bylaws specify that each Member Agency appoints one representative to the BPAC and that the SVBC appoints one representative and one alternate. The bylaws also 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 also precluded from representing a Member Agency that is their employer.

In accordance with the bylaws, the process to fill BPAC vacancies is that VTA staff notifies the appointing authority of the vacancy and current membership requirements. The appointing authority then appoints one member for the designated membership position. For vacancies
occurring in 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 February 2009, BPAC member Bill Manry representing the City of Monte Sereno submitted his resignation. At the March 2, 2009 City Council meeting, the City of Monte Sereno appointed Richard Ruh to serve as representative to the VTA BPAC. Mr. Ruh has lived in Monte Sereno for twenty years and he regularly commutes to work by bicycle. He is also a valued member of the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC).

In addition, the SVBC has appointed Paul Goldstein as its alternate representative. Mr. Goldstein replaces Celia Chung who resigned in February. Mr. Goldstein has been active in many bicycling organizations including serving as the chair of the City of Palo Alto’s Bicycle Advisory Committee. A Palo Alto resident for years, Mr. Goldstein is a member of the SVBC and served on its Board of Directors for ten years.

Due to the qualifications, experience and knowledge of bicycle and pedestrian issues of these individuals, staff recommends that the Board ratify these appointments.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The A&F Committee recommended that the Board ratify the appointments to the BPAC.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board could choose to not to ratify one or both of these appointments.

FISCAL IMPACT:

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

Prepared by: Michelle DeRobertis
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Authorization for Annual Operations Insurance Program Renewal

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:


BACKGROUND:

VTA’s Operations Property and Casualty insurance coverage renews annually on July 1 to coincide with the fiscal year. Each spring VTA’s contract insurance broker, currently Alliant Insurance Services, structures VTA’s insurance program by requesting competing premium estimates from various carriers in the insurance market. Carriers that are approached are chosen on the basis of their historical premium rates, coverage criteria, and underwriting background. In addition, carriers are required to have experience with governmental agencies, adequate financial reserves and a minimum A.M. Best rating of Excellent. VTA’s expense for this year’s operating insurance was $1,914,586. VTA also received $73,395 in incentive credits this year for good loss control experience in the prior coverage year.

Insurers will require VTA to review premium quotes and commit to the purchase of the policies during a two to three week period immediately prior to the July 1, 2009 renewal date. We are seeking Board Authority now to purchase the insurance to avoid placing VTA in the undesirable position of being uninsured for any period of time.
DISCUSSION:
As of the drafting of this memo, premium estimates are not available for the July 1, 2009 renewal. The $2,118,693 authority requested represents the broker’s estimate of premium cost, based on their knowledge of the current market and experience with the completed renewals of other public entities.

For the July 1, 2009/2010 coverage term, VTA has directed the broker to obtain quotes for the same program structure as purchased for the current year. In past years, following risk analyses, cost reductions were achieved by eliminating the Workers’ Compensation Excess, Earthquake and Crime policies. Last year VTA staff worked with the broker to assess the advisability of purchasing these discontinued policies. Based on the premium estimates and VTA’s loss history no changes were made. VTA has been self insured for Workers’ Compensation since July 2002, although we continue to contract for claims handling.

The proposed program continues these strategies. Additional reductions in coverage are not recommended. The proposed program includes $25 million in coverage for General Liability, Auto Liability, Public Officials’ Errors and Omissions Liability, and Property coverage for all VTA buildings, buses, light rail vehicles, and specialized mobile equipment.

The premium estimates include an 11% increase across all lines of coverage. The final premium will be adjusted for changes in the number of vehicles and replacement values of buildings. With the increase, the insurance estimates are as follows: Excess General Liability ($1,298,746), Buses ($380,037), Light Rail Vehicles ($270,926), Flood Insurance ($47,300) for exposed VTA sites (River Oaks and Cerone Division), and Property/Boiler & Machinery ($121,684), for a total of $2,118,693. See Attachment “A” for details.

The results of the insurance marketing and final purchase pricing will be reported to the Administration and Finance Committee at the September 17, 2009 meeting.

ALTERNATIVES:
None are recommended. Staff reviewed and considered increasing the deductibles and the self-insured retention to reduce premium cost. The increased risk resulted in only modest savings that do not warrant the additional exposure.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item at the April 16, 2009 meeting attended by Director Reed, Director Casas, and Director Gage as part of the Consent Agenda. It was approved unanimously without comment.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This action will authorize up to $2,118,693 for Property and Casualty insurance coverage. Appropriation for this expenditure will be included in the Recommended FY10 VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Operating Budget.
SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:

No specific goal has been established for this contract due to the lack of SBE firms available to perform the scope of work. Contractor is encouraged to make reasonable efforts to utilize SBEs in its procurement of ancillary services and products associated with the performance of this contract.

Prepared by: Nanci G. Eksterowicz
## 2009-10 Estimated Operations Insurance Renewal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Deductible</th>
<th>2008-09 Actual Premium</th>
<th>2009-10 Projected Premium</th>
<th>Change ($)</th>
<th>Change (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCESS LIABILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000 Policy Limit</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>136,235</td>
<td>150,199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000,000 Policy Limit</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>994,413</td>
<td>1,148,547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,130,648</td>
<td>$1,298,746</td>
<td>$168,099</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPERTY / BOILER &amp; MACHINERY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000,000 Policy Limit</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oak, Cerone, Chaboya, North, Light Rail, Tamien Child Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$105,353</td>
<td>$121,684</td>
<td>$16,331</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LIGHT RAIL VEHICLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000,000 Policy Limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,750,000 Limit -Light Rail Cars (99 units)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 Limit -Historic Trolleys (4 units)</td>
<td>$100k/$25k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000,000 Limit -Spare Parts</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$246,197</td>
<td>$270,926</td>
<td>$24,729</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROAD VEHICLES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000,000 Policy Limit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$335,000 Limit -Standard Buses (413 units)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$525,000 Limit -Articulated Buses (40 units)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$166,605 Limit -Community Buses (49 units)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,357,000 Limit -Mobile Equipment</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$389,426</td>
<td>$380,037</td>
<td>-$9,389</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLOOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 Limit -River Oak</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 Limit -Cerone</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>$42,962</td>
<td>$47,300</td>
<td>$4,338</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,914,586</td>
<td>$2,118,693</td>
<td>$204,108</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Bill Position: AB 798 (Nava)

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 798 (Nava), which creates the California Transportation Financing Authority to assist local and regional agencies in obtaining financing through the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of improvements to the state’s transportation infrastructure. This bill also allows the authority to permit local and regional agencies, as part of the financing plan for their projects, to impose tolls for the use of the facilities constructed.

BACKGROUND:

AB 798, which is being sponsored by the Treasurer’s Office, establishes the California Transportation Financing Authority to assist local and regional agencies in obtaining financing to construct transportation projects. In doing so, this legislation permits local and regional agencies, subject to specified conditions, to impose tolls for the use of the facilities that are constructed through the authority. The key provisions of AB 798 are as follows:

1. States that the objective of the California Transportation Financing Authority is “to increase the construction of new capacity or improvements for the state transportation system in a manner that is consistent with and will help meet the state’s greenhouse gas reduction goals, air quality improvement goals, and natural resource conservation goals, through the issuance of, or the approval of the issuance of, bonds” backed by various transportation revenue streams.

2. Allows a project sponsor to apply to the authority for revenue bond financing of a transportation project that has been approved by Caltrans and the California
Transportation Commission (CTC).

3. Prior to issuing bonds for a project, requires the authority to determine that the revenues available for that project will be sufficient to pay debt service on the bonds, and to operate and maintain the project over the life of the bonds.

4. Allows a project sponsor to be the issuer of the bonds, subject to authority approval.

5. Allows the authority to authorize a project sponsor to collect tolls as one source of financing if certain conditions are met. These conditions include the following: (a) the governing body of the project sponsor, by a majority vote, must approve the imposition of tolls on users of the project; (b) each highway project for which tolls are imposed must have non-tolled alternative lanes available for public use in the same corridor as the proposed toll project; (c) the tolls must be set and maintained at a level that is expected to be sufficient to pay debt service, as well as to operate and maintain the project over the life of the bonds; (d) excess revenues from the operation of the project must be used exclusively in the corridor from which the revenues were generated to fund the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, or operation of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities, other transportation purposes or public transit service; and (f) tolls may not be set to generate more revenue than the cost of paying debt service on the bonds, operating and maintaining the project, and providing transportation improvements in the corridor.

6. Allows a project sponsor to implement variable or dynamic pricing to manage congestion on the tolled facilities.

AB 798 is intended to add an important piece to the state’s transportation funding puzzle. The California Transportation Financing Authority would have a limited purpose: to issue revenue bonds to pay for improvements to the state’s transportation system. Projects could be requested by a local or regional agency, and the bonds could be repaid through tolls or other transportation revenues.

DISCUSSION:

Capacity demands, combined with declining revenue streams for project financing, have severely eroded California’s transportation network. Population increases have far outpaced project construction. The gas tax, the major state source of transportation construction funding, has depreciated in value and remains unchanged since 1994 at 18 cents per gallon. So far, remedies for this lack of funding have included: (a) state general obligation bonds that are repaid with General Fund revenues, tapping an already limited resource used for other government services, such as public safety, education, health care, social services, and environmental protection; and (b) sales taxes, which are extremely volatile because the amount of money they generate is directly linked to the performance of the economy.

The situation at the federal level is not much better. The federal fuel tax has remained unchanged for the last 15 years, and the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue
Study Commission has found that the Highway Trust Fund will soon be depleted of funds necessary to finance future construction projects.

This confluence of circumstances, combined with the diminishing effect that fuel-efficient vehicles have on the gas tax, have resulted in the need to develop alternative financing mechanisms for transportation projects. AB 798 represents a step in that direction. Through the establishment of the California Transportation Financing Authority, the measure would create a method for local and regional agencies to finance transportation projects in the municipal bond market. The legislation is intended to increase the options available to local and regional agencies to address their most pressing transportation needs.

This bill is identical to AB 3021 (Nava) from 2008, which was approved by the Legislature, but vetoed by Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger for reasons related to how lawmakers handled the FY 2009 state budget, not the policy merits of the legislation. The Board of Directors supported AB 3021 last year, and we recommend that the Board do likewise with AB 798.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could decide to adopt a position for AB 798 that is different from the one being recommended, or could opt to take no position on this bill at this time.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item on April 16, 2009, and unanimously recommended that the Board of Directors support AB 798. In response to a question from Director David Casas about whether the prospects for this bill would different from last year, staff responded that it would depend on the political dynamic surrounding the state budget at the time the measure reached the Governor’s desk, and how that dynamic was affecting the relationship between the Governor and the Legislature.

This item also was considered by the Citizens Advisory Committee on April 8, 2009. The committee took a formal action recommending that the Board of Directors support AB 798.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no immediate fiscal impact associated with this recommendation.

Prepared by: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Bill Position: AB 338 (Ma)

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 338 (Ma), which allows local officials to divert property tax increment revenues to pay for new bonds for infrastructure within transit village development districts.

BACKGROUND:

The major provisions of AB 338 are as follows:

Transit Village Plans: The Transit Village Development Planning Act, which was enacted in 1994, allows cities and counties to plan more intensive development within a quarter mile of rail or light rail stations, ferry terminals, bus hubs, or bus transfer stations. Transit village plans identify areas, called transit village development districts, where local officials are willing to grant density bonuses to builders. To qualify, a transit village plan must demonstrate five public benefits selected from a statutory list of 13 public benefits.

AB 338 recasts the maximum size of a transit village development district to include all land within a half mile of the main entrance of a public transit station.

Infrastructure Financing Districts: Under current law, cities and counties, subject to two-thirds voter approval, can set up infrastructure financing districts (IFDs) to issue tax allocation bonds backed by property tax increment revenues to fund community-scale public works projects, such as roadways, public transit, water and sewer systems, flood control improvements, child care facilities, libraries, parks, and solid waste facilities. To repay the bonds, IFDs can divert the property tax revenues generated by rising property value assessments within the designated area...
of the district from other local governments, except for schools and community colleges, for up to 30 years, but only if the other local governments agree to the diversion. Unlike in the case of a redevelopment agency, the property in an IFD does not have to be blighted, but an IFD cannot overlap a redevelopment project area.

AB 338 expands the use IFDs to include the implementation of a transit village plan. In other words, the legislation would allow a city or county that prepares a transit village plan to create an IFD and thereby use property tax increment financing to pay for public facilities, infrastructure and amenities that are needed to fulfill the goals of the transit village plan. In addition, the bill eliminates the requirement for an election to form an IFD, and to adopt and implement an IFD plan.

**Affordable Housing:** Under existing law, redevelopment agencies must set aside 20 percent of their property tax increment revenues and deposit that money into a Low- and Moderate-Income Housing Fund. They must spend these funds to increase the supply of low- and moderate-income housing. If a redevelopment project destroys affordable housing, local officials must pay relocation assistance to the residents and replace the affordable housing. Unlike redevelopment agencies, IFDs do not need to set aside property tax increment revenues for affordable housing.

AB 338 requires a city or county that utilizes an IFD to implement a transit village plan to set aside 20 percent of those revenues for affordable housing, as well as to relocate residents and replace any affordable housing that is destroyed, following the requirements that apply to redevelopment agencies. In addition, the city or county must include an increase in the stock of affordable housing or travel options for transit-needy groups as one of its five demonstrable public benefits for its transit village plan.

**DISCUSSION:**

The public sector’s investment in commuter rail, light rail, ferries, and bus lines is part of a broader strategy to improve air quality, reduce traffic congestion, and promote compact development. When communities encourage public transit agencies to build rail and bus systems, but then fail to promote higher-density development around their stations, the loss is social, as well as physical. One reason that communities do not encourage more density around transit stations is the lack of fiscal incentives to pay for the public works needed to support the new residents and businesses.

AB 338 lets cities and counties capture the fiscal benefits of new construction inside transit villages by harnessing property tax increment financing for transit village development. This bill is intended to remove a major roadblock to transit-oriented development by encouraging cities and counties to combine transit village planning with property tax increment financing without having to set up redevelopment project areas.

This bill is almost identical to AB 1221 (Ma), which was approved by the Legislature, but vetoed by Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger for reasons related to how lawmakers handled the FY 2009 state budget, not the policy merits of the legislation. The Board of Directors supported AB 1221 last year, and we recommend that the Board do likewise with AB 338.
**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could decide to adopt a position for AB 338 that is different from the one being recommended, or could opt to take no position on this bill at this time.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item on April 16, 2009, and unanimously recommended that the Board of Directors support AB 338. Director Don Gage noted that oftentimes a developer will propose project with higher densities around public transit hubs, but those densities end up getting reduced by the local jurisdiction in response to community concerns to the point where the development cannot support the level of transit service provided at the station site. Director Gage suggested that staff make the author of AB 338 aware of this issue.

This item also was considered by the Citizens Advisory Committee on April 8, 2009. The committee took a formal action recommending that the Board of Directors support AB 338.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this recommendation.

Prepared by: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: Laser Intrusion Detection System at Light Rail Stations Contract Award

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Siemens Building Technology, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $307,096 for the Laser Intrusion Detection System at Light Rail Stations, pending approval by FTA for a waiver to the Buy America requirements. This contract is 100% funded by a combination of Federal Transit Security, Federal Department of Homeland Security and State Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

BACKGROUND:

The Tasman East Extension Elevated Guideway has been identified by VTA as a critical infrastructure component that should be monitored and protected against human and automobile intrusion. This protection is desired to prevent potential light rail and pedestrian/automobile conflicts on the structure where light rail operates at 55 mph. This project is proposed to provide a detection system that will set off an alarm at the VTA Light Rail Operations Control Center and notify VTA of an intrusion onto the light rail structure for investigation by Protective Services. The proposed laser scanning system is consistent with the improvement currently used at the San Jose Diridon tunnel portals.

Construction is scheduled to begin in July 2009 with completion in December 2009.

DISCUSSION:

The Laser Intrusion Detection System construction contract was advertised on January 30, 2009. Bids were opened on March 17, 2009 with the following results:
Siemens Building Technology, Inc. is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid is approximately 33% under the Engineer’s Estimate. Staff has completed a bid analysis and determined the bid to be fair and reasonable.

Since the project is funded by a Federal grant, the construction contract requires that equipment be fabricated and assembled in the United States of America. Since there are no American suppliers that can satisfy the contract requirements, the low bidder certified that it cannot comply with the requirements of section 165(a) of the Surface Transportation Assistant Act of 1982.

VTA staff believes that an exception to the requirement due to unavailability can be obtained (pursuant to section 165(b) (2) or (b) (4) of the Surface Transportation Assistant Act of 1982 and regulations in 49 CFR 661.7). A waiver request has been prepared and submitted to Federal Transit Administration. It is anticipated that a response to the request will be provided in May 2009.

Pending approval of the waiver application by Federal Transit Administration, staff recommends award of this contract to Siemens Building Technology, Inc. Award will not be made until the waiver is approved.

ALTERNATIVES:

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will authorize $307,096 for the construction of a Laser Intrusion Detection System. There is sufficient appropriation for this expenditure in the FY09 Adopted VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Capital Budget. This project is funded by Federal Transit Administration and Prop 1B California Transit Security Grants.

Operating Budget Impact: The additional Laser Intrusion Detection equipment will serve as part of the overall light rail system, and operating and maintenance costs connected with these improvements will be included in the Recommended FY10 and FY11 and subsequent years’ VTA Transit Enterprise Operating Budget.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PARTICIPATION:

VTA is complying with Federal requirements that the advertisement and award of this contract utilize race-neutral provisions, as this contract will have Federal Financial assistance. There was no DBE contract goal established. DBE participation was not a condition of contract award.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee considered this item on April 16, 2009. After receiving a staff report, the Committee unanimously approved the item without discussion and placed it on the Board’s May meeting Consent Agenda.

Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: Closed Circuit Television at Light Rail Stations Contract Award

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Cupertino Electric, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $524,920 for the Closed Circuit Television Phase 1, 2 and 3 Project. This contract is 100% funded by a combination of Federal Transit Security, Federal Department of Homeland Security and State Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

BACKGROUND:

VTA’s current closed circuit television (CCTV) network includes coverage at the Chynoweth, Santa Clara, Mountain View, Alum Rock, Great Mall, and Hamilton light rail stations, the Eastridge Transit Center, and the San Jose Diridon light rail station and tunnel portals.

This project will expand the CCTV video-on-demand system to the Penitencia Creek, I-880/Milpitas, Baypointe, Cropley, Montague, Convention Center and Tasman light rail stations. In addition, the Tasman East elevated structure will be improved with CCTV equipment.

All proposed CCTV improvements will direct live video streams via network to the VTA Light Rail Operations Control Center (OCC) located at the Younger Facility, and the Protective Services Department located at the River Oaks Administration site. The CCTV video on demand system will provide 24 hours/day monitoring of stations as well as data retrieval illustrating date and time information.

Construction is scheduled to begin in May 2009 with completion in December 2009.
DISCUSSION:

The CCTV Phase 1, 2 and 3 construction contract was advertised on January 30, 2009. Bids were opened on March 10, 2009 with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino Electric</td>
<td>$524,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemens Building Technology</td>
<td>$548,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Control</td>
<td>$707,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSQ Technology</td>
<td>$736,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitech Security Systems</td>
<td>$747,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris Electric</td>
<td>$748,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker Construction</td>
<td>$849,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Estimate</td>
<td>$979,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cupertino Electric is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid is 49% under the Engineer’s Estimate. VTA staff has completed a bid analysis, has determined the bid to be fair and reasonable, and recommends award of this contract to Cupertino Electric. The low bid is the result of the competitive bidding climate.

ALTERNATIVES:

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will authorize $524,920 for installation of a CCTV video-on-demand system at the listed stations. There is sufficient appropriation for this expenditure in the FY09 Adopted VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Capital Budget. This project is funded through Federal Transit Security Grants, Federal Section 5307 Grants, and VTA Transit Enterprise local funds.

Operating Budget Impact: The expanded CCTV system is included as part of the entire light rail system and operating and maintenance costs for the improvements will be included in the Recommended FY10 and FY11 and subsequent years’ VTA Transit Enterprise Operating Budget.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PARTICIPATION:

VTA is complying with Federal requirements that the advertisement and award of this contract utilize race-neutral provisions, as this contract will have Federal Financial assistance. There was no DBE contract goal established. DBE participation was not a condition of contract award.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee considered this item on April 16, 2009. After receiving a staff report, the Committee unanimously approved the item without discussion and placed it on the Board’s May meeting Consent Agenda.
Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Operating Officer, Donald A. Smith Jr.

SUBJECT: Competitive Negotiation Resolution for Procurement of 40-Foot Hybrid Buses

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a Resolution upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Directors finding that a competitive
sealed bid process does not constitute a method of procurement adequate for VTA’s needs and
directing the use of competitive negotiation for the purchase of up to 107 low-floor diesel
electric hybrid 40-foot buses, as required by Public Contract Code Sections 20216 and 20217.

BACKGROUND:

VTA has issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) to purchase new, 40-foot transit buses that will
replace some of the older model high-floor buses purchased in 1997 and 1998. The buses
scheduled for replacement present a myriad of maintenance issues, most notable are recurrent lift
failures.

The buses will be purchased using a combination of federal stimulus and state Proposition 1B
funds. The exact quantity purchased will depend on the final amounts of federal and state
funding we are able to obtain.

DISCUSSION:

The Public Contract Code authorizes VTA to purchase buses using competitive negotiation upon
a vote of two-thirds by the Board of Directors that the purchase of buses through normal
procedures (e.g., competitive bidding) would not be adequate for VTA’s needs. The competitive
negotiation procurement process has previously been used by VTA to procure 100 low-floor
light rail vehicles and 40 low-floor articulated buses.

Procurement of these buses through competitive negotiation, rather than through a competitive bid process, is the appropriate means of procurement as this involves a specialized product, low-floor diesel electric hybrid 40-foot buses. There are significant differences in what manufacturers are able to offer, and factors other than price are just as important to consider. The competitive negotiation process helps to ensure the best value for the investment. It is a multi-step process which for this purpose includes consideration of fitness of purpose, manufacturer’s warranty, performance reliability, life-cycle costs, support logistics and price.

Manufacturers of this unique type of bus are limited; however we anticipate at least three proposals for low-floor diesel electric hybrid 40-foot buses. Once VTA has received and reviewed the initial proposals, staff will meet with each vehicle manufacturer to refine, clarify and negotiate initial elements of their proposal. We will then request that each bidder submit their “best and final” offer. This process allows VTA to consider the essential elements previously referenced as well as performance and price.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

These buses can be competitively bid, however, as previously noted, staff feels the outcome will not yield the overall best product for our customers and service.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The use of a competitive negotiation may result in a higher overall cost given that other factors in addition to price are considered as part of the vendor selection process. However, using a competitive negotiation does facilitate receiving the best value for the investment.

**STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee received a presentation from staff and discussed this unique opportunity to procure new buses with the infusion of federal stimulus money. Staff reviewed the procurement schedule and indicated the contract award is scheduled to go to the Committee of the Whole for review in July and to the August board meeting for final approval. Once negotiations are completed, the bus manufacturer will have a prototype available for public review.

The Committee asked if other transit agencies are considering buses of this nature and is it possible to collaborate with them in order to maximize pricing efficiencies. Staff responded that typically buses are procured to meet the specific needs of a service area. For example, SF Muni has hills to contend with, whereas VTA does not. VTA is purchasing a minimum of 50 buses, which is sufficient to ensure competitive pricing. Options to purchase more than 50 are included in the RFP.

The Committee asked about cost per bus and staff responded that until the contract negotiations are completed, actual pricing information is very tentative; a very approximate estimated cost per bus is anticipated to be between $500,000 and $800,000. It was noted that these buses will afford maximum accessibility for our customers as well as being some of the most energy efficient in
the industry.

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee unanimously approved this item and moved it to the Board of Directors’ May meeting Consent agenda.

Prepared by: Sandra Weymouth
Resolution No. _____________

RESOLUTION OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY BOARD OF DIRECTORS DIRECTING PURCHASE OF LOW-FLOOR DIESEL ELECTRIC HYBRID 40-FOOT BUSES BY COMPETITIVE NEGOTIATION

WHEREAS, pursuant to Public Contract Code Sections 20216 and 20217, the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) may direct the purchase of buses by competitive negotiation upon a finding by two-thirds vote of all members of the Board that the purchase of those products or materials by otherwise applicable contracting provisions does not constitute a method of procurement adequate for VTA’s needs;

WHEREAS, VTA desires to purchase up to 107 low-floor diesel electric hybrid buses and to obtain the best value for the investment in such vehicles, various factors must be considered and refined in the procurement process including fitness of purpose, manufacturer’s warranty, performance reliability, life-cycle costs and support logistics;

WHEREAS, the purchase of such low-floor diesel electric hybrid buses under competitive bidding procedures would not permit adequate consideration of the above-referenced factors;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, that the purchase of up to 107 low-floor diesel electric hybrid buses in compliance with the provisions in the Public Contract Code generally applicable to such purchase does not constitute a method of procurement adequate to VTA’s needs, and the purchase of such buses by competitive negotiation is hereby directed.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority on May 7, 2009, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

___________________________
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Board of Directors

Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

___________________________
Kevin D. Allmand, Counsel
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: HOT Network Legislative Framework

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Endorse the Regional High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Network legislative framework for AB 744 (Torrico) proposed by MTC as described in the memorandum.

BACKGROUND:

Assembly Bill 2032, signed into law by Governor Schwarzenegger in 2004, establishes the legislative authority for VTA to implement and operate two corridors of High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes within Santa Clara County. HOT Lanes allow single occupant vehicles to access the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes for a fee to be collected via electronic toll equipment. VTA has followed through on the authority granted by AB 2032 and has been developing HOT Lane projects in Santa Clara County since 2005. On December 11, 2008 the VTA Board of Directors approved the Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program for implementation. The action by the Board directed staff to proceed with the development and deployment of Express Lanes on Route 85 and 101 and deployment of an Express Connector project at the Route 237/880 Interchange. (The action also established “Express Lanes” as the preferred naming terminology for HOT Lanes.)

On July 23, 2008 MTC adopted a policy to implement an 800-mile network of Express Lanes throughout the Bay Area and also adopted principles to guide the development and implementation of the system. (Attachment A) On December 11, 2008 VTA also endorsed those principles along with several additional key policy statements to guide VTA staff in the discussion with MTC and other parties in the development of the system and governing legislation. Recently, MTC has sponsored legislation, AB 744 (Torrico), to establish authority for the 800-mile Bay Area Regional Express Lane Network.
On August 6, 2008 the VTA Board of Directors approved the VTP 2035 project list and revenue plan submittal to MTC in response to the preparation of the Regional Transportation Plan 2035 (RTP) for the Bay Area. Included in the VTP 2035 submittal to MTC is a forecast of revenue generated by Express Lanes in Santa Clara County totaling $3.8 Billion. A portion of the revenue ($1.7 Billion) was assigned to construction and operation of a complete system of HOV/Express Lanes in Santa Clara County with the net revenue ($2.1 Billion) from the Express Lane System allocated to support the 2000 Measure A Transit Program.

Recently VTA updated the 2000 Measure A project costs, which included an increase in costs of the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Project and also updated the forecast of future sales tax revenue downward due to the national economic decline. The combination of lower sales tax revenue and higher costs caused MTC to delay approval of the 2009 RTP until updated costs and revenues for all Counties and transit operators were updated. Federal and state law requires MTC to adopt a financially balanced RTP, comparing reasonably available revenues to project costs over the 25-year duration of the plan.

MTC included $9.8 Billion in revenue derived from Bay Area Express Lanes in the RTP with $3.7 Billion going to construction of the HOV/HOT system and $6.1 Billion in net revenue unassigned to any project. Express Lane corridors in Santa Clara County are projected to generate, between 40% to 50% of all of the revenue in the Bay Area.

VTA has recently again, requested that MTC include $2.1 Billion in net revenue generated from Express Lanes in Santa Clara County be applied to the 2000 Measure A Program. Express Lane funding dedicated directly to Santa Clara County is required in order to allow the entire Measure A program including SVRT Project to be included in the financially balanced 2009 RTP.

In response to the VTA request, MTC has conditionally approved the inclusion of the funds for Santa Clara County in the RTP, subject to VTA Board endorsement of the regional HOT network legislative framework for AB 744.

**DISCUSSION:**

VTA has been a strong supporter of the development of a regionally consistent, seamless and connected network of Express Lanes throughout the Bay Area. VTA believes the development of an Express Lane System can be used as a powerful tool to manage the efficiency and effectiveness of the existing freeway system, to offer a new mobility choice for motorists and to potentially be a new source of revenue to improve commute corridors, reduce air pollution emissions from congested freeways and support transit service in those corridors. The VTA Board of Directors endorsed the MTC principles for implementation of the system in December 2008.

MTC has now developed a draft legislative framework to guide development of language to be included in AB 744 (Attachment B). The framework outlines roles and responsibilities of the various parties including CMAs, the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA), and Caltrans and also establishes a governance structure and decision-making process and parameters for revenue distribution.
Staff recommends approval of the AB 744 legislative framework.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could choose to amend the staff recommendation or choose not to support the recommendation to endorse the legislative framework as proposed.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Although the action to endorse this item does not have a direct financial impact on VTA, the Express Lane System contemplated by the legislation does have a potentially very large fiscal impact. VTA has included the Express Lane System and revenue generated from the system in the Valley Transportation Plan 2035, adopted by the Board in January 2009. The revenue is intended to finance completion of the HOV/HOT System as well as augment and support the Measure A Transit Program. Santa Clara County Express Lanes are projected to generate up to 50% of all of the revenue from the entire Bay Area Network estimated at $9.8 Billion over 25 years.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee heard this item on April 16, 2009. The CMPP Committee recommended that VTA Board of Directors endorse the legislative framework for AB 744 as proposed by MTC but requested that staff return with additional information on items listed below for consideration by the full Board at the May 7, 2009 meeting.

The staff presentation on the item included a description of the benefits and implications of the proposed new legislation. The new legislation would allow MTC/BATA to develop and implement a Bay Area network of toll lanes. The legislation does provide an opportunity to finance the network through a network enterprise backed by bridge tolls managed by BATA. The enterprise financing concept could provide an opportunity to obtain more favorable financing rates and also could provide VTA the opportunity to avoid incurring risk of issuing debt for development of the corridors in Santa Clara County. Additional, benefits would be the development and application of common and consistent standards for operations of the Express Lanes to ensure a seamless system for the users.

The new legislation would alter the approval authority structure of the program implementation and re-investment plans for net revenue. The current statute provides that VTA has the final authority to set direction on Express Lane implementation and investment of net revenue from the corridors in Santa Clara County. The new legislation would vest that final authority in BATA. VTA, as well as other participating counties, would have a preliminary approval role of the corridor investment plans before final approval by BATA.

After the original CMPP Committee memorandum was prepared, which outlined areas of clarification needed, MTC did provide an updated, revised framework document which did satisfactorily clarify the issues raised in the memorandum.

During deliberation on the item, the CMPP Committee requested that staff provide additional
information or amendment in the following areas:

a) Provide further explanation of the enterprise financing concept provided through BATA.
b) Include clean air goals, which meets State adopted emission requirements, as one of the objectives of the Express Lane Program.
c) Ensure that the role of CMAs (VTA) includes authority to develop and approve corridor implementation and corridor investment plans.
d) Describe Santa Clara County options for representation on MTC.

Staff will present the information requested by the CMPP Committee at the meeting on May 7, 2009.

Prepared by: John Ristow
OBJECTIVES

Development and implementation of a Bay Area Express/High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) Network has five primary objectives:

- More effectively manage the region’s freeways in order to provide higher vehicle and passenger throughput and reduce delays for those traveling within each travel corridor;
- Provide an efficient, effective, consistent, and seamless system for users of the network;
- Provide benefits to travelers within each corridor commensurate with the revenues collected in that corridor, including expanded travel options and funding to support non-highway options that enhance effectiveness and throughput;
- Implement the Express/HOT Lane Network in the Bay Area, as shown in Exhibit 1 and as amended from time to time, using a rapid delivery approach that takes advantage of the existing highway right of way to deliver the network in an expedited time frame; and
- Toll revenue collected from the HOT network will be used to operate the HOT network; to maintain HOT system equipment and software; to provide transit services and improvements in the corridors; to finance and construct the HOT network; and to provide other corridor improvements.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. **Collaboration and Cooperation.** To accomplish the objectives requires collaboration and cooperation by numerous agencies at several levels of government, including the Congestion Management Agencies (CMA), Caltrans, California Highway Patrol (CHP) and the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA). This collaborative process shall establish policies for implementation of the HOT network including, but not limited to, (a) phasing of HOV conversion and HOT construction, (b) phasing of corridor investment plan elements, and (c) occupancy and pricing policies for HOT network operations.
2. Corridor-Based Focus & Implementation. Utilize a corridor-based structure that recognizes commute-sheds and geographic communities of interest as the most effective and user-responsive models for Bay Area Express/HOT Lane facilities implementation.

3. Reinvestment within the Corridor. Recognize that popular, political and legislative support will rest on demonstrating that the revenues collected in a corridor benefit travelers – including the toll payers – in the corridor through a variety of mechanisms, including additional capital improvements on the freeway and parallel arterials, providing support for transit capital and operations that increase throughput capacity in the corridor, and providing funds for enhanced operations and management of the corridor.

4. Corridor Investment Plans. Corridor Investment Plans, developed by stakeholder agencies within the corridor, will direct reinvestment of revenues to capital and operating programs serving the corridor, commensurate with the revenue generated by each corridor.

5. Simple System. Users deserve a simple, consistent and efficient system that is easy to use and includes the following elements: (a) consistent geometric design; (b) consistent signage; (c) safe and simple operations; (d) common technology; and (e) common marketing, logo and terminology.

6. Toll Collection. BATA shall be responsible for toll collection.

7. Financing. A collaborative process will determine the best financing mechanism, which could include using the state owned toll bridge enterprise as a financing pledge to construct the network.
Legislative Framework for a Bay Area Express Lane Network

OBJECTIVES

The development and implementation of a Bay Area Express Lane Network (hereafter “network”) has five primary objectives:

1. More effectively manage the region’s freeways in order to provide higher vehicle and passenger throughput and reduce delays for all travelers in the corridor, especially those traveling by carpool, vanpool or bus within each travel corridor.

2. Provide an efficient, effective, consistent, and seamless system for customers of the network.

3. Provide benefits to travelers within each corridor commensurate with the revenues collected in that corridor, including expanded travel options and funding to support non-highway options that enhance effectiveness and throughput.

4. Expedite the implementation of the network using a rapid delivery approach that, to the greatest extent possible, recognizing safety, operational, and environmental constraints, relies upon existing highway right of way and minimizes the environmental impact.

5. Use express lane toll revenue to finance construction of the network and other corridor improvements, operate and maintain the network; and provide transit services and improvements in the network corridors.

I. THE KEY PLAYERS

Bay Area Express Lane Network Project Oversight Committee (BAY POC)

Create in statute the Bay Area Express Lane Network Project Oversight Committee (BAY POC), consisting of a staff representative from each of the participating congestion management agencies (CMA), Caltrans, California Highway Patrol (CHP) and the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA). Participation by CMAs in the BAYPOC shall be limited to those that are participating in a Corridor Working Group (CWG).

BAY POC will be the primary entity responsible for recommending policies for the network. Recommendations of the BAYPOC shall be forwarded to BATA for approval.

BAYPOC will be responsible for recommending an express lane development plan. The plan will consist of two elements: (1) a phasing plan for development of the express lane network, and (2) an operational plan that will recommend consistent standards for the regional network, including, but not limited to, the following: (a) geometric design; (b) signage; (c) safe and simple operations; (d) technology; (e) shared marketing, logo and terminology; (f) pricing policies and goals; and (g) occupancy requirements. While development of a consistent, regional network will be the goal, some variation in design or other policies will be permitted as needed to build the system in a timely manner. In developing the phasing plan, BAYPOC will first prioritize those corridors that can be converted to express lanes from existing high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes and that demonstrate the ability to generate sufficient toll revenue to cover their financing, operating and maintenance costs. Caltrans and CHP will each be required to approve the elements of the plan that fall under their authority. The plan shall be updated at least every four years and shall be initiated with BATA providing an estimate of funds available for development and construction of express lanes.
Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA)

The legislation will authorize BATA to acquire, construct, administer and operate an express lane network within the jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. It will provide that BATA is responsible for: (a) establishing and approving standards for the network; (b) adopting a phasing plan for construction of the network, consistent with the goal of rapid delivery; (c) toll collection and the maintenance and operation of the toll collection equipment; (d) all financial management, including the issuance of express lane toll revenue bonds for the network, toll setting authority and project financing; and (e) compliance with any requirements necessary to meet financing obligations and assure efficient operation and build-out of the network. While BATA shall be responsible for the financial management of the express lane network toll revenue stream, the legislation will not preclude a local agency from proposing to use its own funds, including bonds backed by sources other than express lane tolls, for a portion of the construction of the network. The legislation will authorize BATA to use bridge tolls for costs associated with the network.

Corridor Working Groups

Implementation of the network shall follow a corridor-based model that recognizes commute-sheds and geographic communities of interest as the most effective and customer-oriented approach. The legislation shall establish Corridor Working Groups (CWGs) as subgroups within the BAYPOC. The initial CWGs shall be based on the existing, statutorily created HOT lane corridors. The legislation will provide flexibility to allow new CWGs to be created, existing ones merged and membership changed to reflect actual travel patterns. The CWG shall propose the geographic boundary of the corridor subject to approval by the CMAs in which the express lane corridors are located and BATA.

CWGs shall be comprised of a staff representative of a CMA as well as a representative of Caltrans, CHP and BATA. CMA membership in a CWG shall include any of the following: (a) a Bay Area CMA that has committed funding associated with that county to the final design or construction of an express lane corridor; (b) a CMA whose board has an adopted policy in support of developing an express lane project along the corridor within the BAYPOC framework; or (c) a CMA in which the corridor is located; or (d) a Bay Area CMA that represents a county whose residents comprise a significant share of the toll payers along the corridor. The legislation should allow each CWG to determine its own representation and voting arrangements to reflect the level of county investment and the commute shed patterns served by the corridor.

II. USE OF REVENUE

Bond financing will require toll revenues from each corridor to be pooled for financing purposes and spent first on debt service and financing costs associated with phased construction of the network, including all debt service and bond covenant requirements, potential reimbursement of local funds previously invested in the HOV lane system, operation (including collection and enforcement), maintenance, and administration of the express lanes. At least 95 percent of revenues net of operating, maintenance, debt service, financing costs and all covenants required of the issuance generated within each corridor • “corridor revenues” • will be provided to that corridor’s corridor working group to fund projects in the corridor investment plan. The use of corridor revenues shall be determined by the CWGs in Corridor Investment Plans, as described below.

BATA will establish a process whereby a CMA who is a project sponsor of a CIP project can access the corridor revenues from BATA by (1) submitting an invoice for CIP expenditures or (2) receive regular payments of net revenue for eligible CIP expenditures, subject to an approved CIP; or (3) another method agreed to by BATA and the CMA.
III. CORRIDOR INVESTMENT PLANS

Each CWG shall be responsible for preparation of a Project Study Report (PSR) for the installation of express lanes in the corridor. Each CWG shall create a Corridor Investment Plan (CIP) for express lane improvements in the corridor, improvements to be funded from reimbursement of local investment in the HOV system, as well as the investment of any corridor revenues. In order for each group to have a sound basis for formulating a proposed CIP, BATA will provide each group with the information necessary to do so, including but not limited to, information about estimated revenue available for the construction of express lanes within the group’s corridor. In selecting projects recommended to be funded, the CWG shall prioritize projects that reduce vehicle emissions and provide cost-effective public transit options. The CIP shall contain two key elements. The first will focus on the development of the corridor, the use of HOT revenue, and include proposed phasing of express lane projects in the corridor; the second element will include a recommendation for occupancy and tolling policies that would support the corridor phasing plan and a proposed timeline for implementation.

The CIP shall also contain a thorough analysis of equity considerations, including, but not limited to, the impact of the proposed segment of the network on low-income travelers in the corridor, transit riders, carpoolers, and the distribution of benefits by geographic area. The CIP shall also contain an examination of safety and operational issues, including, but not limited to, express lane ingress and egress challenges. Each CIP shall be reviewed by the BAYPOC for network consistency and subsequently forwarded for review and approval by the respective boards of the CMAs in which the express lane corridors are located. Subsequent to CMA board approval, the CIP shall be forwarded to BATA for approval. If BATA adopts a finding that the CIP is not consistent with the goals of the network, it shall return the CIP to the CWG for revision. Upon revision of the CIP, the CWG would then be required to resubmit the CIP to both the CMA and BATA for approval. If a CMA board has not approved the CIP within 60 days of its initial receipt from BAYPOC or its return from BATA for revision, the CIP shall be presented to BATA for approval with an opportunity for representatives of the CMA to present their reasons for not acting on the CIP.

The CIP will detail any local funding proposed to be used for the development of the express lane corridor, which may include the use of bond financing backed by local sources other than express lane tolls.

The CIP will also detail which agency should perform the work described therein, including, but not limited to, the express lane network planning, environmental review, design and construction, as well as other improvement projects to be funded with corridor revenues.

IV. TRANSITION FOR EXISTING HOT LANE AUTHORITY

For corridors in development under existing statutory authority provided by AB 2032 (Dutra), Statutes of 2004, a transition plan for incorporating those corridors into a Bay Area Express Lane Network shall be negotiated between the existing authority and BATA within one year after enactment of the legislation. A final sunset date for all existing authority shall not exceed one year from the start of service on the first of the express lane segments previously authorized for each agency authorized to develop express lanes within the Bay Area.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Adopt 2009 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the 2009 VTA Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan.

BACKGROUND:

The 2000 Measure A program identified an integrated Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) network linking activity centers throughout the county through enhanced bus service on the 22 Line (El Camino-Santa Clara-Alum Rock) and 23 Line (Stevens Creek-West San Carlos) corridors. Three additional corridors that have BRT potential were identified in VTA’s long-range plan, Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035 and the 2007 Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA). To evaluate these corridors and define the elements of a future BRT network, VTA initiated a BRT Strategic Plan in March 2008. The goals of the BRT Strategic Plan were to: 1) establish a brand identity for VTA’s future network of BRT services; 2) evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of developing BRT facilities in the candidate corridors; 3) seek input from project stakeholders prior to beginning Engineering efforts, and; 4) develop an action plan for implementation in each corridor.

To evaluate each of the candidate BRT corridors, the BRT Strategic Plan relied on the Transit Sustainability Policy and the Service Design Guidelines, adopted by the VTA Board of Directors in February 2007. The Service Design Guidelines establish standards for transit service investment based on transit market and land use conditions in a corridor. The initial screening analysis was based on existing transit demand and operating performance, land use, transit competitiveness, market potential, and physical constructability. Conceptual planning for the near-term BRT corridors then used the Service Design Guidelines as a basis for operations and capital planning proposals.
With the adoption of the BRT Strategic Plan, VTA staff will enter into project development activities for the recommended near-term BRT corridors. Long-term development activities for the remaining corridors will also continue as VTA and the cities continue to refine land use and transportation plans for future needs.

**DISCUSSION:**

The following discussion summarizes the findings of an initial market analysis of all candidate BRT corridors and the subsequent effort to develop preliminary operating and capital plans. On a separate but parallel track, the strategic plan created a distinctive brand identity for future VTA BRT service.

The market analysis was performed early in the study and the results shared with Board standing and advisory committees in August 2008. After this initial screen line analysis was complete, the three corridors that emerged as the most promising alignments for near-term BRT service implementation were:

- **Santa Clara/Alum Rock** - stretching from HP Pavilion to Eastridge Mall (6.9 miles) and currently served by the Rapid 522, the Local 22, and the Local 23
- **El Camino Real** - stretching from Palo Alto Transit Center to HP Pavilion (16.6 miles) and currently served by the Rapid 522 and the Local 22
- **Stevens Creek/West San Carlos** - stretching from De Anza College to Downtown San Jose (8.6 miles) and currently served by the Local 23

The BRT Strategic Plan recommends these three corridors proceed to the next step of development, which is Preliminary Engineering in the case of Santa Clara/Alum Rock and Conceptual Engineering and environmental clearance for El Camino and Stevens Creek/West San Carlos. Corridors identified for future consideration include Sunnyvale-Cupertino, Monterey Highway and King Road.

**Operating Principles**

With the focus on the three near-term corridors, the Strategic Plan established key operating principles based on the Service Design Guidelines for future Santa Clara County Bus Rapid Transit service. Key principles included:

- Target a 30 percent improvement in travel time in each corridor to attract choice riders to the system through a fast service, competitive with the automobile.
- Operate at 10-minute headways to offer frequent service not requiring schedules.
- Employ stylized, hybrid electric buses to offer high-level amenities and comfort to passengers.
- Create stations with a Light Rail-like interface, including specially designed shelters, real-time information capabilities and “off-board” fare collection through ticket vending machines and all-door boarding.
The three near-term corridors were studied in-depth to determine the most effective blend of route, service profile and facilities. Ten options were developed, tested and analyzed. Options vary in routing, service frequency, and local service overlay. Operating costs for each option were estimated, including vehicle and labor hours and contributing costs such as fare inspectors, fare collection and additional street and station maintenance.

Operating Analysis Findings
Implementation of the near-term BRT services would be an expansion of transit service and represent an increase in operating hours compared to existing conditions, though operating cost per passenger improves, as discussed later. Operating costs were estimated and reviewed for each of the ten options under consideration. Key operating cost findings are:

- Annual operating costs range from $59 - $73 million.
- Annual operating costs are between $12 - $25 million higher than the existing annual $47.4 million cost for the three corridors.
- El Camino corridor costs increase by 10-25 percent over existing operating costs, to $39 - $47 million.
- Stevens Creek corridor costs increase by 35-125 percent over existing operating costs, to $15-$26 million.
- It is assumed for the Strategic Plan that the additional service is introduced incrementally between 2012 and 2015.
- Additional VTA labor required to support BRT facilities and equipment have been included in the operating cost estimate and account for 28% of the marginal increase in operating cost estimates.

Capital Improvement Principles
The BRT Strategic Plan proposes capital improvements for the purposes of developing order of magnitude capital costs and to serve as a starting point for discussions with cities and Caltrans. For this reason, designs are conceptual in nature and will require significant further analysis to incorporate a range of issues such as the incorporation of bike lanes, access to commercial properties, landscaping and lighting and design features such as public art, lighting and shelters. Capital improvements and modifications to the corridors are consistent with the Service Design Guidelines and the recent experience on the Santa Clara-Alum Rock corridor. The principles for BRT capital improvements are:

- To achieve a 30 percent improvement in travel time, dedicated bus lanes would be required when intersection congestion reaches a level of service rated "D" or lower.
- Corridors are a mix of dedicated running way (BRT 2) and mixed flow operation (BRT 1), depending on what is required to maintain the objective of a 30 percent improvement in travel time.
- Transit Signal Priority is assumed for every traffic signal in the BRT corridors.
• Necessary improvements to VTA maintenance facilities are included in all cost estimates.
• BRT stations in mixed flow operation are located at the curb with “bulb-outs” allowing the vehicle to make stops in the far right traffic lane for rapid boarding and alighting.
• BRT stations in a dedicated running way facility are split on both sides of an intersection, similar to the configuration that is used for Light Rail Stations throughout the County.
• Where additional right-of-way width is required for dedicated bus lanes; the Strategic Plan recommends the removal of on-street parking and utilization of roadway medians instead of removing travel lanes. The Plan does not recommend removing traffic lanes at any point in the three primary corridors. At stations, intersections will need to be widened and additional right-of-way will be required.

**Capital Improvement Analysis Findings**

Capital improvements for BRT include the running way and stations, together with supporting facilities and equipment such as real-time information systems, traffic signals and ticket vending machines. The primary cost for each corridor is the amount of dedicated bus lanes required.

• Capital costs range from $410 - $585 million, depending on service option. Individual corridor costs are estimated as follows:
  - Santa Clara-Alum Rock: $129 million
  - El Camino Real: $215 - $222 million
  - Stevens Creek Boulevard: $145 - $235 million

• In general, BRT capital costs are less than 50 percent of those expected for equivalent Light Rail development on a per-mile basis. Typically, Light Rail development can cost $40 million per mile or higher. Per mile capital costs for the three corridors analyzed in-depth are:
  - Santa Clara-Alum Rock: $18.6 million per mile.
  - El Camino Real: $13.0 million per mile.
  - Stevens Creek: $16.8 million per mile.

While Santa Clara-Alum Rock and El Camino are characterized by a blend of mixed flow and dedicated running ways consistent with the Service Design Guidelines, the segment of Stevens Creek Boulevard in between the Valley Fair and Santana Row shopping malls requires special treatment due to significant congestion and a constrained right-of-way.

The Strategic Plan suggests two alternatives for this segment, which results in a wide range of capital costs for this segment. The first alternative is a single reversible bus-only lane between I-880 and Winchester Boulevard with a station in front of the Malls (at Santana Row/Baywood). The second alternative is a two-lane aerial viaduct extending from east of I-880 to just west of Winchester. Each of these alternatives raises concerns that will need to be addressed as the project moves into further planning. It is not known whether a single-lane BRT facility in this area is either feasible or functional. VTA staff is currently engaged in a separate effort to model traffic and transit operations for this single-lane option, in an effort to better understand any
potential operational constraints. The viaduct alternative may produce a visual impact and will also cost up to $90 million, significantly increasing the project’s overall capital cost while also reducing its cost-effectiveness. VTA staff is working with the ownership of the malls and the City of San Jose for a comprehensive solution to the Stevens Creek/I-880/I-280 interchange area.

**Ridership and Productivity**

The corridors that are the subject of the Strategic Plan analysis are already the three highest ridership bus transit corridors in Santa Clara County. Recent upgrades of service in 2005 when the 522 Rapid was introduced and 2008 when the new bus service improved frequencies and routing have resulted in immediate ridership increases. However, based on analysis of the overall travel market completed as part of the COA, the Strategic Plan has found that there is still significant latent demand for high quality transit service in the three target corridors. Realizing this ridership will result in more productive service and up to 24,000 additional daily transit riders.

As Figure 1 demonstrates, average weekday ridership in 2030 for the ten service options included in the Plan ranges from 70,000-84,000 passengers. This compares to 59,600 riders for the No-Project alternative and 31,000 current riders in these corridors.

![Figure 1](image-url)

Market penetration is also an important element in the overall BRT strategy - to attract more choice riders through high-speed and high-quality BRT service. The options with the highest levels of both local and BRT service show the most promise to increase market share and attract
new riders, generating 35-40 percent more riders than the No Project Scenario. This is not surprising, as the segment of Stevens Creek west of Valley Fair to De Anza currently has relatively low transit ridership, despite the presence of several large trip generators (such as Valley Fair, De Anza College, and various shopping malls nearby) and concentrated transit-competitive areas along the corridor.

Operating productivity in terms of boardings per revenue hour is fairly consistent among options, ranging from 79 to 87 boardings per revenue hour on each corridor. This represents the combined productivity of both local and BRT routes for a given service option. If the BRT 522 or 523 are separately assessed, both have rates of around 100 boardings per revenue hour, which is well above the Transit Sustainability Policy standard of 55 boardings per revenue hour for BRT-2.

Operations and Maintenance (O&M) costs per new rider is a measure of productivity based on the costs of providing each rider the transit service in question. Today, the 22 and 522 lines are some of the most productive in VTA’s system with an average of $4.39 per passenger. The proposed BRT service improves this measure to just under $3.00 for most options. For Stevens Creek, the O&M cost per passenger measure improves from today’s $3.63 to just over $2.00 in the most productive alternatives. This suggests that even though full build-out options will increase operating costs, there is actually a significant improvement in service productivity generated by significantly higher ridership.

Existing land use conditions on the Alum Rock Corridor, and to a slightly lesser degree, the El Camino Corridor, are supportive of high frequency and high-capacity transit as seen by the combined ridership of the Local 22 and the Rapid 522, the most productive corridor in VTA’s service realm. The Alum Rock Corridor passes through Downtown San Jose and serves transit-supportive areas to the east of City Hall. It is the most productive corridor with the highest boardings per revenue hour, and is served by the Local 23 as well. The El Camino Corridor is dotted with higher density residential uses, providing links to large malls, universities, and transit centers. The Stevens Creek Corridor is lined with major regional shopping and employment destinations such as De Anza College, Cupertino Civic Center, Vallco Fashion Park, as well as Valley Fair and Santana Row. Future land use plans on each of these corridors are supportive of increased transit investment with higher densities and more intensive land uses.

**Branding Strategy**

The creation of a distinctive and effective brand identity is a common element to all successful BRT projects. A strong and recognizable brand identity expresses to customers and the general public the value and purpose of a product. This is done through colors, images and product features that all reinforce a unifying message.

A "BRT brand" is meant to convey three things to customers and potential customers when they see the BRT vehicles and stations:

- **What is this service?** - It is VTA’s BRT service as opposed to a local bus, community or express bus.

- **What the BRT brand does** - The BRT provides fast, frequent, all-day transit service that is competitive with the automobile and serves major destinations along the route. The BRT service will be environmentally friendly with hybrid vehicles and solar-powered
station facilities.

- **Why it matters** - BRT service is a good choice for existing riders and non-riding segments of the travel market that value competitive travel times and a higher level of comfort and amenities.

It is important that VTA maintain the unique attributes of this service once it commits to a brand identity for BRT service and does not compromise the overall service and in turn diminish the value of the brand.

VTA engaged the firm Funk/Levis and Associates, with previous experience in BRT branding, to help with developing a brand identity that would convey the unique attributes of BRT and yet still identify BRT as a VTA service. The first step was to develop a brand name that conveyed both the specifics of the brand identity and at the same time associates the BRT service with VTA. The name selected for testing was *Valley Rapid*, which met the following criteria:

- Compatible with the current VTA identity
- Distinguishes the service as high quality, reliable and fast.
- Offers modern comfortable surroundings and easy-to-use, high-technology interface.

After a final group of potential brand identity packages (logo, color scheme, name, etc.) were developed, they were tested with the general public and target market segments through focus groups and on-line surveys. The focus groups and survey respondents overwhelmingly chose one branding package, which is shown in Attachment A. The brand identity will be used in the near-term as the basis for Santa Clara/Alum Rock Preliminary Engineering and for developing the specifications for VTA’s order of new hybrid articulated buses that will operate the Valley Rapid service. When the Valley Rapid service is ready for operation, the brand will be used in VTA’s marketing campaign.

**Stakeholder Input**

One of the purposes of the BRT Strategic Plan was to develop conceptual plans and operating scenarios and invite input and reaction from project stakeholders. The first group of stakeholders was internal departments at VTA, where staff was asked to define and better understand the BRT mode. The public was engaged primarily through the creation of a brand identity and will continue to have an opportunity for input as individual projects move into Conceptual and Preliminary Engineering stages. The Santa Clara-Alum Rock project solicited public input throughout the Conceptual Engineering process.

The other significant stakeholders involved in the study were City and Caltrans staff. Briefings with staff from corridor cities were helpful in formulating a development strategy for each corridor as well as to understand how city-generated land use and transportation plans can integrate with future BRT efforts. VTA staff met with cities individually and through the VTA Technical Advisory Committee as well as through general presentations to the South Bay Transportation Officials and the Grand Boulevard Project Working Group. Caltrans was engaged through meetings at the District 4 headquarters in Oakland and will continue to be a partner in the El Camino, The Alameda and the Alum Rock corridors.

A sample of input from stakeholder meetings:
• Caltrans staff was receptive to the loss of on street parking as a means of creating right-of-way for dedicated bus lanes. Caltrans staff prefers on-street parking removal over the removal of through lanes, as has been proposed by both San Francisco and East Bay cities.

• Planning staff from Santa Clara and Cupertino suggested the possibility of a unified Master Planning effort for Stevens Creek Boulevard modeled after the current effort on El Camino known as the Grand Boulevard Initiative. A corridor Master Plan could help to unify land use and transit planning efforts.

• Several city staff asked how the future BRT project plans can accommodate bicycle lanes in realigned roadways.

• Several city staff expressed strong interest in more landscaping and improved pedestrian environment to support the project.

• Some city staff are not comfortable with the possibility of losing on-street parking and wish to explore alternative measures to preserve parking access for smaller retail businesses.

• Other city staff suggested removing a through travel lane to accommodate a bicycle lane and additional space for wider sidewalks and enhanced landscaping.

**NEXT STEPS**

The next steps to develop a BRT network in Santa Clara County are to:

• Begin Preliminary Engineering on the Santa Clara/Alum Rock project.

• Begin Conceptual Engineering and environmental clearance for the El Camino Corridor.

• Work with the I-880/Steven Creek interchange project to develop options for a BRT alignment and stop in the Valley Fair/Santana Row area.

• Begin the process of ordering BRT branded articulated buses powered by hybrid engines.

• Develop capital funding plans for the El Camino and Stevens Creek Corridors. While Santa Clara/Alum Rock is funded through State bond funds and Measure A, the other two corridors will require funding plans that will be developed in subsequent project phases.

• Develop a plan to phase in operations for all corridors. Full operation of the BRT and local bus headways envisioned in the Plan and features, such as off-board fare collection, which require increased operating expense must be phased in to match VTA’s ability to meet operating expenses.

• Before a commitment of capital funds for construction is made for BRT in Santa Clara/Alum Rock (as first corridor for implementation) and subsequent corridors, VTA staff will assess the level of operations that can be financially supported and return to the Board of Directors with a recommendation as to whether it makes to proceed into construction.
**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors can reject or modify all or portions of the BRT Strategic Plan.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Although the adoption of the BRT Strategic Plan does not have a direct fiscal impact at this time, subsequent Board actions would be needed to allocate funds to continue work on the Santa Clara/Alum Rock project and begin work on the El Camino and Stevens Creek projects. The capital costs for the build-out of the entire BRT system is estimated to be between $410 – 585 million. The corridors can be phased in with Santa Clara/Alum Rock (approx. $129 million) and El Camino (approx. $215 million) proceeding initially and Stevens Creek (approx. $145 - 235 million) being built in a later phase. It is anticipated that Measure A and federal, state, regional and other local revenues will be used as sources of capital funding. At the February 27, 2009 Board Workshop staff recommended that development activities for these projects be funded at the following levels in the proposed Fiscal Year 2010 and 2011 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Capital Budget to be considered by the Board of Directors in June: Santa Clara/Alum Rock--$18.1 million, El Camino Real -- $9.6 million, and Stevens Creek--$1 million.

The future operating and capital costs will modeled in the upcoming Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) in order to analyze VTA’s ability to implement the BRT Program and to accommodate the marginal operating cost increases as the BRT system proceeds to full build-out.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee (TP&O) heard this item on March 19, 2009 and April 16, 2009 and unanimously recommended approval.

The Committee requested staff work with business owners on Alum Rock Avenue regarding the potential removal of on-street parking as a result of the Santa Clara Alum Rock BRT Project and continue to report on outreach activities during the development of the project.
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Executive Summary

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is an enhanced bus service that offers many of the same service attributes as rail transit, such as fast, frequent, and reliable service, branded service, specialized vehicles, high-amenity stations, and real-time information. The BRT Strategic Plan is intended to develop an integrated near-term BRT network throughout Santa Clara County to provide high quality service to areas not served by light rail transit. Specifically, the VTA BRT Strategic Plan was prepared to:

- Establish a framework for BRT implementation;
- Provide direction on related policy issues; and
- Serve as a vehicle to engage cities and stakeholders.

BRT Corridors

An assessment of new BRT services was conducted on six potential corridors within the Santa Clara Valley: Alum Rock, El Camino, King Road, Monterey Highway, Stevens Creek, and Sunnyvale-Cupertino. A preliminary screening was undertaken based on existing transit demand and operating performance, land use, transit competitiveness, market potential, and physical constructability to identify those corridors with the best potential to support BRT-tier service. Three corridors emerged as the most promising alignments for near-term BRT implementation:

- **Alum Rock** – stretching from HP Pavilion to Eastridge Mall (6.9 miles) and currently served by the Rapid 522 (15-minute headways), the Local 22 (12-minute headways), and the Local 23 (12-minute headways).
- **El Camino** – stretching from Palo Alto Transit Center to HP Pavilion (16.6 miles) and currently served by the Rapid 522 (15-minute headways) and the Local 22 (12-minute headways).
- **Stevens Creek** – stretching from De Anza College to Downtown San Jose (8.6 miles) and currently served by the Local 23 (12-minute headways).

Subsequent work on the BRT Strategic Plan involved creating an operating plan and infrastructure strategy for each near-term BRT corridor, focusing service and BRT enhancements on the Local 22, Local 23, and Rapid 522 services. Two new BRT services were proposed: the BRT 522 to replace the Rapid 522 and the BRT 523 to complement the Local 23. Ten operating plans were developed seeking to achieve enhanced transit market share in the corridor, while making transit more efficient and effective at serving riders. These ten operating plans were evaluated based on a set of criteria to identify a preferred operating plan. Key evaluation criteria included: (i) future demand (in Year 2030 from the VTA Model); (ii) new market penetration (in terms of increased transit use in the corridor in total and relative terms); (iii) cost-effectiveness; (iv) supportiveness of existing and future land uses and development; and (v) BRT/local mobility and service coverage.

Preferred Operating Plan

The BRT 10-15 (Option 7A) emerged as the preferred operating plan – this nomenclature refers to the relative headway of the BRT 523 versus that of the Local 23 on Stevens Creek. Also though, the BRT 10-15 refers to the goal of 10-minute BRT headway and 15-minute local headway service on both the El Camino and the Stevens Creek corridors (BRT lines from these two corridors would both operate on Alum Rock forming a BRT 5-15 service on this corridor). The BRT 10-15 best
represented the ideal for VTA BRT service on these three corridors, providing ample overlay local service to meet demand of local users as well.

The preferred BRT 10-15 plan would consist of the following principal service features (as shown in the graphic below):

- Local 22 service along the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors (from Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge), operating at 15-minute headways;
- Truncated Local 23 service along the Stevens Creek Corridor (from De Anza College to San Jose State), operating at 15-minute headways;
- New BRT 522 service to replace the Rapid 522 on the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors (from Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge), operating at 10-minute headways; and
- New BRT 523 service to complement Local 23 service west of Downtown and to replace it east of Downtown (from Downtown to Eastridge), operating at 10-minute headways.

Again, the BRT 10-15 operating plan represents the ultimate full build-out goal of BRT service on these three corridors. The transition from existing levels of service to the envisioned BRT 10-15 would be a gradual one, with BRT services phased in once key infrastructure and facilities on the corridors were complete. While BRT 10-15 service might be initiated from the outset on the Alum Rock and El Camino corridors due to high demand that already exists, BRT on Stevens Creek would be phased in and start
with less frequent local service – perhaps a BRT 10-30 configuration – in order to build more sustained user levels and await more transit-supportive conditions in the corridor.

The preferred operating plan, the BRT 10-15, generated the highest overall ridership of all operating plans – nearly 84,000 daily riders combined on the four routes. The Alum Rock Corridor was forecast to carry the highest number of passengers at nearly 35,000 daily riders, about 40% of total demand. The El Camino Corridor was close behind at just under 40% of the total, while the Stevens Creek Corridor followed at nearly 16,000 daily riders or 19% of the total. Of note:

- All corridors were forecast to experience substantial growth in daily demand versus the existing July 2008 case, with overall demand on the corridors growing by nearly 170% or 52,500 daily users.
- The growth in demand by corridor versus the existing case ranged from 140%-210%, with demand on the Stevens Creek Corridor growing the fastest, and demand on the Alum Rock Corridor increasing the most, nearly 22,500 daily riders.
- Growth was more modest versus the 2030 No Project forecasts, but still significant – total demand on all corridors grew by 24,000 daily riders or 40%.
- Against the 2030 No Project forecasts, individual corridor growth ranged from 20%-60%, with Alum Rock demand growing the quickest and increasing the most.

The BRT 10-15 operating plan generated the highest annual operating and maintenance (O&M) costs of all plans, amounting to $72.3 million for all routes. The marginal or incremental annual increase in O&M costs from the 2008 base case was on the order of $24.9 million. As shown in the figure above, O&M costs for the two locals would decrease in 2030 by between $1.9-$3.0 million per year, while that for the envisioned 2030 BRT services would increase by between $12.2-$17.5 million per year.
Despite its high operating costs, the BRT 10-15 could carry new riders just as cost effectively as less extensive options – typically generating incremental O&M costs per new rider figures that were lower or on par with these less extensive options that generated lower ridership. This cost performance is roughly in line with other comparable BRT systems in the United States at around $3.00 per new rider as shown in the adjacent figure.

Capital cost estimates for the BRT 10-15 plan, shown in the adjacent figure, ranged from between $490-$577 million (with Alum Rock costing up to $129 million, El Camino up to $216 million, and Stevens Creek ranging from $145-$232 million, depending on whether a viaduct at Valley Fair is built). Capital costs were largely based on the extent of bus lanes and the number of new BRT stations proposed in the preferred infrastructure strategy.

**Preferred Infrastructure Strategy**

The infrastructure strategy for BRT corridor development primarily focused on the stations and the type of right-of-way for BRT operations (other more minor infrastructure elements included bus signal priority and queue jump lanes). BRT vehicles operating in dedicated bus lanes travel faster and more reliably than those in mixed flow lanes. The infrastructure strategy for the preferred BRT 10-15 option included the following:

- **Alum Rock** – One segment of median busway (totaling 1.4 miles between King Road and Capitol Expressway), enhancements to mixed flow BRT sections, and 11 new BRT stations.

- **El Camino** – Three segments of median busway (totaling 9.9 miles between Embarcadero-Jordan, Sylvan-Lawrence, and Calabazas–Benton), enhancements to mixed flow BRT sections, and 17 new BRT stations.

- **Stevens Creek** – Two segments of median busway (totaling over 3.0 miles between De Anza College-Finch, and Woodhams-MacArthur, with the latter section including the Valley Fair reversible lane or viaduct), enhancements to mixed flow BRT sections, and 15 new BRT stations.
Corridor Funding Strategy

Various funding sources exist for the three BRT corridors, including local (including Measure A), regional, state (including Prop 1B), and federal (including Small/New Starts) sources. Based on an analysis of these potential sources, discussions with key VTA staff, and regional/federal entities, as well as a review of the scope of proposed corridor enhancements, funding strategies and opportunities were identified for each corridor based on the stated conceptual capital costs. Key funding findings included the following:

- VTA should utilize Measure A to its full extent to fund the three BRT corridors. Measure A would facilitate faster implementation with less bureaucratic issues than federal funds and would likely serve as the principal funding source at this time.
- State funding, up to $45.0 million, is also available through Prop 1B, which should be utilized as soon as possible given competition for these funds. VTA has already made plans to use these funds to purchase 40 new 60’ BRT vehicles.
- Although federal funds (including Small Starts) are a potential option to finance some components of each corridor, competition is high, funds must be funneled through the MTC, local matches are required, additional analysis or regulations may need to be met, and projects that utilize federal funds typically take longer to implement. Federal funds should thus be used as a last resort.
- Stevens Creek could be a potential Small Starts funding candidate. Unlike the other two corridors, it lacks pre-existing elements such as bus signal priority, low floor vehicles, enhanced stations, and branded service which is the basis for eligibility. If successful, the Stevens Creek Corridor could receive between $20-$30 million based on past experience of successful applicants.
- The proposed 2009 Economic Stimulus Package could be another proposed federal funding source. At this stage of project design, Alum Rock may be the only plausible corridor for funding through this source.

Branding and Marketing

Branding is an essential element of a successful BRT service, differentiating it from conventional transit services. The brand is, arguably, the single most valuable asset an organization can possess.

The branding process involved an interactive process involving naming and visual branding. Input on the name, logo, and coloring were sought from the VTA BIG TOP meetings, internal VTA staff, and outside focus groups. General and specific criteria for the naming and visual branding process were developed in concert with VTA staff. Criteria for the BRT name included: distinct, relevant, easy to pronounce, non-corruptible, memorable, familiar, as well as quality, reliable, distinctive, fast/speedy, premium, and sleek. The name that emerged was Valley Rapid Transit.
The logo and coloring scheme criteria were similar and included: distinctive, contemporary, memorable, reliable, as well as consistency with the VTA identity and colors. The selected logo design is shown above, as is the preferred color scheme for the VTA BRT vehicles – a predominantly blue scheme.

Construction and Implementation Phasing

Construction and operational phasing was developed. The phasing strategy was based on an incremental approach to BRT implementation, in which many features of BRT would be introduced gradually. This alternative allowed for early implementation before all segments of the traveled way were completed and simultaneously, but gradually introducing BRT amenities, such as off-board fare collection, until such time as the budget permits its introduction. Some of BRT’s impact on potential new riders might be lost using this gradual introduction, but utilizing branded vehicles and stations might help to minimize the impacts.

The development phasing for the three corridors is as follows:

- **Alum Rock** would start preliminary engineering during the second quarter of 2009 and be operational by late 2012. BRT 522 would begin to operate at 10-minute headways immediately after corridor construction was complete. Local 22 service would be slightly reduced to 15-minute headways to create a BRT 10-15 service on Alum Rock.

- **El Camino** would begin conceptual engineering in late 2009, with construction beginning in late 2012. El Camino would be operational by mid-2015. BRT service on El Camino would begin upon completion of the Alum Rock Corridor. BRT 522 would operate at 10-minute headways and the Local 22 at 15-minute headways.

- **Stevens Creek** would start its conceptual engineering in mid-2011, with the corridor being operational by late 2016 if a reversible lane was selected for the Valley Fair stretch. If the viaduct option was selected, operations would begin in mid-2017. BRT operations on Stevens Creek would start once all segments and facilities were completed on the corridor. BRT 523 would commence operations at this time with 10-minute headways, while the Local 23 would be scaled back – perhaps to 30-minute headways to create a BRT 10-30 alignment. Once demand becomes more sustainable on this corridor and more transit-supportive densities and development emerged, the Local 23 service could be increased accordingly.
1 Background

1.1 Rationale of Study

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) is an enhanced bus 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). VTA currently operates one BRT service, the Rapid 522, with potential expansion of BRT services in up to six corridors throughout the Santa Clara Valley.

The VTA BRT Strategic Plan is intended to:

- Establish a framework for BRT implementation;
- Provide direction on related policy issues; and
- Serve as a vehicle to engage cities and stakeholders.

Specific Strategic Plan activities include:

- Evaluating the feasibility and effectiveness of developing BRT service on given corridors, focusing on operational, demand, and cost impacts;
- Considering the enhancement of existing corridor service to BRT 1 or BRT 2 tiers;
- Considering adjacent, parallel service and the potential for local overlay service;
- Recommending a BRT corridor strategy, if applicable;
- Developing action, funding, and phasing plans for BRT implementation; and
- Establishing a brand identity for VTA’s BRT services.

At the outset of the study, six potential corridors were considered, based on the Valley Transportation 2030 Plan (VTP 2030) and VTA’s recent Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA). Through corridor analysis and discussions with VTA, three BRT corridors emerged for near-term implementation and further in-depth study, with the remaining three being more appropriate for long-term implantation. The three near-term BRT corridors emerging were Alum Rock, El Camino, and Stevens Creek. Various operating plans were developed, each seeking to achieve enhanced transit market share in the corridor, while making transit more efficient and effective at serving riders. Based on demand forecasts for these operating plans, as well as operating/capital costs, and other qualitative factors, a preferred operating plan and infrastructure strategy were identified. Phasing and implementation plans were developed as well as a funding strategy.

1.2 Internal Meetings and Public Outreach to Date

The following list of meetings presents key dates in the progression of the BRT Strategic Plan:
Table 1 – Key Meetings and Outreach Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Meeting</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal (BIG TOP)</strong></td>
<td>1/2008</td>
<td>State of Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/2008</td>
<td>BRT Evaluation Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/2008</td>
<td>Branding Introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3/2008</td>
<td>Corridor Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4/2008</td>
<td>BRT Brand Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/2008</td>
<td>Update on Service Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5/2008</td>
<td>Valley Fair/Santana Row</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/2008</td>
<td>Branding Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6/2008</td>
<td>Operating/Service Plan Concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal (Workshop)</strong></td>
<td>7/2008</td>
<td>BRT Service Planning Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal (BIG TOP)</strong></td>
<td>7/2008</td>
<td>BRT Final Operating/Service Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7/2008</td>
<td>Branding Update, Report on Cleveland Euclid BRT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/2008</td>
<td>BRT Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/2008</td>
<td>Ridership, Costs, and Branding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/2008</td>
<td>Fare Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10/2008</td>
<td>Branding Focus Groups, Valley Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11/2008</td>
<td>Draft BRT Plan Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/2009</td>
<td>BRT Vehicles/Fleet Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/2009</td>
<td>BRT Plan Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Committees</strong></td>
<td>2/2008</td>
<td>TAC, PAC, TPO – BRT State-of-the-Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8/2008</td>
<td>TAC, TPO – BRT Corridor Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cities</strong></td>
<td>11/17/2008</td>
<td>Presentation to Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Los</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Altos and Santa Clara on El Camino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/23/2009</td>
<td>Presentation to Santa Clara and Cupertino on El</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camino and Stevens Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/25/2009</td>
<td>Presentation to San Jose on all BRT Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caltrans</strong></td>
<td>1/22/2009</td>
<td>Presentation of BRT Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Outline of Final Report

This report summarizes the findings of this study from start to finish. It introduces the concepts behind BRT, such as frequent service, branded service, and more robust stations. It then reviews the six potential corridors and the process undertaken to select the preferred near-term BRT corridors. For those preferred corridors, operating and infrastructure plans are presented, along with funding and phasing strategies.
2 What is BRT?

Before presenting the analysis of potential BRT corridors for VTA and the development of operating plans, it is important to define what BRT service connotes. BRT can be defined very broadly, but the majority of implemented systems have a level of priority over general traffic, which improves performance over conventional bus service. The aim is to try to emulate the attractiveness of rail transit without the same high level of investment. Key BRT elements are discussed below.

2.1 Principal BRT Service and Infrastructure Elements

Key BRT service and infrastructure elements include:

- **Frequent Service** - One of the hallmarks of rail rapid transit is frequent service throughout the day, in both directions of travel. This characteristic is important to develop consistent ridership. BRT tends to follow this quality whenever possible. BRT frequency can be defined with at least 15-minute headways during weekday off-peak and weekends and 10-12 minutes (or less) during weekday peak periods. Moreover, it is important to operate these frequencies in both directions, since travel patterns have changed and are no longer uni-directional.

- **Fast and Reliable Service** - Another hallmark of rail rapid transit is fast and reliable service – both actual and perceived – which is necessary to provide a time competitive service. Compared to local bus services, BRT operates faster and more reliably due to: (i) some form of dedicated bus lane; (ii) transit priority measures including specialized signals and queue jump lanes; and (iii) longer stop spacing. BRT can also be competitive with the travel times of rail transit.

- **Dedicated Lanes** - Exclusive lanes greatly improve the speed, reliability, and image of transit. Dedicated lanes are the most expensive enhancement to implement, although they are the most visible to the public and riders. The trip will be faster as buses bypass congestion in their own lanes. Lines employing dedicated lanes are classified by VTA as BRT 2. There are three tiers of dedicated lanes:
  - **Reserved Lanes** – Median or curb lanes separated from traffic for transit’s exclusive use. Reserved lanes can be created by adding pavement markings, raising the pavement, or adding median treatments (e.g., bollards). Examples include Boston’s Silver Line, Eugene’s EmX, and Las Vegas’ MAX.
  - **At-Grade Busway** – Exclusive-use transit roadways, built in their own rights-of-way. These are completely segregated from mixed traffic, except at intersections. Examples include Miami-Dade’s Busway and LA’s Metro Orange Line.
  - **Grade-Separated Busway** - Exclusive busway providing complete grade-separation from mixed flow traffic. At-grade busways can often be upgraded to
grade-separated busways so that all crossings become grade-separated. Examples include the Ottawa Transitway and the Pittsburgh Busway.

**Other Transit Priority Measures** - Where exclusive transit lanes are not possible, the following can be used to improve speed and reliability: (i) bus signal priority (BSP); (ii) queue jump lanes; (iii) turning movement prohibitions; (iv) bus bulb-outs; and (v) off-board fare collection. *These measures are less costly than building a dedicated lane, but are less visible.* The trip is faster for passengers, as vehicles bypass queues or traverse intersections without being delayed by red lights. These are defined below.

- **Bus Signal Priority (BSP)** can help reduce delay and variability in vehicle arrival times and complements reserved bus lanes, at-grade busways, and queue jump lanes. It is essential in mixed-flow bus rapid transit operations (such as VTA's classification of BRT 1). Along the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors, the Rapid 522 enjoys active, unconditional priority at most intersections.

- **Queue jump lanes** are special priority lanes, often right-hand turn lanes, used for transit through movements. These permit transit vehicles to bypass long traffic queues at congested points (including intersections and bridge approaches) and can provide an important competitive advantage in heavily congested corridors. The Rapid 522 route contains two queue jump lanes.

- **Prohibition of mixed flow turning movements** improves traffic flow by eliminating interruptions to through movements. Allowing BRT vehicles to continue to make turns where other traffic is prohibited gives transit an edge and permits bus routes that would be difficult otherwise.
Bus bulb-outs are extensions of the curb at bus stops that widen the sidewalk into the parking lane of the street. This allows BRT vehicles to stop in the traffic lane instead of having to pull in and out of the curbside lane. Bus bulb-outs also create more space for bus shelters and other facilities for waiting passengers.

Off-board fare collection and other operational measures, such as all-door boarding, allow BRT vehicles to reduce dwell time at stations. These practices can improve overall travel speed for transit and reduce the impact on general traffic of vehicles stopping at bulb-out stations.

- Longer Stop Spacing - *Increasing the distance between stops is the easiest way to improve travel speeds and reliability, but is less visible than the other measures.* BRT serves higher ridership stops only and skips those with lower ridership. The trip is faster for on-board passengers. However, service must be frequent enough to meet the demand as well as to minimize dwell times and travel times.

## 2.2 Distinctive Branded Service

To clearly differentiate BRT services from local or other bus transit services, operators often use distinctive vehicles and specialized branding. These elements serve to call out the BRT service as unique, innovative, and distinctive. Key elements include:

- **Distinctive and Stylized Vehicles** - *BRT uses distinctive vehicles that differ from the typical vehicle. Some systems use rail-like vehicles with low emissions, a low floor, wider doorways, a more luxurious décor, and rail-like seating configurations.*

- **Branded Stations** – BRT stations convey the overall brand message and are not ordinary bus stops but are more similar in appearance, style, and features to rail stations. They typically have high quality shelters, seating, landscaping, and real-time information.

- **Branded and Specially Marketed Service** – BRT vehicles may be wrapped or branded to further identify BRT as a premium service above and beyond a local bus. Specialized branding may take the form of:
  - A special name or unique numbering;
  - A unique paint or wrapping/logo scheme for BRT vehicles;
  - Specialized color schemes and logos to represent the BRT service on promotional materials, station signage, and maps; and
  - Specialized marketing campaigns focused on differentiating BRT vehicles and local buses.
These measures are combined for greater impact to attract choice riders that would normally not consider taking transit.

### 2.3 Enhanced Amenities

Enhanced passenger amenities, including stations and real-time passenger information, help to further separate BRT from local bus service. Key elements include:

- **Robust and More Substantial Stations** - BRT lines often have more substantial stations that range from simple stylized shelters to more elaborate off-street stations. These facilities provide a feeling of permanence while offering amenities such as better lighting, landscaping, a sheltered waiting area, transit information and, in some cases, restrooms and food services. Some stations are equipped with off-vehicle fare collection (using ticket vending machines or TVMs), which decreases the dwell time at stations.

- **Real-time Information** - Adding real-time passenger information increases the information resources available to the riders, as it gives riders an idea of when the next bus will arrive. Real-time information can be added after the system is operational.

### 2.4 VTA’s Definition of BRT

VTA has developed a framework and guidelines to expand and refine transit services in the region. The Transit Sustainability Policy (TSP) provides a template for the efficient and effective expenditure of transit funds by providing information about options, cost, benefits, and trade-offs of various transit projects and service proposals. The Service Design Guidelines (SDG) were developed to carry out the intent of the TSP through the evaluation, design, implementation, and monitoring of transit services in the region. The two policies provide a link between local commitments to transit service, construction and operational feasibility, and overall operational efficiency.

VTA’s SDG defined two tiers of BRT based on perceived capital costs and infrastructure investment, which are described below:
• **BRT 1**: A premium service with higher operating speeds, greater reliability, and fewer stops than local bus service. Vehicles and stations are branded; stations are more robust and include shelters, benches, and real-time passenger information. BRT 1 primarily operates in mixed flow traffic lanes with transit priority elements such as signal priority, queue jump lanes, or bulb-outs. VTA’s Rapid 522 is a modified version of BRT 1 and a precursor to future BRT 1 service.

• **BRT 2**: An enhanced version of BRT with dedicated running ways (or transitways) either on- or off-street, and high-capacity, rail-like stations with enhanced amenities. Bypass lanes may be provided at stations to support different routes. Capital costs for BRT 2 are significantly higher than those for BRT 1.

Examples of BRT 1 include the Vancouver B-Lines, the Los Angeles Metro Rapid, and the AC Transit San Pablo Rapid.

Examples of systems with BRT 2 elements include the Los Angeles Metro Orange Line, the Las Vegas MAX, the Eugene EmX, the Ottawa Transitway, and the Bogota TransMilenio.

The table below compares the key elements of BRT 1 versus BRT 2 as defined in the Service Design Guidelines.
### Table 2 – VTA SDG Definition of BRT 1 vs. BRT 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Elements</th>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>BRT 1</th>
<th>BRT 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All-day, Frequent Service</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Stops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simplified Routing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Vehicles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Robust Stops</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail-Like Stations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-fare Vehicle Payment</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runningway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates in Mixed Flow Lanes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates in Peak Period Lanes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates in Dedicated Bus Lanes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operates in Dedicated Transitway</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Priority Elements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Signal Priority</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Jump Lanes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulb-Outs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Boardings per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Boardings per Station</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Boardings per Route Mile</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>350-475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Corridor Density (Minimum DU/A)</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Attributes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Investment Costs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Branding Strategy for the VTA BRT

As described in the previous section, branding is an essential element of a successful BRT service, differentiating it from conventional transit services. This section outlines the naming and visual brand process that VTA was guided through for the envisioned BRT service. The role of these two processes in creating a strong brand for BRT is also detailed.

3.1 The Importance of Branding

The brand is, arguably, the single most valuable asset an organization can possess. Creating and nurturing the brand is like creating a person who will, in turn, create long-lasting relationships with the target audiences. This “person/brand,” will be what transit users and the community at large connect with and remember, as well as the reason they continue to utilize VTA services. Branding is an investment and will provide a return, which over time decreases marketing costs while increasing awareness. When it comes to the importance of branding, public transit is no exception to the rules that apply to other consumer businesses.

Consider these interesting facts about consumer brand awareness and value:

- A three-year study of more than forty Fortune 500 companies found that companies that focused on consumer experience outperformed the S&P 500 by 10 to 1.  
  \(^1\)
- 75% of buying decisions are based on emotion.  
  \(^2\)
- Studies on the human brain shows that it reacts to emotion 3,000 times faster than rationale thought – and is willing to pay as much as 200% more for an emotional purchase over a rationale one.  
  \(^3\)
- Intangible assets (like brands) are on the balance sheet and account for huge portions of an organizations market value.  
  \(^4\)
  - Disney – 70%
  - Nike – 85%
  - Microsoft – 98%

While there are many elements that make up the overall brand, two of the most important are the name and the look of the visual brand. The process that VTA was guided through to create a name and visual brand for BRT is described below.

3.2 Name Creation

Creating a new name for an organization, product, or service is one of the most important first steps to establishing a strong brand identity. The name needs to resonate with target audiences and clearly align with, in this case, the service it represents while still feeling at home with the overall organization.

There are numerous variables that should be considered when choosing a name. It needs to be visual, memorable, regional, and distinctive, have a positive connotation, be associative and in general, feel like the other brands within the organization. In order to make the subjective process of name creation as objective as possible, VTA was guided...
through the strategic creative process by a specialized branding firm, Funk/Lewis. The creative process was guided by the use of general criteria common to all effective names. In addition to general criteria, specific criteria unique to the VTA brand came about from several BIG TOP discussions. A document was then prepared that included a brief description of the rationale behind each suggested name.

As touched upon earlier, a name’s potential will be closely correlated with how well it aligns with the general and specific criteria that have been established for this campaign. The following criteria were set and agreed upon to guide the creative brainstorming process:

**General Naming Criteria (criteria to be considered for all names):**

- **Distinct:** The name stands out from the crowd.
- **Relevant:** The name makes sense and relates to the audiences.
- **Easy to Pronounce:** Easy to say.
- **Non-Corruptible:** No apparent negatives can be inferred from/to the name.
- **Positive Connotation:** The words elicit positive feelings.
- **Associative:** A connection or association between the name and the organization itself can be made.
- **Memorable:** Easy to remember and recall.
- **Familiar:** Corresponds with words, concepts and personalities that the audience already knows and can relate to.
- **Extendibility:** How the name works and translates across media and cultural boundaries.

**Specific Naming Criteria (criteria developed specifically with this BRT project in mind):**

**Political Criteria:**

- The new name should be an evolution of the current modified BRT 1 service called the “Rapid” (as in the Rapid 522).
- The name should be mindful of the racial and ethnic diversity of VTA transit users.

**Compatibility Criteria:**

- **Quality:** Seen as high end in quality and service.
- **Reliable:** People feel that they can rely on this service.
- **Distinguished from Other VTA Transit Services:** Different and distinctive from current VTA offerings.
- **Fast/Speed:** Seem to be fast and reflect/convey speed.
- **Premium:** Portrays an image of high-end service.
- **Sleek:** Sounds graceful and streamlined.
- **Interesting/Alluring:** Seen as interesting and attractive to potential riders.
- **Environmentally Sound:** Sustainable and environmentally aware.
Personality Criteria:

- **Speed**: Connotes faster service than other VTA bus services.
- **Cosmopolitan**: Seen as an edgy, big-city service.
- **Premium/High-end**: Perceived as a higher-end service, above other VTA bus services.
- **Innovative**: Seen as an innovation in transit.
- **Alluring**: Attractive, interesting and compelling to current and potential riders.
- **Bold**: The name should be bold and memorable.

Several first round names were presented. From these, the name **Valley Rapid Transit** was chosen to represent VTA’s BRT offering. This name was chosen because it best met both the general and specific criteria that were developed for the naming of the service. The literalness of this name makes it very familiar and memorable. The acronym helps to make it more succinct and interesting. It enjoys a certain element of onomatopoeia with the “vrrr" sound that is similar to the hum of a bus engine. The letter “V" also lends to interesting design opportunities.

### 3.3 Visual Brand Development

Once the name, Valley Rapid, was finalized, it was time to begin developing the visual brand to represent it. The visual brand is made up of all the graphical elements that will distinguish Valley Rapid from competitors and help it to resonate with and engage target audiences. The following graphical elements were developed to encompass the look and feel of Valley Rapid:

- **Logo**
- **Color Palette**
- **Iconography**
- **Typography and Font**

Similar to the naming process, both general and specific criteria guided the design and development of a visual brand. As it is the most important in building brand recognition, the logo is always the first graphic element to be developed. The general criteria common to all effective design included:

**General Visual Brand Criteria (criteria important for all good design):**

- **Content** – Compatible with the nature and personality of the organization.
- **Suitable to Media** – Lends itself to all media applications.
- **Distinctive** – Stands out from competitors.
- **Contemporary** – Will still be attractive in 10 years.
- **Memorable** – Creates a strong and lasting impression with audiences.
- **Reliability** – Suggests a sense of reliability and credibility.
- **Utility** – Is easily used and not offensive.
- **Regional** – Reflects the desired regionality or internationality.
- **Color Individuality** – Color is distinctive from competitors.
Specific Visual Brand Criteria (criteria developed specifically with this BRT project in mind):

- **Consistent with Current VTA Identity** - Needs to work in concert with the current VTA identity.

- **Consistent with VTA Colors** - Recommended to stay consistent with current VTA color scheme.

The first round logos were presented in black and white. After the VTA Marketing Team came to a consensus on which mark to proceed with, several color palette options that worked best with the logo and also aligned with the design criteria were presented. Following the development of a unique and vibrant color palette, complementary iconography, typography and fonts were chosen. The iconography and typography were chosen based on their ability to enhance the mark and the color palette and act as supporters of the overall Valley Rapid BRT brand.

At the last stage of the project, two logos were brought forward for focus group evaluation. The final logo that was chosen was the wave logo (see below), with a predominantly blue color scheme for the new BRT vehicles. We believe that this logo and design align well within the VTA color and brand hierarchy and reflect well on the new service.
4 The Six Potential VTA BRT Corridors

The intent of the BRT Strategic Plan was to assess several corridors for potential BRT-type service as defined in the Service Design Guidelines. The six potential BRT corridors were identified by the recent Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) and VTP 2035. They include:

- **Alum Rock**: This corridor extends from the Eastridge Transit Center in San Jose to Downtown San Jose. This stretch of Santa Clara Street and Alum Rock Avenue represent VTA’s most productive transit corridor. The Rapid 522 (a modified BRT 1 service) operates in the corridor, supplying the line with 35% of its overall ridership. The corridor is also served by locals 22 and 23. Together, the Local 22 and Rapid 522 carry nearly 20% of VTA’s daily riders.

- **El Camino**: This corridor extends from the Eastridge Transit Center in San Jose to the Palo Alto Transit Center. The El Camino Corridor is served by the Local 22 and Rapid 522, which collectively carry 20% of VTA’s daily riders. Again, the Rapid 522 is a modified BRT 1 service with signal priority in some locations and limited stop service. The corridor links east side neighborhoods with downtown San Jose and established commercial centers in Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, Los Altos and Palo Alto.

- **King Road**: The King Road corridor is a north-south route serving transit dependent residential neighborhoods of east San Jose. The corridor extends from Capitol Expressway in the south to McKee Road in the north, intersecting with the Alum Rock Corridor. VTA operates five local bus routes in the corridor, including higher ridership routes such as the Local 22, 70, and 77.
• Monterey Highway: The Monterey Highway Corridor extends from the Santa Teresa LRT Station in South San Jose to downtown San Jose. The Corridor links transit dependent, high-density residential neighborhoods in South San Jose with employment sites in downtown San Jose. The overlapping Locals 66 and 68 serve 6,000 daily boardings per weekday.

• Stevens Creek: The West San Carlos/Stevens Creek Corridor extends from downtown San Jose to the De Anza College Transit Center in Cupertino. The corridor links downtown San Jose with growing retail and mixed-use developments at the intersection of Stevens Creek and Winchester Boulevards and important commercial and educational land uses in Santa Clara and Cupertino. The Local 23 has high ridership and is a primary east-west route in the urbanized portion of the valley.

• Sunnyvale-Cupertino: The Sunnyvale/Cupertino Corridor extends from employment sites in northern Sunnyvale to the De Anza College Transit Center in Cupertino. The Corridor links trip generators at both ends with downtown Sunnyvale. The Local 55 operates in this corridor.

Figure 1 (below) shows the six potential BRT corridors in relation to other high capacity transit modes in the Santa Clara Valley. Table 3 (below) presents key transit performance effectiveness measures by corridor. Table 4 presents the BRT market indicators, which look at the potential effectiveness of implementing BRT improvements using the Transit Competitiveness Factor (TCF) scores, trip length (longer trips benefit more from speed improvements) and whether buses need assistance to increase speed. These data are from October 2007 and are taken from the Preliminary Screening of Corridor Options Memo (April 2, 2008).
## Table 3 - Transit Performance Measures (as of 10/2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Effectiveness Measures (Weekday Daytime Hours)</th>
<th>Santa Clara/Alum Rock</th>
<th>El Camino</th>
<th>King Road</th>
<th>Monterey Highway</th>
<th>Stevens Creek</th>
<th>Sunnyvale-Cupertino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Boardings</td>
<td>6,940</td>
<td>9,787</td>
<td>3,017</td>
<td>4,542</td>
<td>4,222</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Length (miles)</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Boardings per Route Mile</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Hours</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekday Boardings per Revenue Hour</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Time Arrivals%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** (i) Comprehensive Operations Analysis and VTA performance reports

Notes:

A Alignment length for the Sunnyvale-Cupertino Corridor assumes the Sunnyvale-Saratoga/De Anza Boulevard alignment south of El Camino Real.

B An on-time arrival is any run being no earlier than 1.0 minute or no greater than 5.0 minutes late. A late arrival is any run being 5.0 or more minutes late.

## Table 4 - BRT Market Indicators (as of 10/2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BRT Effectiveness Measures</th>
<th>Santa Clara/Alum Rock</th>
<th>El Camino</th>
<th>King Road</th>
<th>Monterey Highway</th>
<th>Stevens Creek</th>
<th>Sunnyvale-Cupertino</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Competiveness Factor (TCF) Origin</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Competiveness Factor (TCF) Destination</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Trip Length/Mi.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>104,995</td>
<td>173,045</td>
<td>78,958</td>
<td>115,705</td>
<td>76,172</td>
<td>64,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>43,666</td>
<td>108,486</td>
<td>10,882</td>
<td>62,067</td>
<td>64,408</td>
<td>53,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** (i) Comprehensive Operations Analysis and VTA performance reports

Notes:

A Alignment length for the Sunnyvale-Cupertino Corridor assumes the Sunnyvale-Saratoga/De Anza Boulevard alignment south of El Camino Real.

□ Indicates competitive conditions for transit (any TCF score over 100 is considered transit-competitive)
5 Methodology and Process to Select a Preferred Operating and Infrastructure Strategy

This section presents the approach and methodology used to develop the VTA BRT corridors and their corresponding service and infrastructure strategies. This process was an iterative one, involving significant input and feedback from VTA and its Planning and Operations team.

At the outset of the study, six potential BRT corridors were under consideration. The first step in this process was to identify those corridors most suitable for near-term BRT implementation. Next, various operating plans were developed, each seeking to achieve enhanced transit market share in the corridor, while making transit more efficient and effective at serving riders. Based on demand forecasts for these operating plans, as well as operating/capital costs and other qualitative factors, a preferred operating plan and infrastructure strategy were identified for each near-term BRT corridor.

The selection process to identify a preferred operating plan and infrastructure strategy for select BRT corridors consists of four steps, as presented in Figure 2 below, with operating and infrastructure analyses occurring concurrently. These steps and the subsequent analyses are explained in the following sections.

---

**Figure 2 - Selection Process Flowchart**

1. **Step 1:** Identify Near-Term BRT Corridors
2. **Step 2a:** Develop Initial Operating Strategies
3. **Step 2b:** Conduct Service Planning Workshop
4. **Step 2c:** Develop Final Operating Plans
5. **Step 3:** Develop Infrastructure Strategy
6. **Step 4:** Select Preferred Operating Plan and Infrastructure Strategy
6 Identification of Near-term BRT Corridors (Step 1)

As Step 1 of the VTA BRT corridor planning process, the most feasible corridors were identified for near-term BRT implementation, given existing corridor conditions. This section describes this process and the ensuing analysis.

6.1 Corridor Selection Objectives

Each corridor was assessed to identify if it was best suited for BRT 1, BRT 2, hybrid BRT 1/BRT 2 enhancements, or local service enhancements. This analysis was based on whether the transit enhancement recommended for a given corridor would:

- Generate substantial new demand and improve market share;
- Match existing and planned land uses and development; and
- Be physically feasible within a corridor, given existing street profiles, adjacent developments, and road configuration.

As defined by the VTA Service Design Guidelines, BRT 1 would operate with transit priority in mixed-flow lanes; BRT 2 would operate in dedicated bus lanes with rail-like stations; and a hybrid BRT 1/BRT 2 system would include stretches of both BRT 1 and BRT 2 operations.

6.2 Evaluation Process

Based on the Evaluation Criteria and Process Memo – Final (February 22, 2008), the Step 1 screening objectives and evaluation criteria are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Data Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Increase corridor/system ridership and transit market share | 1i) Residents in corridor A  
1ii) Employees in corridor A  
1iii) Current boardings per revenue hour A,B | Census and Existing Conditions Report |
| 2. Support existing and future land use patterns | 2i) Compatibility with existing land uses and development (including major activity centers served) (qualitative)  
2ii) Current residential density (du/a) A,B | Existing Conditions Report, Transit Competitiveness Factor (TCF), Year 2000 Census, and City Land Use Maps |
| 3. Minimize construction and operational impacts | 3i) Constructability / Implementability (qualitative) | Physical survey, land use maps, and aerials |

Note:
- A Within the 1/3 mile band of alignment
- B Compared against SDG Local Bus and BRT minimums

While much of the required demand and demographic data for the assessment were included in Table 3 and Table 4, the analysis also took into account physical conditions, land use, residential/employment densities, and development potential along the corridors.

6.3 Preferred Near-Term BRT Corridors

Of the six initial BRT corridors, Alum Rock, El Camino, and Stevens Creek exhibited the best potential for near-term BRT implementation, in terms of operational and physical feasibility. Collectively, by implementing hybrid BRT 1/BRT 2 or BRT 2 enhancements on these corridors, travel speeds and efficiency should improve, transit market share should
increase, and a network of high-speed and high-capacity BRT lines would be created. Transit supportive land uses and future development along with transit competitive origins and destinations exist along these corridors, which bodes well for future sustained BRT demand. Table 6 summarizes the three corridors best suited for near-term BRT implementation. Key findings from this analysis are documented in the Preliminary Screening of Corridor Options – Final Memo (April 2, 2008).

Table 6 - Corridors Best Suited for Near-Term BRT Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommended Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock</td>
<td>The Rapid 522 (modified BRT 1 service) and Local 22/23 currently operate on this corridor between HP Pavilion and Eastridge Transit Center. The corridor has the highest boardings per revenue hour, just at the threshold of BRT 1 productivity. It serves as the primary spine between Downtown and East San Jose, bisecting major transit facilities at Diridon, 1st/2nd Street, and the Alum Rock and Eastridge Transit Centers. Extremely transit-supportive and competitive conditions exist near Downtown San Jose and along the corridor towards Capitol.</td>
<td>BRT 2 enhancements could generate higher transit market share and reduce transit travel times on this corridor. Dedicated bus lanes are feasible east of King Road where the cross-section widens. However, road constraints west of King Road make dedicated lanes unlikely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>The Rapid 522 (modified BRT 1) and Local 22 operate on this corridor between Palo Alto and the HP Pavilion, combined serving the highest volumes in the county. The corridor has some high density residential uses, serves all-day demand to large malls, universities, and transit centers, and is the primary link between Downtown San Jose and West County.</td>
<td>BRT 2 enhancements could generate higher transit market share and reduce transit travel time on this busy corridor. El Camino Real’s relatively wide cross-section could support dedicated bus lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek</td>
<td>Local 23 operates on this corridor between De Anza College and Downtown San Jose. This corridor is lined with major regional shopping and employment destinations such as De Anza College, Cupertino Civic Center, Vallco Fashion Park, as well as Valley Fair and Santana Row. Transit-dependent areas exist east of Valley Fair to Downtown San Jose, with relatively strong demand during off-peak hours from students and shoppers.</td>
<td>Transit productivity, although relatively low, could be improved with hybrid BRT 1/BRT 2 service that would reduce transit travel times. Given expected land use intensification and growth in the corridor, great potential exists to create a high-speed, east-west BRT service from Cupertino to Downtown. BRT would directly link: (i) De Anza College and San Jose State University; and (ii) Valley Fair/Santa Ana Row to Downtown San Jose. The corridor west of Valley Fair is relatively wide and could accommodate dedicated lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.4 Corridors to Receive Local Bus Enhancements

The remaining three corridors were recommended for longer-term BRT implementation and for local bus enhancements, which could include service frequency and bus stop facility upgrades, without major physical enhancements such as dedicated bus lanes.

Traits shared by these corridors making them less supportive of near-term BRT implementation than the Alum Rock, El Camino, and Stevens Creek corridors include:

- Less supportive land use conditions;
- Limited potential to increase transit market share;
- Lack of transit-competitive origins/destinations;
- Primarily peak hour/commute travel pattern; and
- High on-time performance.

A summary and strategy for these corridors follows:

Table 7 - Corridors Best Suited for Local Bus and Facility Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Recommended Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King Road</td>
<td>The King Road Corridor, from Eastridge Transit Center to McKee Road, is primarily residential in nature, with few large employers; there is a large imbalance in jobs versus residents. This area is relatively transit-supportive with significant low-income and zero-car households. However, it lacks major destinations or connections with large transit facilities. The relatively narrow width of the corridor precludes large-scale BRT 2 enhancements such as dedicated bus lanes. The relatively high proportion of boardings in the peak does not suggest all-day BRT service.</td>
<td>Despite high productivity, potential to grow market share is limited due to a high transit mode share and the largely transit-dependent nature of the area. Physical, land use, and demand conditions suggest that local bus service and facility upgrades would be most appropriate. Potential exists for limited BRT enhancements such as bus signal priority, although good on-time performance suggests this may be unnecessary. It was suggested to extend the corridor to the Great Mall Transit Center, which would be a natural turnaround point and connection point to LRT and to express/local bus services to Milpitas and north. A potential BRT routing on King could serve a future BART station at Berryessa. This routing was not evaluated as part of this study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Recommended Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Highway</td>
<td>The Monterey Highway Corridor, from Downtown San Jose to Santa Teresa LR Station, is marked by long stretches without significant transit origins or destinations. Transit-competitive areas are concentrated at the Tully/Senter intersections and the Santa Teresa LR Station, with low-density housing and employment in between. Principal local routes have relatively high on-time performance, suggesting BRT enhancements may be unnecessary.</td>
<td>Existing on-time performance, land use, congestion, and demand conditions suggest that lower cost improvements to local bus service and related facilities would be most appropriate. Recent 10-15% growth in riders on the Local 66/68 over the past year suggests a need to increase service (slated for early 2009) and to focus enhancements on improving stop facilities and transfer infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale-Cupertino</td>
<td>The Sunnyvale-Cupertino Corridor, from De Anza College to Lockheed Transit Center, is an extremely auto-oriented and affluent area with low-density housing/employment. Current transit demand is low, with few boardings in the middle of the corridor. Productivity is low. Few transit-dependent areas or regional destinations exist along the corridor (outside of De Anza College, and the Apple and Lockheed campuses).</td>
<td>Very high on-time performance suggests BRT 1/BRT 2 enhancements to improve travel speeds are unnecessary. Land use, congestion, and demand conditions warrant lower cost improvements to local service and bus stops, with enhancements to the latter facilities being the most appropriate at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Develop Operating Strategies (Step 2)

This section describes Step 2 of the BRT corridor planning process - the development of operating strategies for the three near-term BRT corridors: Alum Rock, El Camino, and Stevens Creek. These three corridors are principally served by three existing bus routes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Corridors Served</th>
<th>Weekday Headway</th>
<th>Description of Existing Bus Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local 22</td>
<td>El Camino &amp; Alum Rock</td>
<td>12 minutes</td>
<td>Local service from Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge Transit Center via King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local 23</td>
<td>Stevens Creek &amp; Alum Rock</td>
<td>12 minutes</td>
<td>Local service from De Anza College to Alum Rock Transit Center via Downtown and the 1st/2nd Street Transit Mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid 522</td>
<td>El Camino &amp; Alum Rock</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>Modified BRT 1 service from Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge Transit Center via Capitol, with branded vehicles; enjoys bus signal priority at most intersections and utilizes two queue jump lanes along El Camino Real</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development of near-term BRT service strategies and operating plans for the three corridors focused on modifications and enhancements to these three routes.

7.1 Develop Initial BRT Operating Strategies (Step 2a)

Focusing on modifying and enhancing these three core routes, the following concepts or ideas were initially devised as a starting point for BRT operating plans (based on the Service Planning Update Memo of June 2, 2008):

- Introducing BRT 522 service to replace the Rapid 522 along El Camino and Alum Rock (the BRT 522) and BRT 523 service to complement or replace the Local 23 along Stevens Creek and Alum Rock;
- Reducing or eliminating local overlay service where BRT would operate;
- Providing direct BRT service to Diridon Station, San Jose State University, and De Anza College;
- Truncating BRT service at San Jose State University or Downtown San Jose to reduce oversupply of capacity on the Alum Rock Corridor, to shorten long route lengths, and to improve operational reliability; and
- Providing direct BRT service to Valley Fair and Santana Row along Stevens Creek.

These initial strategies were presented to VTA and refined into five 22/522 and eight 23/523 operating scenarios.

7.2 Conduct BRT Service Planning Workshop (Step 2b)

The BRT Service Planning Workshop was held in July 2008 and included VTA Planning and Operations staff. The workshop served as a forum for consensus building and operating/service plan refinement. Major goals underpinning the operating plans were described, and five scenarios for 22/522 and eight scenarios for 23/523 were presented.
As described in the BRT Service Planning/Routing Options Meeting Minutes (July 7, 2008), the following themes emerged in the discussions:

- Maintain today’s Local 22 / BRT 522 routing;
- Modify Local 23 to serve San Jose State University instead of the BRT 523;
- Explore BRT-only service on Stevens Creek;
- Operate BRT 523 out to Eastridge;
- Phase BRT 523 implementation to De Anza College;
- Directly serve Downtown San Jose;
- Give Downtown users multiple options to reach the same destination; and
- Provide appropriate levels of service on Alum Rock and be considerate of potential over-supply of capacity.

In terms of service frequencies, it was agreed that:

- BRT would operate as a premium service with 10-minute headways (the Rapid 522 currently provides 15-minute headways);
- Local 22 service would be fixed at 15 minutes, a slight reduction in service from the existing 12-minute service; and
- Local 23 service would have a variable headway (between 15-30 minutes) to be tested in various service scenarios to gauge its impact on demand.

### 7.3 Develop Final BRT Corridor Operating Plans (Step 2c)

Based on the themes that emerged from the Service Planning Workshop, ten operating plans were developed that met the stated goals and objectives. To identify a preferred operating plan for each corridor, each of the operating plans was developed to the extent that it was possible to:

- Identify BRT station locations;
- Forecast 2030 demand at every station using the VTA Model;
- Identify necessary BRT infrastructure and street enhancements (including dedicated lanes, new BRT stations, and facility improvements/modifications);
- Estimate operating costs (including costs to operate/maintain vehicles and related facilities, as well as salary costs for new fare inspectors and revenue collection staff); and
- Estimate capital costs (including those for new vehicles, requisite BRT infrastructure, as well as maintenance and other facility upgrades).
8 Infrastructure Strategy Development (Step 3)

In parallel with the formulation of the operating plans in Step 2, the infrastructure strategy was developed based on discussions in several BIG TOP meetings. Key elements and assumptions underlying the proposed infrastructure strategy on the three near-term BRT corridors are as follows:

- **Running Way** – In line with the findings from the Santa Clara-Alum Rock (SCAR) EIR, a median busway with right-side platforms was the preferred configuration for BRT 2 (as curbside lanes would be subject to disruption from loading/unloading and right-turning vehicles). Bus lanes would facilitate improved travel times and reliability. Bus lanes would normally be for exclusive BRT use – unless decided otherwise by VTA. Where conditions do not warrant bus lanes, BRT would operate in mixed flow lanes (with appropriate street and signal enhancements) alongside the locals. Median bus lane segments would have dual 12’ lanes, separated from mixed flow lanes by 6” concrete curbs. On these streets, the original number of traffic lanes would be maintained to the extent possible, with additional width gained by removing existing curbside parking or cutting into the existing median or dedicated left-turn lane. Right-of-way acquisition would be assumed where center median BRT stations are needed.5

- **Valley Fair/Santana Row Segment** – The Stevens Creek segment through Valley Fair and Santana Row is congested and problematic. VTA service currently avoids this segment by operating along the northern edge of Valley Fair Mall, which results in a lack of direct transit service to the Mall and Santana Row along Stevens Creek. Two infrastructure solutions have been proposed: (i) a single reversible transit-only lane between Winchester and MacArthur; and (ii) a dual-lane, transit-only overhead viaduct between Henry and MacArthur. The former option would include a center passing lane through the station loading areas, while the latter would include an aerial station.

---

5 The recommended BRT street operation (whether in mixed flow or dedicated bus lanes) throughout a given segment was consistent among the various options - the only exception being the segment of Stevens Creek through Valley Fair and Santana Row, which entailed either a reversible at-grade lane or a two-lane aerial viaduct solution. Additional analysis of the Valley Fair proposals is planned, but not a part of this study.
• **Stations** – To accommodate the enhanced amenities, median BRT stations would have 90’ platforms for exclusive BRT use (local buses would use conventional curbside bus stops). In mixed flow BRT segments, BRT stations would be located along the curb and have 160’ platforms to allow simultaneous docking of a 90’ BRT vehicle and a 60’ local bus. BRT stations would allow for right-side boarding only, have a platform for each direction of travel, be located at the far side of intersections, and be staggered or offset with split platforms. The conceptual graphic below shows how a split platform configuration would work for a median busway with side-loading platforms for exclusive BRT use, as is proposed for the VTA BRT corridors (local services would continue to use conventional curbside bus stops).

![Split Platform Configuration for Median Busway with Side Platforms](image)

• **Traffic Signals** – Bus Signal Priority (BSP) exists on much of the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors, although several intersections in the Santa Clara portion (near the Santa Clara Transit Center) and all of Stevens Creek lack BSP. To the extent Enhanced BRT Stations

![Enhanced BRT Stations](image)

BSP Enabled Intersection at Bowers and El Camino

![BSP Enabled Intersection at Bowers and El Camino](image)
possible on the BRT corridors, intersections would be outfitted with BSP. Potential enhancements could entail software coordination to complete signal replacement.

- **Queue Jump Lanes** – Queue jump lanes are currently installed at two locations along the El Camino Corridor at Page Mill and Arastradero. Additional queue jump lanes along the BRT corridors could be considered at poorly performing intersections (such as LOS D or worse) within mixed flow BRT segments and be implemented in concert with related street and paving work.

- **Maintenance and Other Facilities** – The new dedicated fleet of BRT vehicles would require modifications to existing service facilities and yards, particularly at Chaboya (as well as more minor works at North Yard and Cerone). The eventual adoption of off-board fare payment and ticket vending machines (TVMs) would also spur modifications to the TVM Maintenance Facility and the construction of a new money room.

Among the elements identified above, the placement and type of dedicated bus lanes was considered to be the most important infrastructure element, as this has the greatest influence on travel time and transit operating reliability, as well as capital costs. Based on physical inspection of the corridor (including land uses, road widths, and median type/existence), and identification of key physical constraints (overpasses, bridges, and immovable structures such as columns), a series of preliminary infrastructure strategies was presented at a September BIG TOP meeting. Comments received became the basis for refining these strategies in order to arrive at the preferred infrastructure strategy described in Step 4 below.
9 Selection of Preferred BRT Operating Plan and Infrastructure Strategy (Step 4)

This section describes Step 4 of the VTA BRT corridor planning process, the selection of the preferred operating plan and infrastructure strategy on the three near-term BRT corridors.

9.1 Objectives and Criteria to Select Preferred Operating Plan

The ten operating plans defined in Step 2c were subsequently evaluated based on four major objectives and various criteria, as shown below. These criteria were initially proposed and then later refined in the Evaluation Criteria and Process Memo (February 22, 2008). The selection process consisted of a high-level evaluation, based on quantitative (e.g., demand forecasts and cost estimates) and qualitative (e.g., land use, mobility, and coverage) analyses.

Table 9 - Objectives and Evaluation Criteria for Step 4 Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase Corridor/ System Use and Market Penetration</td>
<td># of Boardings</td>
<td>VTA Model Results, Proposed BRT Operating Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of New vs. No Project Boardings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of Boardings/Revenue Hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness</td>
<td>O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td>Operating Cost Memo (11/24/2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O&amp;M Cost per Revenue Hour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incremental O&amp;M Cost per New Rider</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Costs</td>
<td>Capital Cost Memo (11/17/2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Existing &amp; Future Land Use</td>
<td>Best Supports Existing and Future Land Uses and Development Potential (particularly on Stevens Creek)</td>
<td>Land Use, BRT Operating Plan, Transit Competitiveness Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility and Coverage</td>
<td>Best Balance of Local/BRT Service &amp; Coverage</td>
<td>BRT Operating Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Best Provision of One-Seat, Direct Ride</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2 Increased Corridor/System Use and Market Penetration

The travel demand on the four core proposed routes (Local 22, Local 23, BRT 522, and BRT 523) was forecast for 2030 for all operating plans through the VTA Model. Final results were presented at a November 2008 BIG TOP meeting, as shown below.
Figure 3 - 2030 Forecasted Weekday Boardings by BRT Operating Plan

Table 10 - 2030 Weekday Demand and Productivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Plan</th>
<th>Weekday Demand (Passengers)</th>
<th>% New Riders over 2030 No Project Scenario</th>
<th>Weekday Boardings/Revenue Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>59,584</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>76,050</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>72,641</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>70,712</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>76,146</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (BRT 10-0)</td>
<td>79,497</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>77,851</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (BRT 10-20)</td>
<td>82,431</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A (BRT 10-15)</td>
<td>83,578</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B (BRT 10-30)</td>
<td>79,957</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Key demand and market findings were as follows:

- Weekday demand for the ten operating plans ranged from 70,000-84,000 passengers. Full build-out options, where the BRT 522 operates from Palo Alto to Eastridge and the BRT 523 operates from De Anza College to Eastridge showed
the highest daily demand (e.g., Options 4 (BRT 10-0), 7 (BRT 10-20), 7A (BRT 10-15), and 7B (BRT 10-30)).

- The full build-out options to De Anza College showed the most promise to increase market share and attract new riders, generating 35-40% more riders than the No Project Scenario. Options where the BRT 522 is truncated at San Jose State or where the BRT 523 bypasses Downtown performed poorly in this respect.

- Operating productivity in terms of boardings per revenue hour was fairly consistent among options, ranging from 79 to 87 boardings per revenue hour on each corridor. This represents the productivity of all four routes for a given operating plan.

In summary, full build-out options with BRT 522 operating from Palo Alto to Eastridge and BRT 523 operating from De Anza College to San Jose State showed the most potential to increase market share and increase overall transit demand. These options include BRT 10-0, BRT 10-15, BRT 10-20, and BRT 10-30.

9.3 Cost-Effectiveness

Operating and capital costs were established for each operating plan as per the Operating Cost Memo (November 24, 2008) and the Capital Cost Memo (February 17, 2008). Table 11 shows the annual operating and maintenance (O&M) costs, operating cost productivity (annual O&M costs per revenue vehicle hour), and the incremental O&M cost per new rider.

9.3.1 Operating Cost Analysis

Key operating cost findings were as follows:

- Operating costs ranged from $59-$73 million per plan (assuming new 60' BRT specific vehicles, which cost $190/hour to operate). More extensive options, where the BRT 523 operates to De Anza College, would provide more service, but would be more costly.

- More telling were the annual O&M costs per revenue hour and the incremental O&M cost per new rider. These two metrics eliminate bias related to absolute O&M costs and instead focus on the overall productivity of each option in providing local/BRT service. Annual O&M cost per revenue hour was similar across the board, ranging between $200-$210/RVH. This suggests that even though full build-out options such as the BRT 10-0, 10-15, 10-20, and 10-30 options incurred significantly higher costs to operate and maintain, there was no significant loss in service productivity. Thus, the marginal cost to provide additional service was insignificant.

- The O&M cost per new rider was about $3.00 for most options. BRT 10-0 had the lowest incremental cost per new rider ($2.50), as it had a relatively large increase in new riders from the No Project Scenario, yet operated without a Local 23 service on Stevens Creek, significantly reducing O&M costs. Option 2 had the highest incremental cost per new rider at ($3.50) as it generated the lowest demand, since the BRT 523 bypasses Downtown. Despite having the highest annual O&M costs,

6 In the analysis of demand, Options 4, 7, 7A, and 7B were identified as promising since they generate the largest increase in daily demand compared to the No Project scenario. All four of these options have identical Local 22 and BRT 522 route alignments/headways and identical BRT 523 route alignments; the only difference is the Local 23 headway along Stevens Creek Blvd. To differentiate between these options, these four options are given names that correspond to the relative headway of the BRT 523 versus that of the Local 23. For instance, Option 4 is also known as the "BRT 10-0" (i.e., BRT 523 operates at 10-minute headways, while the Local 23 has no service). Option 7 is the "BRT 10-20" (BRT 523 at 10-minute headways and Local 23 at 20-minute headways). Option 7A is known as the "BRT 10-15", while Option 7B is known as the "BRT 10-30".
full build-out options typically had lower incremental O&M costs per new rider, implying that full-build-out options could also serve new riders cost-effectively.

In summary, operating costs were lowest for options providing the least amount of service and coverage (e.g., Options 1, 2, and 3A). While the full-build-out options generated the highest operating costs, they provided service and carried new riders as cost effectively as the other options.

Table 11 - 2030 Operating Cost and Productivity by Operating Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Plan</th>
<th>Annual O&amp;M Cost</th>
<th>Average O&amp;M Cost/RVH</th>
<th>Incremental O&amp;M Cost per New Rider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$62,700,000</td>
<td>$203</td>
<td>$2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$62,600,000</td>
<td>$203</td>
<td>$3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>$58,900,000</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>$64,600,000</td>
<td>$204</td>
<td>$3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (BRT 10-0)</td>
<td>$64,400,000</td>
<td>$209</td>
<td>$2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$64,700,000</td>
<td>$201</td>
<td>$2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (BRT 10-20)</td>
<td>$70,400,000</td>
<td>$203</td>
<td>$2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A (BRT 10-15)</td>
<td>$72,300,000</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td>$3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B (BRT 10-30)</td>
<td>$68,400,000</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Annual O&M costs are approximate to nearest hundred-thousand.

9.3.2 Capital Cost Analysis

Table 12 shows the total capital costs for each option, inclusive of the cost for a reversible lane or a viaduct at Valley Fair. Key capital cost findings were as follows:

- Capital costs ranged from $412-$582 million per operating plan.
- The major cost differential related to whether a viaduct was built at Valley Fair (costing between $85-$90 million) and whether Stevens Creek service was extended to De Anza College from Valley Fair (costing between $75-$80 million, and consisting of over 3.0 miles of dedicated median busway and 15 new BRT stations).

In summary, the options with the most extensive BRT coverage (e.g., those options with BRT 523 service to De Anza College) and with an aerial structure at Valley Fair incurred the highest capital costs.

Table 12 - 2030 Capital Costs by Operating Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operating Plan</th>
<th>Capital Costs (Reversible Lane at Valley Fair)</th>
<th>Capital Costs (Viaduct at Valley Fair)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$412,200,000</td>
<td>$501,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$420,900,000</td>
<td>$510,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>$417,900,000</td>
<td>$507,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>$495,700,000</td>
<td>$582,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (BRT 10-0)</td>
<td>$490,000,000</td>
<td>$576,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$412,200,000</td>
<td>$501,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (BRT 10-20)</td>
<td>$490,000,000</td>
<td>$576,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A (BRT 10-15)</td>
<td>$490,000,000</td>
<td>$576,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B (BRT 10-30)</td>
<td>$490,000,000</td>
<td>$576,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Capital costs are approximate to nearest hundred-thousand.
9.4 Support Existing and Future Land Uses

Existing land uses along the Alum Rock Corridor, and to a slightly lesser degree, the El Camino Corridor, are supportive of high-frequency and high-capacity transit based on the experience of the Local 22 and the Rapid 522. Combined, the Alum Rock and El Camino corridors form VTA’s most productive transit corridor. Alum Rock passes through Downtown San Jose, with its large offices and businesses and higher density commercial uses, while serving transit-supportive areas to the east of City Hall. El Camino is dotted with higher density residential uses, providing links to large malls, universities, and transit centers. Existing and future land uses and development are ripe for higher-capacity transit that can provide a better level of service.

Stevens Creek has major regional shopping and employment destinations, but transit productivity and overall ridership are not as productive as would be expected of a potential BRT corridor. Current land uses, particularly in the middle of the corridor, are not ideal for BRT. However, future land use, growth, and development plans call for more concentrated and high-density growth throughout the Stevens Creek Corridor that would be more conducive to BRT. There is good potential to increase market share in this area and capture more choice riders by implementing BRT.

In summary:

- Operating plans that best met existing and expected land use and growth for the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors were those that provided BRT 522 service along the entire length of both corridors (with added densification and development expected on El Camino, north of Santa Clara), while also providing BRT 523 service along the Alum Rock Corridor (to the Eastridge Transit Center) to maintain the high frequency service that current residents and workers along the Alum Rock Corridor expect.

- Operating plans that best met existing and expected land use and growth on the Stevens Creek Corridor are those that provided for eventual BRT 523 service out to De Anza College, as the majority of concentrated and potentially transit-supportive growth and redevelopment would occur to the west of Valley Fair.

- Operating plans that best met these criteria included:
  - Option 4 (BRT 10-0)
  - Option 7 (BRT 10-20)
  - Option 7A (BRT 10-15)
  - Option 7B (BRT 10-30)

9.5 Mobility and Coverage

In all likelihood, local bus service would see some reduction in frequency or operating hours to allow the more frequent BRT service to accommodate the bulk of riders. While provision of more frequent BRT service could reduce travel times and make transit more convenient for some riders, the corresponding reduction in local bus service must be measured and balanced. For instance, eliminating local service in favor of BRT-only service along a corridor could lengthen access time to bus stops and to final destinations and also make transit inconvenient for the elderly or disabled. Also, if local frequency were significantly reduced (e.g., from 15- to 60-minute headways), remaining local bus users would have much longer waiting periods and would be inconvenienced.
Another key mobility issue is transfers and route directness. A one-seat ride is convenient, easy, and appealing. Imposing one or more transfers, while potentially beneficial for operating purposes, could inconvenience riders and disorient new users.

As such, options with the best balance between local/BRT service and coverage and the provision of a direct one-seat ride are the most appealing. This would mean that:

- Eliminating the Local 23 on Stevens Creek, while generating relatively high productivity, would not be recommended (Option 4, BRT 10-0);
- Truncating the BRT 522 at San Jose State, which would force BRT users along El Camino to transfer to reach Eastridge Mall, would not be recommended, as current Local 22 and Rapid 522 riders make this journey non-stop (Options 3A and 3B);
- Truncating the BRT 523 at Valley Fair, which would force BRT users to transfer to reach De Anza College from Downtown and East San Jose, would not be recommended (Options 1, 2, 3A, and 5); and
- Diverting the BRT 523 south of Downtown (along San Fernando), which could force Stevens Creek BRT users to either walk some distance or transfer to another service to reach Downtown, would not be recommended (Option 2).

In summary, Options 7 (BRT 10-20), 7A (BRT 10-15), and 7B (BRT 10-30) provided the best balance of local/BRT service and coverage, while also providing direct, one-seat rides without imposing transfers.

9.6 Preferred Operating Plan

This section describes the preferred operating plan. Specific details including demand, operating costs, and capital costs are presented.

9.6.1 Description

Based on the analyses above, three operating plans stood out among the others and were identified as preferred operating plans – this despite their relatively high overall capital and operating costs. This was due to the potential benefits from high forecasted demand, new market penetration and growth, as well as relative O&M cost and new rider productivity. These three operating plans also best matched existing and future land use and growth, had the best balance of local/BRT coverage and service, and offered direct, one-seat rides that the public would find appealing and expect of BRT service in the Santa Clara Valley. These three operating plans were:

- Option 7 (BRT 10-20)
- Option 7A (BRT 10-15)
- Option 7B (BRT 10-30)

The most aggressive plan, the BRT 10-15, would generate the highest demand and the largest number of new riders, but the highest operating costs. The most conservative plan, the BRT 10-30, would generate the lowest demand, but the lowest operating costs. The BRT 10-20 operating plan would fall somewhere in between for demand and cost.

These three strategies were presented at a November 2008 BIG TOP meeting for internal discussion. Consensus emerged to take a phased approach to implementing BRT, with the BRT 10-15 emerging as the preferred operating plan. The BRT 10-15 best represented the ideal for BRT service on these three near-term corridors, providing ample overlay local service on all corridors to meet demand of local users as well. The BRT 10-15 would be gradually phased in after the initiation of BRT services and
represents the ultimate full build-out goal of BRT service. While BRT service on the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors would be initiated as a BRT 10-15 service, BRT service on Stevens Creek would likely be less frequent (perhaps a BRT 10-30 configuration). As more key BRT infrastructure facilities were completed, transit-supportive land uses and densification were achieved, and sustainable ridership levels were attained, BRT service would be expanded to eventually achieve BRT 10-15 on both El Camino and Stevens Creek (with combined service being more frequent on Alum Rock). The recommended operating phasing strategy is described in the Phasing and Implementation Memo (February 19, 2009).

Figure 4 below shows the routing plan for the BRT 10-15, the preferred operating plan. In summary, the BRT 10-15 plan would consist of the following principal service features:

- Local 22 service along the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors (from Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge), operating at 15-minute headways;
- Truncated Local 23 service along the Stevens Creek Corridor (from De Anza College to San Jose State), operating at 15-minute headways;
- New BRT 522 service to replace the Rapid 522 on the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors (from Palo Alto Transit Center to Eastridge), operating at 10-minute headways; and
- New BRT 523 service to complement Local 23 service west of Downtown and to replace it east of Downtown (from Downtown to Eastridge), operating at 10-minute headways.

![Figure 4 - Preferred BRT Operating Plan - Option 7A (BRT 10-15)](image_url)
Specific demand and cost details for the preferred operating plan are discussed below.

### 9.6.2 Project Demand

The preferred operating plan, the BRT 10-15, generated the highest overall ridership of all operating plans – nearly 84,000 daily riders combined on the four routes for all corridors as found in Section 9.2. As shown in Table 13, the Alum Rock Corridor was forecast to carry the highest number of passengers at nearly 35,000 daily riders, equating to over 40% of the total demand on the three corridors. The El Camino Corridor was close behind at just under 40% of the total demand, while the Stevens Creek Corridor was to carry nearly 16,000 daily riders or 19% of the total.

Figure 5 graphically compares the 2030 demand for the BRT 10-15 operating plan versus that in July 2008 and that forecast for the 2030 No Project Scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>2008 (July)</th>
<th>2030 No Project</th>
<th>2030 Preferred Option (BRT 10-15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>13,830</td>
<td>26,820</td>
<td>32,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock</td>
<td>12,018</td>
<td>21,767</td>
<td>34,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek</td>
<td>5,111</td>
<td>10,837</td>
<td>15,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,959</strong></td>
<td><strong>59,424</strong></td>
<td><strong>83,542</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Of note:

- All corridors were forecast to experience substantial growth in daily demand versus the existing July 2008 case, with overall demand on the corridors growing by nearly 170% or 52,500 daily users.
- The growth in demand by corridor versus the existing case ranged from 140%-210%, with demand on the Stevens Creek Corridor growing the fastest, and demand on the Alum Rock Corridor increasing the most, nearly 22,500 daily riders.
Growth was modest compared to the 2030 No Project forecasts, but still significant – total demand on all corridors grew by 24,000 daily riders or 40%.

Versus the 2030 No Project forecasts, individual corridor growth ranged from 20%-60%, with demand on the Alum Rock Corridor growing the quickest and increasing the most.

9.6.3 Operating Costs

Analysis in Section 9.3.1 found that the BRT 10-15 generated the highest annual operating and maintenance (O&M) costs of all plans, amounting to $72.3 million for all routes. As shown in Table 14, the BRT 522 and the Local 22 generated the highest operating costs due to their relative longer route lengths and larger amounts of service provided. Combined, the Local 22 and BRT 522 comprise some 65% of the total annual O&M cost.

Overall, the incremental annual increase in O&M costs from the 2008 base case was on the order of $24.9 million. O&M costs for the two locals would decrease in 2030 by between $1.9-$3.0 million per year, while that for the envisioned 2030 BRT services would increase by between $12.2-$17.5 million per year. Figure 6 compares O&M costs for the 2008 and the 2030 scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>2008 Existing O&amp;M Cost</th>
<th>2030 O&amp;M Cost</th>
<th>Incremental Increase in O&amp;M Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local 22</td>
<td>$23,300,000</td>
<td>$21,400,000</td>
<td>-$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local 23</td>
<td>$11,000,000</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>-$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT 522</td>
<td>$13,100,000</td>
<td>$25,300,000</td>
<td>$12,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT 523</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$17,500,000</td>
<td>$17,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$47,400,000</td>
<td>$72,300,000</td>
<td>$24,900,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: BRT 522 costs in 2008 represent those for the Rapid 522

Despite the high operating costs, analysis in Section 9.3.1 found that the BRT 10-15 and other full build-out options (such as the BRT 10-20 and BRT 10-30) could carry these new riders just as cost effectively as less extensive options – typically generating incremental O&M costs per new rider figures that were lower or on par with these less extensive options.
that generated lower ridership. The cost performance of the BRT 10-15 is roughly in line and comparable to that for other North American BRT lines such as the Las Vegas Max and the Los Angeles Ventura Metro Rapid as shown in Figure 7.

![Graph comparing incremental O&M cost per new rider for different BRT lines](image)

Note: Incremental O&M cost per new rider figures for non-VTA lines from various FTA studies

**Figure 7 – Incremental O&M Cost Comparison**

### 9.6.4 Capital Costs

Analysis in Section 9.3.2 found that the BRT 10-15 operating plan generated capital costs ranging from $490-$577 million, among the higher figures for the potential operating plans assessed. Capital costs for the BRT 10-15 are largely based on the infrastructure strategy recommended in the following Section 9.7, which defines the extent of the dedicated bus lanes and the number of new BRT stations planned. Table 15 and Figure 8 present the capital cost breakdown by corridor.

For the base case where a reversible lane is assumed for the Valley Fair segment of Stevens Creek, total cost is $490.0 million for all corridors. Under this scenario, the El Camino Corridor had the highest costs at $216.3 million (44% of the total BRT 10-15 cost), followed by the Stevens Creek Corridor at $145.2 million, and the Alum Rock Corridor at $128.5 million (representing 30% and 26% of the total BRT 10-15 capital cost, respectively). The proportion of total costs borne by a given corridor is shown in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Base Cost with Valley Fair Reversible Lane</th>
<th>Additional Cost for Valley Fair Aerial Structure</th>
<th>Total Cost with Valley Fair Aerial Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>$216,300,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$216,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock</td>
<td>$128,500,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$128,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek</td>
<td>$145,200,000</td>
<td>$86,500,000</td>
<td>$231,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$490,000,000</td>
<td>$86,500,000</td>
<td>$576,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If an elevated viaduct option is assumed at Valley Fair, the Stevens Creek Corridor capital cost increases by $86.5 million to $231.7 million – bringing the total package cost of all three corridors to $576.5 million.

![Figure 8 – Capital Costs for Preferred Operating Plan: BRT 10-15](image)

Details underpinning the capital cost analysis are described below.

### 9.7 Preferred Infrastructure Strategy

Initial infrastructure strategies were presented at a September 2008 BIG TOP meeting. The primary suggestion was to identify BRT corridor segments that needed dedicated bus lanes versus those where BRT could operate in mixed traffic flows. The extent of dedicated bus lanes impacts capital costs, overall construction time (and community disruption), as well as annual operating and maintenance costs. To develop the final infrastructure strategy:
• Corridor segments and intersections were assessed from a transit operations and traffic performance perspective. Intersection level of service (LOS) information from VTA was assessed, while discussions were held with VTA CMA Engineering Staff, as well as Traffic Engineering staff from San Jose, Santa Clara, and Cupertino. These activities identified the most congested and potentially problematic segments and intersections, highlighting those intersections for potential BSP adoption.

• Appropriate starting/ending points for dedicated bus lane segments were identified. Transitioning from a median bus lane to a curbside lane in mixed traffic flows must be gradual and safe, with a sufficient weaving distance provided between the end of the bus lane and the location of the next downstream curbside BRT station.

• Infrastructure strategies included both the reversible lane and viaduct options to span the problematic segment of Stevens Creek past Valley Fair (analysis of these two infrastructure options is planned, although it is not a part of this study).

The final infrastructure strategy was presented during a November 2008 BIG TOP meeting and included the elements described below:

• **Alum Rock** – One segment of median busway (totaling 1.4 miles between King Road and Capitol Expressway), enhancements to mixed flow BRT sections, and 11 new BRT stations.

• **El Camino** – Three segments of median busway (totaling 9.9 miles between Embarcadero-Jordan, Sylvan-Lawrence, and Calabazas–Benton), enhancements to mixed flow BRT sections, and 17 new BRT stations.

• **Stevens Creek** – Two segments of median busway (totaling over 3.0 miles between De Anza College-Finch, and Woodhams-MacArthur, with the latter section including the Valley Fair reversible lane or viaduct), enhancements to mixed flow BRT sections, and 15 new BRT stations.

Preferred infrastructure strategies per corridor are depicted in the figures below. Conceptual intersections under various median bus lane scenarios are illustrated for the El Camino Corridor in Figures 12-14 – these include the staggered or split platform configuration.
Figure 10 - Infrastructure Strategy on Alum Rock Corridor

Figure 11 - Infrastructure Strategy on El Camino Corridor
Figure 12 – Conceptual Street and Intersection Modifications for Median Bus Lane and Stations along the El Camino Corridor

Figure 13 – Conceptual Street and Intersection Modifications for Median Bus Lane at Intersection with Dedicated Left-Turn Lanes along the El Camino Corridor

Figure 14 – Conceptual Street and Intersection Modifications for Median Bus Lane at Intersection with Shared Left-Turn Lanes along the El Camino Corridor
Figure 15 - Infrastructure Strategy on Stevens Creek Corridor

Figure 16 - Infrastructure Options for the Valley Fair Segment of Stevens Creek
10  Project Funding Strategy

The section described the project funding strategy for the preferred operating plan, including strategies for the three near-term BRT corridors and an assessment of federal Small Starts funding potential.

10.1  Corridor Funding Strategy

Capital cost estimates for the BRT 10-15 preferred operating plan ranged from between $490-$577 million (with Alum Rock costing up to $129 million, El Camino up to $216 million, and Stevens Creek ranging from $145-$232 million, depending on whether a viaduct at Valley Fair is built). Various funding sources potentially exist for these three BRT corridors, including

- **Local** - Measure A;
- **Regional** - Transportation for Livable Communities/Housing Incentive Program and Smart Growth Planning;
- **State** - Prop 1B – Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security, State Infrastructure Bank, California Air Resources Board (ARB), and Caltrans Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) Grant Program; and
- **Federal** - Small Starts/New Starts, Bus and Bus Facilities, Urbanized Formula Funds (Section 5307), Highway Funds/Flexible Funds (STP/CMAQ), and 2009 Economic Stimulus Package.

Based on an analysis of these potential sources, discussions with key VTA staff, and regional/federal entities, as well as a review of the scope of proposed corridor enhancements, funding strategies and opportunities were identified for each corridor based on the final conceptual capital costs.

Key funding findings include the following:

- **VTA should utilize Measure A to its full extent to fund the three BRT corridors.** Measure A would facilitate faster implementation with less bureaucratic issues than using federal funds and would likely serve as the principal funding source at this time.

- **State funding, up to $45.0 million, is also available through Prop 1B, which should be utilized as soon as possible given the competition for these funds.** VTA has already made plans to use these funds to purchase 40 new 60’ BRT vehicles for the three BRT corridors.

- **Prop 1B Lifeline funds are also a potential option for Alum Rock (up to $30 million), which traverses lower income areas.**

- **Small Starts funding eligibility requires new corridor-based bus projects (BRT) to incorporate the majority of the following elements in the future project: (i) bus signal priority; (ii) substantial stations; (iii) low-floor vehicles or level boarding; and (iv) branding.** Because the El Camino and Alum Rock corridors already have three of the four elements on the existing Rapid 522 route, these corridors are likely to be ineligible for Small Starts federal funding.

- Although federal funds are a potential option to finance some components of each corridor, competition is high, funds must be funneled through the MTC, local matches are required, additional analysis or regulations may need to be met, and
projects that utilize federal funds typically take longer to implement. Federal funds should thus be used as a last resort.

- The proposed 2009 Economic Stimulus Package could be another proposed federal funding source, although at this stage of project design, it seems that Alum Rock would be the only plausible corridor for funding through this source.

The most relevant and applicable funding source(s) for each corridor are described below.

- **Alum Rock Corridor** - The Alum Rock Corridor (HP Pavilion to Eastridge Transit Center) has estimated capital costs of $129 million and is proposed to be operational by 2012. BRT service on Alum Rock calls for 15 new 60’ BRT vehicles ($17.2 million). It is recommended that the full costs be provided through Measure A, with vehicles funded through Prop 1B. Additional options for funding beyond Measure A and Prop 1B could include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Sources</th>
<th>State Sources</th>
<th>Regional Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$17.2 million Bus and Bus Facilities</td>
<td>Up to $30 million Prop 1B for expansion of the Lifeline commitment</td>
<td>Permit flexing of federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undetermined funds from proposed 2009 Economic Stimulus Package</td>
<td></td>
<td>No direct funding for capital costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **El Camino Corridor** - The El Camino Corridor (Palo Alto Transit Center to HP Pavilion) has estimated capital costs of $216 million and is projected to be operational by 2015. BRT service on El Camino calls for 14 new 60’ BRT vehicles ($15.4 million). It is recommended that the full costs be provided through Measure A, including using a portion of the funds designated for the Palo Alto Intermodal Center, with vehicles funded through Prop 1B. Additional options for funding beyond Measure A and Prop 1B could include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Funding Sources</th>
<th>Regional Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$15.4 million Bus and Bus Facilities</td>
<td>Permit flexing of federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No direct funding for capital costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Stevens Creek Corridor** - The Stevens Creek Corridor (De Anza College to Downtown San Jose) has estimated capital costs up to $145 million, with a single reversible lane at Valley Fair, or $232 million with a viaduct at Valley Fair. It is projected to be operational by 2017. BRT service on Stevens Creek out to De Anza College calls for 17 new 60’ BRT vehicles ($18.7 million). It is recommended that the full project costs be provided through Measure A, with vehicles funded by Prop 1B. Additional options for funding beyond Measure A and Prop 1B could include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Funding Sources</th>
<th>Regional Funding Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$20-30 million Small Starts</td>
<td>Permit flexing of federal funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18.7 million Bus and Bus Facilities</td>
<td>No direct funding for capital costs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.2 Stevens Creek Small Starts Funding Analysis

Small Starts funding was considered an option to be investigated for Stevens Creek Corridor. For this reason, additional research and a survey of five recipients of Small Starts and Very Small Starts funding were conducted to understand the application process, key reasons for applying for federal funding, and any tips for future applicants. Major findings from the two surveyed Small Starts recipients, Fort Collins and Portland, were as follows:

- The Small Starts application is a long process and is quite similar to the New Starts process. It also requires annual updating as the project progresses in the development cycle. Both Fort Collins and Portland indicated that additional information was needed for the Small Starts application that would not have been requested if the projects were funded locally.

- Both Fort Collins and Portland indicated that if local funds had been available, it would have been an easier, faster, and more flexible implementation. However, neither city had local funding options.

- The Small Starts application for Fort Collins and Portland took between 2-4 months. Both transit systems hired external consultants to supplement their internal agency personnel.

- All recipients worked with their local FTA representative during the application process, provided draft applications to avoid rework and had meetings to assure that expectations were clear.

Overall, given the transit-supportive policies in the Bay Area, the Stevens Creek Corridor likely has the potential to obtain Small Starts funding. However, as Small Starts ratings are primarily based on findings and information from the Preliminary Engineering and Final Design stages, a definitive go or no-go recommendation for Small Starts funding cannot be made at this time. Given the increasing competitiveness of Small Starts funding and the previous recipient amounts, it appears plausible that VTA, if successful, would be unable to receive the full $75 million allowed by Small Starts, but instead could receive between $20-30 million. Since Measure A already would provide sufficient funding for the entire Stevens Creek BRT Corridor, VTA needs to weigh the positives of obtaining limited federal funding with the potential negatives (time, cost, process) in undertaking the federal funding process for the corridor. The experiences of the two surveyed agencies that received Small Starts funding could be very instructive to VTA. Both agencies noted that using local funds would have been easier and faster, allowing for a more flexible implementation, than going through the federal funding process.
11 Construction and Implementation Phasing

Phasing recommendations for physical BRT corridor implementation and construction, BRT service operations, and BRT fare collection were formulated for the BRT 10-15 operating plan, including for the three near-term BRT corridors. Three potential options were considered for phasing:

- **Option 1: Opening the Full BRT Route after Bus Lane Completion** - This most dramatically introduces the new service to the public and emphasizes features not available in conventional bus service in the same corridor. It has a better chance of catching the attention of non-riders and inducing them to try the service.

- **Option 2: Opening the Full BRT Route prior to Bus Lane Completion** - This approach allows for product differentiation as shown in the first option, but recognizes that bus operations have inherent flexibilities over rail operations. BRT vehicles need not wait until the entire physical route is constructed, but can start operating earlier using any exclusive lanes that have been completed and operating in mixed traffic elsewhere along the route.

- **Option 3: Introducing BRT Amenities Gradually** - This allows for early implementation before all route segments are completed. It gradually introduces BRT amenities, such as off-board fare collection, once the budget permits. Some of its impact on potential new riders is lost due to the gradual introduction, but utilizing branded vehicles and stations may help to minimize the impacts.

Based on direction received from VTA staff, the implementation of the three BRT corridors would be introduced gradually (Option 3).

11.1 Construction and Design Timeline

The Alum Rock Corridor is in a more advanced stage of development than the other two, with its EIR certified by the VTA Board in early December 2008. It would be the first of the three corridors to be constructed. The El Camino Corridor would be the second corridor to be implemented, as it is already served by the Rapid 522 service, serves high transit demand along the corridor on the 22/522 routes, and would provide a continuous BRT 522 service from East San Jose to Palo Alto. The Stevens Creek Corridor would be the last corridor of the three to be finished, providing an important east-west high-speed transit link between Cupertino and Downtown/East San Jose.

Assuming that the three BRT corridors undergo similar project development phases (including conceptual engineering (CE), preliminary engineering (PE), and final design engineering, environmental review, right-of-way acquisition, procurement, and construction), some overlap is assumed among design and engineering phases for the three corridors, the corridors are built one after the other, and accounting for progress already made on the Alum Rock Corridor, estimates for corridor development phasing are shown below:
Table 16 - Summary of Corridor Development Phasing (Duration in Months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>Environmental Analysis</th>
<th>PE</th>
<th>ROW Acquisition</th>
<th>Final Design</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Compressed Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Completed (13 months)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek – Reversible Lane</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stevens Creek – Viaduct</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Compressed duration assumes overlap of some engineering tasks.

Overall, key phasing findings were as follows:

- Alum Rock would start preliminary engineering during the second quarter of 2009 and be operational by late 2012.

- El Camino would begin its conceptual engineering in late 2009, while Alum Rock was midway through its preliminary engineering. Construction on the El Camino Corridor would begin soon after the Alum Rock Corridor was finished in late 2012. El Camino would be operational by mid-2015.

- Stevens Creek would start its conceptual engineering in mid-2011, as preliminary engineering for El Camino commenced. Construction on Stevens Creek would begin soon after the El Camino Corridor was finished. Stevens Creek would be operational by late 2016 if a reversible lane was selected for the Valley Fair stretch, otherwise by mid-2017 if a viaduct was selected.

The proposed project development schedule is shown on the next page.
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11.2 Operations Implementation

In terms of service levels and frequency, the ultimate goal for the envisioned BRT 10-15 operating plan would include BRT service at 10-minute headways and local service at 15-minute headways (thus resulting in a combined BRT 5-15 configuration on the Alum Rock Corridor). However to reach the BRT 10-15 service goal, a gradual transition from existing levels of service must be implemented. At present, existing levels of service on the three BRT corridors are geared towards providing more local service (as the local routes operate at 12-minute headways versus 15-minute headways for the Rapid 522).

Operational phasing would coincide with the completion of particular corridor segments or infrastructure facilities (as determined in the capital infrastructure phasing in Section 3) and on achievement of sustainable levels of transit demand. In summary:

- BRT on the Alum Rock and El Camino corridors would start off as a BRT 10-15 service (inclusive of the Local 22 and BRT 522) from the outset once the Alum Rock Corridor was completed (in late 2012);
- BRT on the Stevens Creek Corridor would begin with a less aggressive operating plan, perhaps a BRT 10-30 (with BRT 523 at 10-minute headways and the Local 23 at 30-minute headways), initiated immediately after the Stevens Creek Corridor was completed (in late 2016 or mid 2017, depending on the Valley Fair solution selected); and
- Local 23 headways on the Stevens Creek Corridor could be decreased to every 15 minutes after certain sustainable transit demand levels were achieved in the future (date unknown).

11.3 Recommended Fare Collection Strategy

Off-board fare collection has typically been a key component of BRT services, as it can reduce cash transactions between driver and passenger which, in turn, speeds boarding times, reduces dwell times, and shortens overall vehicle travel times. Off-board fare collection, however, typically requires procurement of ticket vending machines (TVMs) to facilitate prepayment, as well as deployment of fare inspectors to minimize fare evasion.

At present, VTA bus passengers either flash their pass to the driver or pay direct cash fares to the drivers; only LRT uses off-board fare collection with TVMs. While the ultimate goal for VTA’s BRT services is an off-board fare collection system, the transition to such a system is unlikely to occur overnight due to associated operating and procurement costs and operating impacts. A gradual fare collection phasing strategy is described below.

Components for VTA’s eventual full off-board fare collection for BRT would include:

- **Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs)** – These devices allow passengers to pre-pay before boarding the bus, resulting in reduced dwell time. Ideally, each station platform would be equipped with at least one TVM. If funding is limited, TVMs could be installed first at more heavily used stations, which would permit rear-door boarding for pre-paying passengers at those stations.

- **Fare Inspection** – Fare inspectors, an
extension of the enforcement staff currently patrolling VTA’s LRT system, would be deployed once rear-door boarding is allowed.

- **Front-Door Boarding** – All passengers would be able to enter through the front door at all times.

- **Rear-Door Boarding** – Rear-door boarding could result in faster boarding and possibly faster overall trips. Decisions about permitting riders to board through rear doors hinge on when fare inspectors would be available and where the TVMs were deployed.

Full off-board fare collection would be implemented incrementally, contingent on: (i) availability of funds to purchase TVMs and hire additional fare inspectors; (ii) VTA’s tolerance for less than optimal operating speeds before full implementation of off-board fare collection (though speeds will still exceed what are experienced on those corridors today); and (iii) ridership levels. Table 17 shows the proposed phasing of the off-board fare collection system.

### Table 17 - Proposed Phasing for BRT Off-Board Fare Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1: BRT Operations Begin (Limited Funds for TVMs/Inspectors)</th>
<th>Stage 2: Full Deployment of Fare Inspectors</th>
<th>Stage 3: Demand Increases; Funding Increasingly Available for TVMs</th>
<th>Stage 4: Full Off-Board Fare Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TVMs</td>
<td>None at this time</td>
<td>None at this time</td>
<td>TVMs at heavily used stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fare Inspectors</td>
<td>None at this time</td>
<td>Weekday/daytime enforcement only</td>
<td>Full-time enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-Door Boarding</td>
<td>Allowed for all passengers at all times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear-Door Boarding</td>
<td>Not allowed at this time</td>
<td>Allowed for passholders only on weekdays and daytime hours</td>
<td>Allowed for passholders and pre-paid fares only at stations where there are TVMs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: Kato Road Flood Control Improvements Contract - Pre-qualification Waiver

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve a waiver of VTA’s pre-qualification requirement for the advertisement of the Kato Road Flood Control Improvements contract.

BACKGROUND:

In May, 2003 the VTA Board adopted the Contractor Pre-qualification Program which establishes a process by which contractors intending to submit bids on a construction contract estimated to be greater than $1.2 million are required to provide documentation to help VTA determine the contractor’s responsibility. This pre-qualification documentation is a precursor to the formal bid submission and is an approximately five week process to complete.

In December 2002, VTA purchased right-of-way from the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) for use as a transportation corridor extending approximately 15 miles from Fremont to San Jose. Although VTA plans to use the property for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Program, VTA has defined certain activities, identified as Freight Railroad Relocation (FRR) activities, that exclude the BART extension improvements but would fulfill VTA obligations under the Purchase and Sale Agreement with UPRR and eliminate ongoing freight operations on VTA property, and otherwise prepare the property for eventual use as a transportation corridor. In June 2008, the VTA Board of Directors authorized the design and construction of FRR activities that were ready to advance to those stages. The FRR activities exclude project-level actions for the SVRT Program but are compatible with the eventual use of the property as a transportation corridor.

In September 2008, the City of Fremont initiated the environmental clearance process for its planned Kato Road Grade Separation Project. VTA’s rail corridor property crosses Kato Road.
The California Transportation Commission announced on August 28, 2008 that the City of Fremont, in partnership with VTA, would receive $10.0 million in State funding for construction of the Kato Road Grade Separation Project. The funding is part of the Highway-Railroad Safety Crossing Account included in the Proposition 1B transportation bonds passed by State voters in 2006, also known as the I-Bond funds.

In November 2008, the VTA Board authorized the General Manager to execute a Project Implementation Agreement with the City of Fremont for the improvements of the Kato Road Grade Separation Project.

DISCUSSION:

Included in the Kato Road Grade Separation Project is the replacement of an existing 60-inch storm drain pipeline with a 5’ x 7’ reinforced concrete box culvert located within an existing easement on the south side of the roadway on the Castilleja property. Currently, the property is vacant land; however the developer (Robson Homes) will begin constructing single family residences there this summer/fall. These homes would be occupied when the grade separation of Kato Road is scheduled to begin construction next year. The new box culvert will be located within approximately 2 feet of homes. Construction of the 8-foot deep box culvert will require driving sheet pile shoring. The sidewalk that leads to the homes will have to be removed during construction as the box culvert will lie beneath it. In addition to the sidewalk access impacts, there is the potential for the homes to experience damage from settlement caused by the deep excavation.

At the request of the property owner, and in the best interests of all concerned, it is proposed that the box culvert construction be removed from the Kato Road Grade Separation Project contract and that portion of work be advertised as an advance construction contract this spring. This would allow construction of the box culvert to be completed prior to a majority of the housing construction activities. For construction to be completed prior to the rainy season, it must start and be completed by October 31st. The estimated construction cost of the box culvert contract would require the pre-qualification of the contractors under VTA’s Contractor Pre-qualification Program. The approximately five week pre-qualification process would prevent construction of the storm water box culvert to be completed by October 31st deadline for flood control improvements. The schedule if pre-qualification was required would be as follows:

- Complete pre-qualification June 29, 2009
- Advertise June 30, 2009
- TP&O Committee August 21, 2009
- Board approval September 3, 2009
- Start construction April 15, 2010
- Complete construction August 6, 2010

This start of construction schedule is only slightly ahead of the schedule forecast for the Kato Road Grade Separation Project.
Should a pre-qualification waiver be granted, the proposed Kato Road Flood Control Improvements contract schedule would be as follows:

- Advertise May 8, 2009
- TP&O Committee May 21, 2009
- Board approval June 4, 2009
- Start construction July 6, 2009
- Complete construction October 26, 2009

VTA staff requests a Board waiver of the pre-qualification requirement for the Kato Road Flood Control Improvements contract.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board may decide to deny this pre-qualification waiver request, which would result in potential impacts to the adjacent property owners during the full build out of the Kato Road Grade Separation Project.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no anticipated change to the cost of construction as a result of the pre-qualification waiver.

Prepared by: John Donahue, Engineering Group Manager
Agenda Item # 24
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Information will be distributed at the meeting.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Monthly Legislative History Matrix

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

For your information, I am attaching our Monthly Legislative History Matrix, which describes key transportation-related bills that are being considered by the California Legislature during the 2009-10 session. It indicates the status of these measures and any adopted VTA positions with regard to them.

DISCUSSION:

Scarcely a month after Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger and lawmakers successfully enacted an intricate package of 33 bills that sought to close the massive $40 billion gap between state revenues and spending over the next 17 months through a complex combination of budget cuts, revenue increases and loans, the Legislature Analyst’s Office declared that the fix will fall short by $8 billion because California’s economy is continuing to falter.

In a sobering report recently issued to senators and Assembly members, the Legislative Analyst’s Office wrote, “Unfortunately, the state’s economic and revenue outlook continues to deteriorate. Even in the few weeks since the budget was signed, there have been a series of negative developments. Our updated revenue forecast projects that revenues will fall short of the assumptions in the budget package by $8 billion. Consequently, the Legislature and Governor will need to adopt billions of dollars in additional solutions in the coming months to bring the 2009-10 budget back into balance.”

Because so many of the “solutions” adopted last month are temporary, the report notes that “without corrective actions, the state’s huge operating deficits will reappear in future years - growing from $12.6 billion in 2010-11 to $26 billion in 2013-14.” The Legislative Analyst’s Office recommended that to close the newly discovered $8 billion gap, the state should
maximize its use of federal economic stimulus funds and continue to develop programmatic solutions.

Meanwhile, lawmakers tried to shift their focus, albeit perhaps only temporarily, to reviewing the roughly 2,000 new bills that have been introduced since January. Policy committees in both the Senate and Assembly have until May 1 to decide the fate of measures that have a fiscal impact on the state. Throughout the year, VTA will be actively engaged on the following bills:

**AB 112 (Beall):** This measure calls for making several technical changes to VTA’s enabling statutes to ensure that we have the appropriate statutory authority to work with our local jurisdictions on developing funding strategies to address their local street and road maintenance needs. AB 112 is a reintroduction of a bill from last year that was approved by the Legislature, but, along with several hundred other measures, was vetoed by the Governor as a way to express his frustration over how lawmakers handled the FY 2009 budget.

**AB 116 (Beall):** VTA is partnering with the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans); the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit); and the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (Golden Gate Transit) on this measure. It raises the dollar threshold for when VTA and the other three transit agencies must use the formal competitive bidding process to procure materials, supplies and equipment from $25,000 to $100,000, consistent with federal guidelines. The legislation also provides VTA, as well as SamTrans, AC Transit and Golden Gate Transit, with the option to use either low bid or best value when going through the formal bidding process for these types of procurements that exceed $100,000. Like AB 112, this bill is a reintroduction of a measure from last year that was vetoed because of state budget politics, not because of any policy objections on the part of the Governor.

**AB 729 (Evans):** Sponsored by the California Transit Association, this legislation makes permanent the current statutory authority for public transit agencies to use design-build contracting for transit capital improvement projects. If AB 729 is not enacted into law, this statutory authority will sunset on January 1, 2011. Pursuant to the direction provided in the Board-adopted 2009 Legislative Program, VTA will be supporting this bill.

**AB 744 (Torrico):** Sponsored by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), AB 744 is the legislative vehicle for authorizing the development and implementation of a high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane network on state highways within the nine-county Bay Area. Because this measure will have implications for VTA’s Express Lane Program, VTA will be actively involved with MTC in crafting the language for AB 744.

**AB 1072 (Eng):** Established as a new formula program under Proposition 1B, the Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) provides $3.6 billion to public transit operators for the following: (a) rehabilitation, safety or modernization improvements; (b) capital service enhancements or expansions; (c) new capital projects; (d) bus rapid transit improvements; and (e) bus and rail car procurement, rehabilitation or replacement. AB 1072 makes two changes to this program: (1) fixes the formula factors that would be used to allocate the remaining amount of funding to public transit operators under PTMISEA; and (2) calls upon public transit operators to submit to the state an expenditure plan
for their remaining formula shares so that a statewide program of projects for PTMISEA can be established. The California Transit Association has asked VTA to co-sponsor this measure with them. The Board-adopted 2009 Legislative Program allows VTA to accommodate this request.

**AB 1414 (Hill):** This bill is the legislative vehicle for making a series of changes to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process that are recommended in the Board-adopted 2009 Legislative Program. These changes include: (a) eliminating the four-year county share period, thereby allowing county shares and programming capacity to be calculated based on the STIP Fund Estimate; (b) strengthening the language in current law to ensure that the California Transportation Commission (CTC) cannot “cherry-pick” projects in Regional Transportation Improvement Programs (RTIPs); (c) establishing clear criteria as to when the CTC may reject an RTIP in its entirety; and (d) allowing local agencies to bond against their STIP county shares. At the request of MTC and the Bay Area congestion management agencies (CMAs), VTA will take the lead on trying to shepherd AB 1414 through the legislative process.

**SB 205 (Hancock):** Mirroring bills that have been introduced in the past, SB 205 authorizes countywide transportation planning agencies, including VTA, to place a measure before their voters to impose a vehicle registration surcharge to fund transportation-related projects and programs. Pursuant to the direction provided in the Board-adopted 2009 Legislative Program, VTA will be supporting this bill.

Prepared By: Kurt Evans
## State Assembly Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 112</strong></td>
<td>Makes several technical corrections to the enabling statutes of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to ensure that VTA has the appropriate statutory authority to work with local jurisdictions on developing funding strategies to address their local street and road maintenance and repair needs.</td>
<td>3/13/09</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Beall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 116</strong></td>
<td>Amends the enabling statutes of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to raise the dollar threshold for when VTA must use the formal competitive bidding process to procure materials, supplies and equipment from $25,000 to $100,000, consistent with federal guidelines. Also includes comparable provisions for: (a) the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans); (b) the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit); and (c) the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (Golden Gate Transit).</td>
<td>3/14/09</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Beall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 118</strong></td>
<td>Repeals the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Logue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 153</strong></td>
<td>Specifies that the California High-Speed Rail Authority constitutes a “governing body” for the purpose of adopting a resolution of necessity pursuant to an eminent domain proceeding. Allows the authority to employ its own legal staff or contract with other state agencies for legal services.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ma)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 177</strong></td>
<td>Enacts the Green Economy Inclusion Act of 2009. Declares the intent of the Legislature to enact a bill to ensure greater equity and inclusion of all Californians in the development and implementation of climate change, transportation, land-use, and economic stimulus policies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the state.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 231 (Huffman)</td>
<td>Requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt a schedule of fees to be paid by the sources of greenhouse gas emissions regulated pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 by March 30, 2010. Requires the fees established by CARB to be designed to allocate the costs of implementing the act based on the contribution of the source to statewide emissions of greenhouse gases, and to meet all of the following goals: (a) minimizing costs and maximizing total benefits to California, while achieving the statewide greenhouse gas emissions limits established in the act; (b) reducing disproportionate impacts on low-income communities; (c) providing incentives to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and (d) implementing any market-based compliance mechanisms adopted by CARB. Requires revenues collected pursuant to compliance mechanisms related to the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act to be deposited in the Climate Protection Trust Fund and to be made available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 266 (Carter)</td>
<td>Every five years, requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to develop an assessment of: (a) the unfunded costs of programmed state and federally earmarked transportation projects in California; and (b) available funding for transportation purposes and unmet transportation needs on a statewide basis. Requires the assessment to include recommendations on how the state and local transportation agencies may address the transportation funding shortfalls and unmet needs that are identified. Requires the results from the initial assessment to be submitted to the Legislature by March 1, 2011.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 277 (Ammiano)</td>
<td>Pursuant to the Bay Area County Traffic and Transportation Funding Act in existing law, deletes the option of specifying the membership of a county transportation authority that would administer a local sales tax in the retail transaction and use tax ordinance.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 338 (Ma)</td>
<td>Allows a local government to create an infrastructure financing district and thereby use tax increment financing to pay for public facilities and amenities within a transit village development district. Recasts the area for a transit village development plan to include all land within not more than a half mile of the main entrance of a public transit station. Requires a transit village development plan utilizing an infrastructure financing district to all of the following: (a) include an increase in the stock of affordable housing or live-travel options for transit-needy groups as one of its five demonstrable public benefits; (b) use at least 20 percent of all revenues derived from the infrastructure financing district to increase, improve and preserve the supply of low- and moderate-income affordable housing in the district for a period of at least 55 years for rental housing and 45 years for owner-occupied housing; and (c) replace dwelling units at an affordable housing cost when specified dwelling units are destroyed or removed. Eliminates the requirement for voter approval for the formation of an infrastructure financing district, adoption of an infrastructure financing district plan, and the issuance of bonds for implementing an infrastructure financing district plan.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 610</strong> (Caballero) Local Infrastructure: Public-Private Partnerships</td>
<td>Requires the Office of Planning and Research to advise and educate local agencies and other interested stakeholders about the role that public-private partnerships can play in planning, studying, designing, financing, constructing, operating, maintaining, or managing local infrastructure projects. Requires the assistance provided by the Office of Planning and Research to include the following: (a) developing and disseminating information that would help a local governmental agency determine whether a local infrastructure project would benefit from a public-private partnership that provides an alternative financing and procurement approach; and (b) serving as a clearinghouse of information regarding the use of public-private partnerships in infrastructure projects in California and elsewhere.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 619</strong> (Blumenfield) Federally Funded Transportation Projects</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans to notify the Legislature within 30 days of making a determination that a project will be delayed beyond its scheduled completion date due to state cashflow or other funding issues, if the delay places at risk federal funds, including money earmarked for the project.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 652</strong> (Skinner) Bike Racks on Buses</td>
<td>Provides that a folding device designed and used exclusively for transporting bicycles may not extend more than 40 inches, rather than 36 inches, from the front body of a public transit bus when fully deployed. Provides that the handlebars of a bicycle that is transported on a folding bike rack may not extend more than 46 inches, rather than 42 inches, from the front body of the public transit bus.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 726</strong> (Nielsen) Local Roadway Rehabilitation Projects</td>
<td>States that local roadway rehabilitation projects are eligible for funding under the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 729</strong> (Evans) Design-Build Contracting: Transit Projects</td>
<td>Makes permanent the statutory authority for public transit agencies to use design-build contracting for capital improvement projects.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 732</strong> (Jeffries) Design-Sequencing Contracts</td>
<td>Extends the authority for Caltrans to use the design-sequencing method of contracting for the design and construction of not more than 12 transportation projects from January 1, 2010, to January 1, 2012.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 744</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Torrico)&lt;br&gt;Bay Area HOT Lane Network</td>
<td>Authorizes the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) to develop and implement a high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane network on state highways within the geographic jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Declares the intent of the Legislature that: (a) the network be developed and implemented in a collaborative manner that includes the congestion management agencies (CMAs) in the Bay Area, Caltrans, the California Highway Patrol (CHP), and BATA; (b) the network utilize a corridor-based structure that recognizes commute sheds and geographic communities of interest as the most effective and user-responsive models for implementing HOT lane facilities; (c) revenues generated in a particular HOT lane corridor be reinvested to provide benefits to all travelers in that corridor; (d) corridor investment plans be developed by stakeholder agencies, and guide the use of revenues to capital and operating programs serving the corridor commensurate with the revenues generated by each corridor; (e) the network provide customers with a simple, consistent and efficient system that is easy to use; and (f) a collaborative process be used to determine the best financing mechanism for constructing the network, including the use of the state-owned toll bridge enterprise as a financing pledge.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 782</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Jeffries)&lt;br&gt;Sustainable Communities Strategies</td>
<td>Provides that upon the acceptance of the California Air Resources Board (CARB) that a sustainable communities strategy or alternative planning strategy, if implemented, will achieve the greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets established by CARB, that acceptance shall be final, and no person or entity may initiate a legal action to review the propriety of CARB’s acceptance. Provides that any local government agency participating in a sustainable communities strategy or alternative planning strategy that subsequently determines that a project proposed for approval within its jurisdiction is consistent with the applicable strategy, that project shall be deemed to be compliant with the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 and SB 375 of 2008, and no person or entity may initiate a legal action to review the propriety of the local government agency’s determination that the project is consistent with the strategy. Requires a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) preparing a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy to create a business advisory committee to provide input on the potential impacts of the proposed strategy on business activities and the economy. Exempts all projects funded through Proposition 1B transportation infrastructure bond revenues and the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, as well as projects listed in local transportation sales tax measures prior to December 31, 2010, from the consistent requirements with regard to sustainable communities strategies.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **AB 798**  
(Nava)  
California Transportation Financing Authority | Creates the California Transportation Financing Authority for the purpose of increasing the construction of new capacity or improvements for the state transportation system, in a manner that is consistent with and will help meet the state’s greenhouse gas reduction goals, air quality improvement goals, and natural resource conservation goals, through the issuance of bonds backed, in whole or in part, by various transportation revenue streams. Allows a project sponsor to apply to the authority for bond financing or refinancing of a transportation project that has been approved by Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Prior to issuing bonds for a project, requires the authority to determine that the revenues and other moneys available for that project will be sufficient to pay debt service on the bonds, and to operate and maintain the project over the life of the bonds. Allows the authority to authorize a project sponsor or Caltrans to collect tolls as one source of financing to pay debt service, and to operate and maintain a project under the following conditions: (a) the governing body of the project sponsor, by a majority vote, has approved the imposition of tolls on users of the project, or a majority of the voters within the jurisdiction of the project sponsor has approved a ballot measure imposing the tolls; (b) each highway project for which tolls are imposed must have non-tolled alternative lanes available for public use in the same corridor as the proposed toll project; (c) for highway projects, the road segment is on the state highway system; (d) the approval of the tolls must require that the tolls be set and maintained at a level expected to be sufficient to pay debt service, as well as the operation and maintenance of the project over the life of the bonds; (e) the project’s financial pro forma must incorporate life-cycle costs for the project, including revenues to pay for operation, maintenance and rehabilitation; (f) subject to any constraints in the bond documents necessary to make the bonds marketable, excess revenues from the operation of the project must be used exclusively in the corridor from which the revenues were generated to fund acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, or operation of high-occupancy vehicle facilities, other transportation purposes or transit service; and (g) except for purposes of implementing congestion management mechanisms, tolls may not be set to generate more revenue than the expected cost of paying debt service on the bonds, contracts entered into by the authority or project sponsor in connection with the bonds, funding reserves, operating and maintaining the project, repair and rehabilitation of the project, and providing transportation improvements in the corridor. Allows a project sponsor of a project imposing tolls to incorporate congestion management mechanisms to regulate usage and increase mobility, accessibility and environmental benefits. Provides that nothing in the bill shall allow for: (a) the conversion of any existing non-tolled or non-user-fee, mixed-flow lanes into tolled or user-fee lanes; or (b) the imposition of a toll on any local street or road. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk |
| **AB 878**  
(Caballero)  
Infrastructure Financing | Authorizes a local governmental agency to enter into an agreement with a private entity for financing for specified types of revenue-generating infrastructure projects. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk |
| **AB 949**  
(Logue)  
State-Local Partnership Program | Expands the definition of eligible local matching funds for purposes of the Proposition 1B State-Local Partnership Program to include: (a) developer fees; (b) mineral or resource extraction fees or taxes; and (c) local or regional fees or taxes solely dedicated to transportation improvements within a county or any part thereof by voter approval or by the county board of supervisors. | As Introduced | Assembly Desk |
<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 1072</strong> (Eng) Proposition 1B Transit Capital Program</td>
<td>For the remaining Proposition 1B transit capital funds to be appropriated by the Legislature, bases a public transit operator’s formula share on the operator’s average of State Transit Assistance Program (STA) allocations for FY 2005, FY 2006 and FY 2007. Requires a public transit operator to submit to Caltrans an expenditure plan for its remaining formula share of Proposition 1B transit capital funds, so that a statewide program of projects can be established for purposes of guiding annual appropriations for these funds.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td>Co-Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1414</strong> (Hill) STIP Process</td>
<td>Makes on-substantive changes to provisions in existing state law dealing with transportation planning and programming.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACA 9</strong> (Huffman) Local Governments: 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 any special tax if the tax is approved by its electorate by a 55 percent majority. Also allows a local agency to incur indebtedness in the form of general obligation bonds to fund: (a) the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure improvements and public safety agency facilities; (b) the development of affordable housing; and (c) the acquisition or lease of real estate for public infrastructure improvements, public safety agency facilities and affordable housing, if the bond issuance is approved by its electorate by a 55 percent majority.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACA 15</strong> (Arambula) Local Governments: Transportation 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 local transportation projects if the tax is approved by its electorate by a 55 percent majority.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACR 14</strong> (Niello) Global Warming Solutions Act: Economic Analysis</td>
<td>Prior to any regulatory action being taken consistent with the scoping plan for the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to perform an economic analysis that would give the state a more complete and accurate picture of the costs and benefits of the act’s implementation. Calls upon the governor to use the authority granted by the act to adjust any applicable deadlines for regulations.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## State Senate Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senate Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 10</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Leno)&lt;br&gt;Local Vehicle Assessment</td>
<td>Authorizes counties and San Francisco to impose a voter-approved local vehicle assessment at a rate not to exceed 2 percent of the market value of each motor vehicle or trailer coach registered within their respective jurisdictions for general revenue purposes if: (a) the board of supervisors approves an ordinance to that effect by a two-thirds vote; and (b) the assessment is approved by a majority vote of the electorate.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 31</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Pavley)&lt;br&gt;Global Warming Solutions Act: Compliance Revenues</td>
<td>Requires revenues collected pursuant to compliance mechanisms related to the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 that are adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to be deposited in the Air Pollution Control Fund. Allows these revenues to be used for: (a) renewable energy and energy efficiency programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, particularly those programs focusing on low-income consumers; (b) investments in technologies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, especially technologies that provide pollution reduction co-benefits; and (c) green jobs development and training that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 104</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Oropeza)&lt;br&gt;Global Warming Solutions Act: Definition of Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td>Includes nitrogen trifluoride in the definition of “greenhouse gases” under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. For purposes of implementing the act, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to designate as a greenhouse gas any anthropogenic gas one metric ton of which makes the same or greater contribution to global warming as one metric ton of carbon dioxide. For anthropogenic gases that are designated as a greenhouse gas, requires CARB to adopt regulations, including emissions limits and emissions reduction measures.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 128</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Padilla)&lt;br&gt;California Climate Change Institute</td>
<td>Declares the intent of the Legislature to enact a bill to create the California Climate Change Institute to: (a) identify and support climate change research and education to be undertaken at academic and research institutions and laboratories throughout the state; (b) oversee, coordinate and manage a non-duplicative, targeted research and development program for the purposes of achieving the state’s targets for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and mitigating the effects of those emissions; (c) develop effective model education pathways, training, model curriculum, and professional development necessary for emerging green technologies and industries; and (d) ensure that its climate change research is conducted in a manner that is targeted and non-duplicative of other research programs.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 165</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Lowenthal)&lt;br&gt;Federal Economic Stimulus Bill</td>
<td>Specifies that the investment of federal economic stimulus funds for transportation in California should be guided by both of the following principles: (1) investment in transportation projects should stimulate job creation in the near term and support economic activity in the long term; and (2) transportation projects funded with federal economic stimulus money should contribute to a transportation system that is environmentally sustainable, allowing for mobility of people and goods in the cleanest and most efficient manner possible.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 205 (Hancock) Vehicle Registration Surcharges</td>
<td>Authorizes a countywide transportation planning agency to place a measure before its voters to impose an annual surcharge of up to $10 on each motor vehicle registered within its county to fund transportation-related programs and projects. Provides that the ballot measure must be approved by a simple majority vote of the county’s electorate before such a surcharge could be imposed. Requires the governing board of the countywide transportation planning agency to: (a) adopt a resolution by a majority vote to put the surcharge on the ballot; (b) make a finding of fact by a majority vote that the programs and projects to be funded with surcharge revenues have a relationship or benefit to the persons who will be paying the surcharge; and (c) adopt an expenditure plan programming the surcharge revenues to transportation-related programs and projects that have a relationship or benefit to the persons paying the surcharge. Specifies that the programs and projects included in the expenditure plan may serve the following purposes: (a) providing matching dollars for funding made available for transportation programs and projects from state general obligation bonds; (b) creating or sustaining congestion mitigation programs and projects; and (c) creating or sustaining pollution mitigation programs and projects. If requested by a countywide transportation planning agency, requires the Department of Motor Vehicles to collect the surcharge approved by the voters upon the registration or renewal of registration of any motor vehicle in the applicable county, except for those vehicles that are expressly exempt from the payment of registration fees. Requires the countywide transportation planning agency to pay for the initial set-up and programming costs identified by the Department of Motor Vehicles through a direct contract with the department. Allows the countywide transportation planning agency to be reimbursed for these costs through the initial revenues generated by the surcharge.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 391 (Liu) California Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans to update the California Transportation Plan every five years. Requires the plan to address how the state would achieve maximum feasible emissions reductions in order to attain a statewide reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. Requires the plan to identify the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system needed to achieve these results. Requires the plan to consider all of the following subject areas with regard to the movement of people and freight: (a) mobility and accessibility; (b) integration and connectivity; (c) efficient system management and operation; (d) existing system preservation; (e) safety and security; (f) economic development, including productivity and efficiency; and (g) environmental protection and quality of life.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 485 (Wright) SHOPP Funding</td>
<td>Enacts the State Highway Operation and Protection Program Emergency Funding Act. States the intent of the Legislature to provide adequate funding to meet the needs of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) in FY 2010.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 3 (Wyland) Proposition 42 Suspensions</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to eliminate the ability of the Governor and the Legislature to suspend the transfer of gasoline sales tax revenues pursuant to Proposition 42 from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF). Prohibits the loaning of TIF revenues under any circumstances. Prohibits the enactment of a statute that would reduce the extent to which gasoline sales tax revenues are deposited into the General Fund for transfer to the TIF for transportation purposes.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Revenue and Taxation 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 5</strong> <em>(Hancock)</em></td>
<td>State Budget</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to allow for General Fund appropriations in the state budget bill to be enacted by the Legislature with a majority vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCA 10</strong> <em>(Ducheny)</em></td>
<td>Constitutional Amendments</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Elections, Reapportionment and Constitutional Amendments Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution regarding statewide initiative measures. Specifically, requires the Secretary of State’s Office to transmit a copy of an initiative measure certified for the ballot that would amend the constitution to both the Senate and Assembly no later than 176 days prior to the election at which the measure is to be considered by the electorate. Within 30 days, allows the Legislature to propose an amended form of the initiative measure by adopting a concurrent resolution. If the sponsors of the initiative measure accept the proposed amendments, requires the Legislature’s proposal to appear on the ballot in place of the certified initiative measure. If the amended form proposed by the Legislature is not accepted, requires information regarding the proposed amended form to be included in the ballot materials related to the initiative measure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2008 take effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Budget must be submitted by the Governor to the Legislature on or before this date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Last day to submit bill requests to the Legislative Counsel’s Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Last day for bills to be introduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring Recess begins upon adjournment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Spring Recess.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Last day for bills to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budget must be passed by midnight.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JULY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report bills introduced in the other house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</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>17</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Summer Recess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in the other house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JANUARY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADMINISTRATION & FINANCE COMMITTEE
Thursday, April 16, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER
The Regular Meeting of the Administration and Finance Committee (A&F) was called to order at 12:07 p.m. by Vice Chairperson Gage in Room B-104, VTA River Oaks Campus, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Casas</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gage</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Kniss</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Reed</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Campos</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shirakawa</td>
<td>Alternate Board 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
There were no Public Presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY
Vice Chairperson Gage noted a request to move the following Agenda Item from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda: Agenda Item #8. Monthly Investment Report – February 2009.

M/S/C (Casas/Reed) to accept the Orders of the Day.

4. RECESSED TO CLOSED SESSION at 12:09 p.m.

A. Conference with Labor Negotiators

[Government Code Section 54957.6]

VTA Designated Representatives:
Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer
Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
Robert L. Escobar, Human Resources Manager

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Employee Organizations:
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265
Service Employees International Union, (SEIU), Local 521
Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA), Local 21

Board Member Reed arrived at the meeting and entered Closed Session at 12:10 p.m., and a quorum was declared.

RECONVENED TO OPEN SESSION at 12:34 p.m.

5. CLOSED SESSION REPORT
   A. Conference with Labor Negotiators
      [Government Code Section 54957.6]
      VTA Designated Representatives:
      Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer
      Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
      Robert L. Escobar, Human Resources Manager
      Employee Organizations:
      American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
      Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265
      Service Employees International Union, (SEIU), Local 521
      Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA), Local 21
      There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.

CONSENT AGENDA

6. Regular Meeting Minutes of March 19, 2009
   M/S/C (Casas/Reed) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of March 19, 2009.

7. Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Appointment
   M/S/C (Casas/Reed) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to ratify the appointments to the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) of Richard Ruh as the City of Monte Sereno representative and Paul Goldstein as the alternate representative of the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition.

8. (Removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.)
   Review the Report on Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Investments for the month of February 2009.

9. Monthly Legislative History Matrix
   M/S/C (Casas/Reed) to review the Monthly Legislative History Matrix.
10. **Authorization for Annual Operations Insurance Program Renewal**

M/S/C (Casas/Reed) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to authorize the General Manager to purchase insurance coverage for Fiscal Year 2009/2010 for Excess Liability, General and Auto Liability, Public Officials Errors and Omissions Liability, Property/Boiler and Machinery, Inland Marine for Buses, Vans and Mobile Equipment, Inland Marine for Light Rail Vehicles, and Flood Exposures for the Annual Operations Program Insurance Renewal for an amount not to exceed $2,118,693.

*The Agenda was taken out of order.*

**REGULAR AGENDA**

8. **Monthly Investment Report - February 2009**

Tammy Dhanota, Chief Steward of Services Employees International Union (SEIU), Local 521, referenced the bargaining units meeting related to FY 2010 and FY 2011 Recommended Budget with Michael T. Burns, General Manager, reflected a decline in sales tax revenues. Ms. Dhanota queried about the sales tax revenues discrepancy reported at the bargaining units meeting and the information included in the Monthly Investment Report related to General Market Conditions, where it states, “retail sales unexpectedly rose 1 percent after six months of decline.”

Joe Smith, Chief Financial Officer, responded the information is based on sales tax activity, which occurred in FY 2008 and FY 2009, noting VTA has not received the data regarding third quarter sales tax revenues at this time.

Kim Koenig, Fiscal Resources Manager, stated the retail sales information is included in the National Economic Indicators Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and not necessarily reflected in what occurs within Santa Clara County.

M/S/C (Reed/Casas) to review the Report on Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Investments for the month of February 2009.

11. **VTA Governance Update**

Jim Lawson, Senior Policy Advisor, reported on the Hay Group Organization and Financial Assessment recommendation in the area of governance, which identified Board Member turnover as a critical challenge to VTA’s Governance Structure. Mr. Lawson reported the turnover is particularly high for the small city groupings.

Mr. Lawson stated the Hay Group Assessment recommended the Board of Directors examine alternatives to lengthen member’s office term and to work with appointing authorities to ensure members are eligible to serve on the Board and include appropriate qualifications.

At the May 1, 2008 Board of Directors Regular Meeting, the Board approved the following recommendations: Eliminate the concept of city groups selecting their representatives through a rotation process and instead each of the city groupings will select their representative to serve on the Board; Directors will serve two-year terms but appointing authorities are encouraged to reappoint representatives to serve consecutive
Mr. Lawson noted the A&F Committee Meeting on October 16, 2008, where staff was directed to work with the cities on the governance changes and to provide a progress report back to the Committee. Staff has met with the small city groupings to present updates on VTA’s Governance issue and recommended they develop a methodology to select their representatives for appointment to serve on VTA’s Board in January 2010.

Mr. Lawson commented on Group 3 (Campbell, Cupertino, Town of Los Gatos, Monte Sereno, and Saratoga), which consists of one Member and one Alternate Member, the group agreed to continue their current policy to appoint a representative at their Mayor and Managers meeting with each city having an equal voice in the process.

Group 2 (Los Altos, Town of Los Altos Hills, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Santa Clara and Sunnyvale), which consists of three Members and one Alternate Member, the cities are currently in the process of seeking approval by their respective city councils appoint representatives by population weighted rank order vote.

Group 4 (Gilroy, Milpitas, and Morgan Hill), which consists of one Member and one Alternate Member, the group is attempting to develop a methodology to accommodate the significant regional differences within the grouping.

Mr. Lawson stated staff will continue to work with Groups 2 and 4 and provide an update report at the September 17, 2009 A&F Committee Meeting.

Vice Chairperson Gage suggested staff work to formulate a recommendation to be presented to the A&F Committee then forward to the Board of Directors for discussion and consideration.

On order of Vice Chairperson Gage and there being no objection, the Committee received the VTA Governance Update.

12. **Bill Position: AB 798 (Nava)**

Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager, reported Assembly Bill (AB) 798 (Nava) creates the California Transportation Financing Authority (CTFA) to assist local and regional agencies in obtaining financing through the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of improvements to the State’s Transportation Infrastructure.

Mr. Evans stated AB 798 (Nava) is identical to AB 3021 (Nava) from 2008, which was approved by the Legislature but vetoed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. VTA Board of Directors supported AB 3021 (Nava) in 2008 and staff recommends the Board support AB 798 (Nava).

**M/S/C (Reed/Casas)** to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 798 (Nava), which creates the California Transportation Financing Authority to assist local and regional agencies in obtaining financing through the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of improvements to the State’s transportation infrastructure. This bill also allows the authority to permit local and regional agencies, as part of the financing plan for their projects, to impose tolls for the use of the facilities constructed.
13. **Bill Position: AB 338 (Ma)**

Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager, reported Assembly Bill (AB) 338 (Ma) allows local officials to divert property tax increment revenues to pay for new bonds for infrastructure within transit village development districts. Mr. Evans stated AB 338 (Ma) allows cities and counties to capture the fiscal benefits of new construction inside transit villages by connecting property tax increment financing for transit village development.

Mr. Evans reported the intention of AB 338 (Ma) is to remove a major roadblock to Transit Oriented Development (TOD) by encouraging cities and counties to combine transit village planning with property tax increment financing without having to setup redevelopment project areas.

Vice Chairperson Gage queried if the assembly bill could include certain development standards where planned TOD densities could not be reduced later. Mr. Evans responded staff would forward the information to the author of the bill for consideration.

**M/S/C (Reed/Casas)** to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 338 (Ma), which allows local officials to divert property tax increment revenues to pay for new bonds for infrastructure within transit village development districts.

**OTHER ITEMS**

14. **Peer Performance – VTA/ATU Pension Investments**

Kimberly Koenig, Fiscal Resources Manager, referenced Board Member Reed’s request for investment performance information on VTA’s peers, noting the information focuses on VTA/Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Pension Plan.

Ms. Koenig stated the comparison should be compared to funds with the same asset allocation, plan duration, and benefit structure. Staff working collaboratively with Mercer Investment Consulting, Inc., VTA’s investment services consultant, was able to obtain investment performance data for nine plans of similar size, asset allocation mix, and plan duration. The nine plans consist of the following: Regional Transportation Authority located in Illinois and eight other plans that elected not to have their names identified.

Ms. Koenig reported VTA/ATU Pension Plan has exceeded its Policy Index and performance of similar plans for all the time periods considered. VTA/ATU Pension Plan investment performance was above the middle for all public funds with less than $1 billion of assets in the Russell/Mellon Trust Universe®.

VTA forwarded a survey to the forty members of the California Association of Public Retirement Systems (CALAPRS) requesting current and historical investment performance data. CALAPRS members consist of statewide systems, counties, cities, and special districts, including a few transit agencies. Ms. Koenig reported eight out of the eleven agencies provided investment performance by calendar year, noting VTA/ATU Pension Plan outperformed the eight agencies during the last quarter of 2008.
Board Member Reed noted the importance for VTA to have the right asset allocation mix. Board Member Reed expressed appreciation to staff for the investment performance information, noting VTA has outperformed its peers.

Board Member Reed asked when VTA’s contribution rates will be reviewed and if the information will be factored into FY 2010 and FY 2011 projections. Ms. Koenig responded the losses and gains experienced in the VTA/ATU Pension Plan are not recognized in the same year since they are amortized over a longer period of time.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Peer Performance - VTA/ATU Pension Investments.

15. **Items of Concern and Referral to Administration**

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

16. **Committee Work Plan**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Committee Work Plan.

17. **Committee Staff Report**

**Discussion regarding the Fiscal Year 2010 and Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Preparation**

Joe Smith, Chief Financial Officer, provided a brief overview of the FY 2010 and FY 2011 Budget Preparation Process. Mr. Smith stated VTA has significant decreases in anticipated revenues, noting the State budget has eliminated all operating assistance funding, which VTA receives from the State Transportation Assistance (STA) Program. Mr. Smith stated VTA’s intent is to preserve its service plan as well as job positions. The financial challenges facing VTA’s budget is related to revenues and funding resources. VTA will have a deficit of $28.4 million in FY 2010 and $49.7 million in FY 2011.

Mr. Smith commented on VTA’s strategies to offset revenue reductions in development of Preliminary Projections: maximize the use of Federal Preventive Maintenance Funds; maintain current vacancy rates; reduction in Travel; reduction in Outside Repair Services; reduction in Materials and Supplies; reduction in Professional Services; reduction in Security Contract; reduction in Telephone and Communications; reduction in Advertising and Printing; reduction in Office Supplies; and reduction in Paratransit Contract.

Mr. Smith commented on the following strategies to offset revenue reductions and minimize VTA’s projected deficit: fare increases; labor savings; service modifications; align Paratransit Service coverage with Fixed Route Service; departmental non-labor savings; no increases in VTA’s share from FY 2009 Caltrain Contribution and Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) Contribution; and reductions in light rail shuttles.

Mr. Smith commented on the following labor saving strategies: wage freeze and cuts; work furloughs; employee contribution to pension plan; employee contribution to retiree medical; and an increase in employee contribution to health care.

Mr. Smith stated staff is currently working on VTA’s budget preparation process and provided an update to the bargaining units on April 14, 2009 as well as to the Advisory
Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs on April 15, 2009. VTA will conduct Employee Forums and present the information on April 17 through April 23, 2009. VTA’s budget update will be presented at the April 24, 2009 Board of Directors Workshop Meeting. VTA’s recommended budget is scheduled for review at community meetings and VTA’s Advisory Committee Meetings in May 2009. VTA’s final recommended budget will be presented at the May 21, 2009 Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee then will be forwarded for consideration at the June 4, 2009 Board of Directors Regular Meeting.

Board Member Casas expressed concern regarding the proposal to align Paratransit Service coverage with Fixed Route Service. Board Member Casas queried if the proposed fare increase could be increased by 20 percent to offset the proposed changes to the Paratransit Service coverage. Board Member Casas stressed the importance to be considerate of the senior/disabled individuals who utilize Paratransit Service and do our due diligence to not negatively affect the level and depth of their lives.

18. Chairperson’s Report

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

19. Determine Consent Agenda for the May 7, 2009 Board Meeting

CONSENT: Agenda Item #7, Ratify the appointments to the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) of Richard Ruh as the City of Monte Sereno representative and Paul Goldstein as the alternate representative of the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition;

Agenda Item #10, Authorize the General Manager to purchase insurance coverage for Fiscal Year 2009/2010 for Excess Liability, General and Auto Liability, Public Officials Errors and Omissions Liability, Property/Boiler and Machinery, Inland Marine for Buses, Vans and Mobile Equipment, Inland Marine for Light Rail Vehicles, and Flood Exposures for the Annual Operations Program Insurance Renewal for an amount not to exceed $2,118,693;

Agenda Item #12, Recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 798 (Nava), which creates the California Transportation Financing Authority to assist local and regional agencies in obtaining financing through the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of improvements to the State’s transportation infrastructure. This bill also allows the authority to permit local and regional agencies, as part of the financing plan for their projects, to impose tolls for the use of the facilities constructed; and

Agenda Item #13, Recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 338 (Ma), which allows local officials to divert property tax increment revenues to pay for new bonds for infrastructure within transit village development districts.

REGULAR: None

20. Announcements

Board Member Reed referenced a letter dated March 10, 2009 from Assembly Member Jim Beall Jr. regarding the creation of an advisory committee related to the development of the San Jose Diridon Station and High Speed Rail (HSR) Project.
21. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Vice Chairperson Gage and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 1:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle M. Garza, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP) was called to order at 10:02 a.m. by Chairperson Liccardo in Conference Room B-104, Valley Transportation Authority, River Oaks Campus, 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>Rose Herrera</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pyle</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoriko Kishimoto</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Campos</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>N/A</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

An addendum to the agenda was added:

4.1 CLOSED SESSION

Conference with Labor Negotiators

4.2 CLOSED SESSION REPORT

M/S/C (Pyle/Herrera) to approve the Orders of the Day.

4. RECESSED TO CLOSED SESSION at 10:03 a.m.

Conference with Real Property Negotiators

[Government Code Section 54956.8]

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Property: 10,616 parcel owned by VTA at the intersection of North First and St. James Streets in downtown San José, CA

Negotiators for VTA: Bijal Patel, Deputy Director, Property Development & Management
Negotiators for Santa Clara County Courthouse: Judge Loftus

Under negotiation: Price and terms of payment for sale of Property

4.1 CLOSED SESSION

Conference with Labor Negotiators

[Government Code Section 54957.6]

VTA Designated Representatives:

Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer
Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
Robert L. Escobar, Human Resources Manager

Employee Organizations:

American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265
Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Local 521
Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA), Local 21

RECONVENED TO OPEN SESSION at 10:45 a.m.

4.2 CLOSED SESSION REPORT

There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.

CONSENT AGENDA

5. Minutes of March 19, 2009

M/S/C (Kishimoto/Pyle) to approve the Minutes of March 19, 2009.

REGULAR AGENDA

6. (Deferred to the May 21, 2009, CMPP Meeting)

Adopt the 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program Project List as shown in Attachment A.
John Ristow, Chief Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Officer and Staff Liaison, stated the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) deferred this item to its May 14, 2009, meeting due to priority changes and format revisions required by four cities and the County. He recommended CMPP defer this item until its May 21, 2009, meeting.

Member Herrera noted a City of San José project was missing from the list and requested this item be deferred.

Chris Augenstein, Deputy Director, Planning, provided a PowerPoint Presentation on the VTA Bike Program & 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) highlighting:

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto noted great progress had been made and expressed her enthusiasm for the completed projects.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto questioned regarding project development funding. Mr. Ristow stated the $160 Million is an estimate over a 25-year period. He noted VTA and MTC will be working to increase bicycle project funding over the next four-year period.

Member Herrera expressed enthusiasm for what she deemed a very exciting Bicycle Program. She confirmed with staff the Thompson Creek Trail Project has been included on the final list of projects submitted.

Member Pyle expressed her appreciation for a well written report. She congratulated staff, noting the City of San José was recently chosen as one of the most walkable cities in the United States.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto questioned a bike-friendly designation for the County. Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, stated an application was in process and would be submitted for the year 2010.

Chairperson Liccardo questioned the Bike Share Program. Mr. Augenstein stated a capital project has not been established for the bike share program. He noted a pilot program study is underway.

Chairperson Liccardo questioned the project scoring. Mr. Augenstein noted projects currently underway will not be rescored.

Chairperson Liccardo praised staff for the high-quality work on completed projects.
On order of Chairperson Liccardo and there being no objection, the Committee deferred this item to the May 21, 2009, CMPP meeting.

7. **CMP Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines Update**

George Naylor, Principal Transportation Planner, provided an update on the CMP Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines.

Mr. Naylor reported the updated guidelines have been reviewed by the Systems Operations and Management (SOM) Working Group of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).

**M/S/C (Herrera/Pyle)** to adopt the updated Congestion Management Program - Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines.

8. **HOT Network Legislative Framework**

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, reported on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC’s) sponsored legislation, AB 744 (Torrico), to establish authority for the 800-mile Bay Area Regional Express Lane Network.

Member Herrera noted the final bill language had not been included in the memo. Mr. Ristow stated the recently received language was under review by staff.

Kevin Allmand, General Counsel, stated he reviewed the AB 744 language and noted revisions will be necessary to ensure net corridor revenue is returned to the corridor.

Mr. Ristow reported gross revenues will be applied to construction and conversion of existing HOVs. He stated VTA and other CMAs should have the authority to direct gross revenue fund distribution.

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, noted one of the main tenets of the regional concept, and the CMAs use of the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) as the primary agency, is BATA would take a large percentage of the risk by issuing the bonds for construction of the HOT Lanes for this regional network.

Chairperson Liccardo questioned regarding BATA issuing bonds rather than VTA. Mr. Ristow stated one benefit of a regional or enterprise system is their ability to include all of the corridors in a better financing structure using existing, unallocated bridge toll revenues as a backing to get lower bond rates. He noted bridge tolls already pledged to bonds, for bridges under construction, cannot be used.

Mr. Burns noted: 1) Capital is required to build the HOT Lanes; 2) Debt issued will be secured by the revenues the HOT Lanes will generate; and 3) BATA has an additional source of security in the unallocated bridge tolls allowing them access to a lower bond rate.

Member Pyle expressed concern with regard to enforcement of HOT Lanes. She noted solo drivers are taking advantage of the current system. Mr. Ristow reported enforcement will be managed through a combination of manual enforcement, with an increased CHP presence, and rapidly-advancing technology.
Members Herrera and Liccardo questioned regarding increasing VTA’s number of seats on the MTC Board, noting the percentage of revenue contributed should correlate with the level of Board representation.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto questioned regarding future forecasted revenues. Mr. Ristow stated VTA has suggested MTC align VTA’s $2.1 Billion in forecasted Express Lane System revenues against the Measure A Program. He noted as corridors develop, and actual revenue is generated, the VTA Board should have the ability to direct which projects will benefit.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto questioned regarding Corridor Investment Plan (CIP) approval. Mr. Ristow stated a 10-20 year CIP would be: 1) developed/coordinated with any existing corridor partner; 2) adopted by the Board; and 3) sent to BATA.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto stated her support for this plan is contingent on the inclusion of clean air goals within the network operating standards.

Chairperson Liccardo expressed concern over long-range capital needs and bond obligations. He noted under AB 2032 Santa Clara County has authority to operate in two corridors: 1) 85/101 and 2) 237 Express Connector. He then noted the importance of ensuring VTA has the ability to direct fund disbursement.

The CMPP requested staff include specific language within the motion to: 1) Provide further explanation of the enterprise financing concept provided through Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA); 2) Include clean air goals, which meets State adopted emission requirements, as one of the objectives of the Express Lane Program; 3) Ensure the role of Congestion Management Agency (VTA) includes authority to develop and approve corridor implementation and corridor investment plans; and 4) Describe Santa Clara County representation options for the Regional Express Lane Program.

M/S/C (Herrera/Pyle) to endorse the Regional High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Network legislative framework for AB 744 (Torricco) as proposed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and as amended by the staff recommendation described in the memorandum with specific language added to: 1) Provide further explanation of the enterprise financing concept provided through Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA); 2) Include clean air goals, which meets State adopted emission requirements, as one of the objectives of the Express Lane Program; 3) Ensure the role of Congestion Management Agency (VTA) includes authority to develop and approve corridor implementation and corridor investment plans; and 4) Describe Santa Clara County representation options for the Regional Express Lane Program.

9. **SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors - Amendment to Design Contract**

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, defined the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors as the implementation stage of the Express Lane Program approved by the Board at its December 11, 2008, meeting.

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, noted staff would undertake preliminary work related to preparation of a benefit/cost analysis prior to finalizing on the implementation of the project.
M/S/C (Pyle/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to amend the contract with Parsons Brinkerhoff for design services for the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project through final design and implementation. The amendment will increase the approved contract by $1,715,315 for a revised contract value not to exceed $2,000,000.

OTHER

10. **Regional Transit-Oriented Bike Share Pilot Program Update**

On order of Chairperson Liccardo and there being no objection, the Committee received the Bike Sharing Pilot Program Update.

11. **Review Draft CMP Work Program**

On order of Chairperson Liccardo and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the draft Fiscal Year 2010 Congestion Management Work Program.

12. **Items of Concern and Referral to Administration**

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

13. **Committee Work Plan**

On order of Chairperson Liccardo and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Committee Work Plan.

14. **Committee Staff Report**

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, reported: 1) Borregas Avenue Bicycle Bridge Grand Opening Ceremony is scheduled for April 22, 2009, at 10:30 a.m. in Cupertino; 2) Mary Avenue Bicycle Footbridge Grand Opening Ceremony is scheduled for April 30, 2009, at 3:00 p.m. in Cupertino; 3) A VTA Board Workshop is scheduled for April 24, 2009, to discuss FY10 and FY11 Budget; 4) High Speed Rail Authority’s environmental scoping periods closed for both the San Jose-Merced and San Jose-San Francisco segments on April 6, 2009, with stakeholder coordination meetings scheduled beginning May 2009; 5) On April 22, 2009, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is scheduled to approve programming the second round of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding resulting in an additional $5 Million for Santa Clara County Cities/County local streets projects and $6 Million for the SR237/I-880 Express Connector Project; 6) MTC is scheduled to consider approval of the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan - Transportation 2035 on April 22, 2009; 7) VTA will be the host agency for the California Transportation Commission’s July 8-9, 2009, meeting at San José City Hall; 8) Community Design and Transportation (CDT) Capital Grants release will be in Summer 2009, with projects due in Fall 2009; and 9) Lifeline Transportation Program Second Cycle Release, in Spring 2009, is due May 4, 2009.

15. **Chairperson’s Report**

There was no Chairperson’s Report.
16. **Determine Consent Agenda for May 7, 2009, Board of Directors Meeting**

**CONSENT:**

*Agenda Item #7,* Adopt the updated Congestion Management Program - Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines.

*Agenda Item #9,* Authorize the General Manager to amend the contract with Parsons Brinkerhoff for design services for the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project through final design and implementation. The amendment will increase the approved contract by $1,715,315 for a revised contract value not to exceed $2,000,000.

**REGULAR:**

*Agenda Item #8,* Endorse the Regional High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Network legislative framework for AB 744 (Torrico) as proposed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and as amended by the staff recommendation described in the memorandum with specific language added to: 1) Provide further explanation of the enterprise financing concept provided through Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA); 2) Include clean air goals, which meets State adopted emission requirements, as one of the objectives of the Express Lane Program; 3) Ensure that the role of Congestion Management Agency (VTA) includes authority to develop and approve corridor implementation and corridor investment plans; and 4) Describe Santa Clara County representation options for the Regional Express Lane Program.

17. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Announcements.

18. **ADJOURNMENT**

*On order of Chairperson Liccardo* and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 12:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Garcia, Board Assistant  
VTA Board of Directors
Transit Planning & Operations Committee

Thursday, April 16, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee was called to order at 4:34 p.m. by Chairperson Sellers 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>Dominic Caserta</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Kalra</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Sandoval</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sellers</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Campos</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Livengood</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

There were no Public Presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Michael T. Burns, General Manager requested the Closed Session item be continued until a quorum was established.

On Order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole accepted the Orders of the Day.

REGULAR AGENDA

The Agenda was taken Out of Order.
5. **Report from the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Meeting**

Jim Unites, CTA Staff Liaison, provided a report from the April CTA Meeting highlighting the following:

- The Committee adopted a provisional draft Mission Statement which included adding the wording, “seniors and economically disadvantaged” and made a secondary motion to recommend a name change to the Committee for Transportation Accessibility.

- The Committee reviewed a variety of items from the Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee and will continue to be involved with that process.

- Chairperson Morrow made a motion to discontinue the Mobility Options Task Force and talked to staff about developing a Committee workshop in June to address the issue.

- Chairperson Morrow met with Dan Smith, Chief Operating Officer, and Michael T. Burns, General Manager, to discuss ongoing process issues and communication with staff.

Chairperson Sellers indicated he met with Mr. Morrow regarding the committee and their role, and at the request of Mr. Morrow, will be forwarding a letter summarizing their discussion. He indicated his agreement with Mr. Morrow that matters pertaining to the economically disadvantaged were important, but conveyed his belief that it is outside the purview of the CTA.

Member Sandoval took her seat at 4:38 pm and a quorum was declared.

**On Order of Chairperson Sellers** and there being no objection, the report from the Committee for Transit Accessibility was received.

### 3.1 Recessed to Closed Session at 4:40 pm.

**A. Conference with Labor Negotiators**

[Government Code Section 54957.6]

VTA Designated Representatives:

- Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer
- Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
- Robert L. Escobar, Human Resources Manager

Employee Organizations:

- American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
- Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265
- Service Employees International Union, (SEIU), Local 521
- Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA), Local 21

Reconvened to Open Session at 5:00 pm.

### 3.2 Closed Session Report

There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.
CONSENT AGENDA

4. Minutes of March 19, 2009

M/S/C (Sandoval/Kalra) to approve the Minutes of March 19, 2009.

REGULAR AGENDA (continued)

6. 2009 VTA Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan

Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a brief update on the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan. On advice obtained from the advisory committees, outreach was made to other groups and cities for input on the study. He indicated feedback was received that ranged from enthusiasm to trepidation, which was expected.

Member Kalra questioned outreach conducted in the Alum Rock Corridor indicating concerns were expressed by vendors regarding the loss of parking and the impacts construction would have on business. Mr. Connolly indicated the parking issue has been addressed and parking in the corridor will only be lost on one side of the street. He noted detailed designs need to be implemented before many of the questions regarding construction and scheduling can be answered.

Member Kalra requested there be an outline added to future presentations signifying outreach performed and future outreach planned.

M/S/C (Kalra/Sandoval) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to adopt the 2009 VTA Bus rapid transit (BRT) Strategic Plan.

7. Laser Intrusion Detection System

Mark Robinson, Chief Construction Officer, provided a brief presentation on the Laser Intrusion Detection System to be installed at the Tasman East Elevated Guideway. The sensors will allow the system to detect an intrusion onto the light rail structure to aid in the prevention of pedestrian/automobile conflicts. Mr. Robinson indicated there were two bids received for the contract and Siemens Building Technology, Inc. was the lowest responsible bidder. He indicated the federal grant requires equipment be assembled and fabricated in the Unites States, but there are no American suppliers or manufacturers of the laser equipment. The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has been notified and a request submitted to waive the requirement. He noted approval is expected to be granted before the May Board meeting.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY
M/S/C (Kalra/Sandoval) to submit a recommendation to the Board of Directors to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Siemens Building Technology, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $307,096 for the Laser Intrusion Detection System at Light Rail Stations, pending approval by FTA for a waiver to the Buy America requirements. This contract is 100% funded by a combination of Federal Transit Security, Federal Department of Homeland Security and State Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

8. **Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) Phase 1, 2, and 3 Project**

Mark Robinson, Chief Construction Officer, provided a brief update on the Closed Circuit Television project, which will add cameras at seven light rail stations. The bidding was competitive with seven bidders and the lowest responsible being Cupertino Electric.

M/S/C (Kalra/Sandoval) to approve a recommendation to the Board of Directors to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Cupertino Electric, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $524,920 for the Closed Circuit Television Phase 1, 2 and 3 Project. This contract is 100% funded by a combination of Federal Transit Security, Federal Department of Homeland Security and State Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

9. **Low –Floor Diesel Electric Hybrid Buses**

Michael Hursh, Deputy Director for Maintenance and Security, provided information on VTA’s preparation to purchase up to 107 low-floor diesel electric hybrid 40-foot buses, using a combination of stimulus funds and Proposition 1B funds. He indicated the process needs to move forward quickly to secure the funds, and approval is needed to use a competitive negotiating process instead of a competitive bid process to get the best price, the most reliable power plant, most accessible bus possible, and the highest reliability. He indicated this process was used to purchase both the articulated buses and the light rail vehicles.

Chairperson Sellers questioned if the item will come back to the Board at the end of the process. Mr. Hursh indicated it will be presented several times during the process and ultimately to the Board for approval of the purchase of the buses.

Member Sandoval questioned if other transit agencies receiving federal stimulus funds are looking at purchasing the buses as well and queried if it is wise to have several organizations interviewed together for a better competitive price.

Mr. Hursh indicated the difficulty of agencies trying to purchase vehicles together because of different needs. He noted there is significant interest in purchasing the buses in the State of California to meet the California Air Resources Board (CARB) deadline for zero emission buses.

Chairperson Sandoval questioned the cost of the buses from contract to delivery. Mr. Hursh indicated the range is $500 to $800 thousand per bus depending on features. VTA
is looking to obtain the hybrid bus that provides the most accessibility and cleanest emissions.

M/S/C (Sandoval/Kalra) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to adopt a resolution upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Directors finding the conditions are not appropriate for a competitive bid process and use of competitive negotiation for the purchase of up to 107 low-floor diesel electric hybrid 40-foot buses is adequate to meet VTA’s needs, as required by Public Contract Code Sections 20216 and 20217.

10. **Light Rail System Analysis**

Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a presentation on the Light Rail Analysis program focusing on making the system as efficient and effective as possible and providing capital improvements to give the system the ability to handle future growth. He indicated overall the system is not as productive as similar properties in North America. Several constraints including, single track segments, downtown transit mall where speeds slow to 10 mph, intersections with heavy traffic, and train sequencing where there are single tracks relate to the systems efficiency and flexibility. He noted the system is run well but is not achieving high ridership in comparison to similar systems throughout the country.

Mr. Connolly indicated the light rail is not competing well in certain areas, and at times takes twice the time of using a car to make the trip. Several solutions include; Santa Teresa express trains and skip-stop service operation on North First Street, double tracking portions of North First Street, predictive priority systems at key traffic signals, and adding terminal space in downtown San Jose and on the Vasona Line. He indicated scenario testing and cost benefit analysis will be further analyzed in June and July and the study is expected to be completed by December 2009.

Member Sandoval questioned where light rail ridership is in comparison to VTA’s initial projections and requested staff provide the information when the item is presented again.

Member Kalra indicated he was in favor of the idea of express service and questioned the amount of time it would save traveling from Santa Teresa to the downtown area. Mr. Connolly indicated there would be a 25 percent reduction in travel time.

**On Order of Chairperson Sellers** and there being no objection, the Light Rail System Analysis presentation was received.

**OTHER ITEMS**

13. **March 2009 Monthly Ridership and Fare Revenue Performance Report**

Joonie Tolosa, Manager, Operations Analysis and Reporting, provided a report on the March 2009 Monthly Ridership and Fare Revenue Performance which highlighted the following: 1) System ridership increased by 4.6 percent compared to the same period last
year and average weekday ridership increased by 3.4 percent; 2) Average weekday bus ridership increased by 2.3 percent; 3) Average weekday light rail ridership increased by 7.1 percent, which is the highest March in VTA history; and 4) Fare revenue for Fiscal Year To Date (FYTD) increased by 3.1 percent and monthly totals decreased by 1.9 percent. Mr. Tolosa indicated there continues to be an increase in pass sales.

On Order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the March 2009 Monthly Ridership and Fare Revenue Performance Report was received.

14. **Items of Concern and Referral to Administration**

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

15. **Committee Work Plan**

On Order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the Committee Work Plan was reviewed.

16. **Committee Staff Report**

Dan Smith, Chief Operating Officer and Staff Liaison, distributed a written staff report to the Committee which highlighted the Cupertino Senior Center’s Golden Getaway trip to Stanford and Palo Alto, an assault and robbery, passenger stabbing, and theft of bicycles and a handbag.

On Order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the Committee Staff Report was received.

17. **Chairperson’s Report**

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

18. **Determine Consent Agenda for the April 2, 2009 Board of Directors Meeting**

Consent:

**Item #7,** Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Siemens Building Technology, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $307,096 for the Laser Intrusion Detection System at Light Rail Stations, pending approval by FTA for a waiver to the Buy America requirements. This contract is 100% funded by a combination of Federal Transit Security, Federal Department of Homeland Security and State Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

**Item #8,** Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Cupertino Electric, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $524,920 for the Closed Circuit Television Phase 1, 2 and 3 Project. This contract is 100% funded by a combination of Federal Transit Security, Federal Department of Homeland Security and State Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.
Item #9, Adopt a Resolution upon a two-thirds vote by the Board of Directors finding the conditions are not appropriate for a competitive bid process and use of competitive negotiation for the purchase of up to 107 low-floor diesel electric hybrid 40-foot buses is adequate to meet VTA’s needs, as required by Public Contract Code Sections 20216 and 20217.

Regular:

Item #6, Adopt the 2009 VTA Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan.

19. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

20. **ADJOURNMENT**

On Order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Menominee L. McCarter, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
Committee for Transit Accessibility

Wednesday, April 8, 2009

MINUTES

NOTE: MEMBERS MAY TAKE ACTION ON ANY ITEM ON THIS AGENDA.

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Chairperson Morrow in Building A, Auditorium, 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>Lori Arnberg</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Eljas</td>
<td>Second Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Fernandez</td>
<td>Staff Aide to Ex-Officio Board Liaison Reed</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Gallo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Gouveia</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Grant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Heatley</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Hernandez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Jensen</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Julian</td>
<td>First Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Langford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Lasich</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Michels</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Montague</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Morrow</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawna Nourzaie</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Saltman</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dilip Shah</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Slack</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Stahl</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Zhu</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. INTRODUCTION OF AUDIENCE MEMBERS

David Sausjord, Revenue Services Manager; Camille Williams, Accessible Services Program Manager; Sandra Weymouth, Policy and Administration Manager; Dan Smith, Chief Operating Officer; Ann Carey, Executive Assistant to the General Manager; Walter Schinke, South County Advocate; David Ledwitz, Management Analyst; Ali Hudda, Deputy Director of Accounting; Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer; and Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary.
3. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:**

Walter Schinke, Interested Citizen, thanked staff for addressing concerns regarding community bus safety issues, noting there has been an improvement with drivers securing tie downs and placing seats in proper position. Mr. Schinke expressed concern regarding the bus stops in South County that are not accessible to individuals with mobility devices and announced inventory will be taken of all bus stops and priority given to those which should be completed first.

4. **Minutes of March 11, 2009**

Member Stahl noted the minutes reflected a request to agendize changing the Committee name at the April meeting and indicated the item was not on the Agenda.

Chairperson Morrow indicated the item would be discussed as part of the Mission Statement.

**M/S/C (Gouveia/Jensen) to approve the Minutes of March 11, 2009.**

5. **Chief Operating Officer’s Report**

Dan Smith, Chief Operating Officer, provided a brief report highlighting the following:

- Solar panels are being installed at the Cerone Division. The panels have the potential to market a new type of solar collector that collects more energy than the traditional flat panels. This will result in $15,000 to $20,000 in savings for VTA.

- The security contract was fully transitioned to Allied Barton on March 13, 2009. A smooth transition was achieved due in part to the retention of a majority of Securitas Personnel.

- On March 6, 2009, transit officers responded to an attempted robbery at the Curtner Light Rail Station. Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) cameras aided in the apprehension of the suspect. On March 15, 2009, a light rail operator reported a robbery on the Great Mall Platform. The suspect was apprehended and the passenger treated for minor injuries.

- A fare enforcement detail was conducted at the McKee Light Rail station. Approximately 90 passengers were checked, 15 citations issued and two arrests made by sheriff’s transit deputies.

Member Grant questioned standard procedures for boarding a passenger using a walker if there are already two people on board with wheelchairs occupying the two secured areas. Jim Unites, CTA Liaison, indicated it is an error on the operator’s part if the passenger in the walker is refused boarding and noted there was a memo being prepared addressing the concern.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Member Grant questioned the order of boarding when there are both cognitively disabled and ambulatory passengers. Mr. Smith indicated it is handled at the discretion of the operator based on the situation, and encouraged anyone who is denied service to contact Customer Service.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Chief Operating Officer’s Report.

**BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER**

6. **5310 Local Review Committee Appointment**

David Ledwitz, Management Analyst, provided a brief update on the Fiscal Year 2009 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 Program and asked the CTA to select three members to serve on the Local Review Committee (LRC) to evaluate and rank applications. Mr. Ledwitz indicated the applications are due May 20, 2009 and the LRC will meet on May 26, 2009 and if additional work is required the committee will meet again on May 27th.

Chairperson Morrow questioned if there were any new guidelines for the process. Mr. Ledwitz indicated the major changes were implemented in 2008 and this is the second year the LRC will be working with those changes.

Ex-Officio Member Heatley indicated there were two additional questions on the application which may require coordination with the Office of Emergency Services or the broker to answer.

Chairperson Morrow indicated he would like to serve on the LRC and asked for additional volunteers. He suggested a courtesy call be given to Member Julian and Member Langford to ask if they would like to serve.

Member Jensen questioned the days and times of the meetings. Mr. Ledwitz indicated the LRC would meet to evaluate the applications on May 26th from 9:00 am - 3:00 pm, and on May 27th if needed.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee appointed three members from the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) to serve as the Local Review Committee (LRC) to evaluate and rank Fiscal Year 2009 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 Program project applications.

7. **Advanced Farebox System**

David Sausjord, Revenue Services Manager, provided a brief update and review of the Advanced Farebox System. He indicated the Request For Proposals (RFP) will be issued in June. Proposals, features, and bids will be evaluated and the contract awarded by the end of the calendar year.

Member Stahl questioned if the device can be checked by a person in a wheelchair. Mr. Sausjord indicated equipment will be brought to VTA and CTA will be invited to observe and comment.
Member Grant questioned the type of fare media the boxes would accept noting a token system would be easier for a disabled passenger. Mr. Sausjord indicated a system which recognizes electronic fare media is what is being looked at for the long term, but token capabilities are being researched as well.

Member Grant questioned the timeline for a final decision and requested the item be agendized again. He questioned if there was a chance the replacement of fareboxes would be postponed due to budget constraints.

Ali Hudda, Deputy Director of Accounting, indicated the fareboxes generate a significant amount of road calls because the system is fragile and vulnerable and needs to be replaced.

Member Grant questioned if passengers would be able to pay using a credit card. Mr. Hudda indicated the overall strategy is to get a farebox which has a card reader, but going in the system may not be able to read them because there is additional back end work that needs to be done and would be an add-on item.

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the status update for the Advanced Farebox System project.

8. Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Update

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, and Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, provided a brief overview VTA’s Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) update and provided a list of the following top three priorities designated by the ACE Task Force:

• Add to Board memo advisory committee vote and major comments/concerns

• Advisory committees should have the ability to identify, for Board of Directors consideration, future trends or potential areas of concern to the Board, Member Agencies, or constituent groups.

• Committees need to review and provide input to staff on items and issues in early development, not final completion stage.

Christina Fernandez, Staff Aide to Ex-Officio Board Liaison Reed, left the meeting at 1:44 p.m.

Member Stahl requested clarification regarding the review of projects priority. Ms. Loft indicated the Task Force suggested the items coming to the advisory committees for consideration be brought forth earlier in the process.

Chairperson Morrow noted he is trying to understand what the goal is in adding major comments and advisory vote to Board Memos. He indicated he is uncomfortable writing a report when the Board Secretary’s Office records the meeting, and thinks it should come from them. It would be the responsibility of the Chairperson to convey the meaning when reporting to the appropriate Board.

Member Grant questioned why CTA is reporting to Transit Planning and Operations Committee (TPO) noting the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) pertains to the whole organization.
Chairperson Morrow indicated CTA could report straight to the Board if there was a pressing issue. He noted that in his meeting with Greg Sellers, TPO Chairperson, some of the issues affecting CTA were addressed and noted they are actively seeking ways to communicate.

Member Grant indicated there were similar issues with the former CTA Chairperson, Randy Tamez. Member Grant referenced correspondence between Dolly Sandoval, former TPO Chairperson, and the CTA. Chairperson Morrow indicated the memo Member Grant referenced was from December 2007 in response to questions and issues brought forward by Mr. Tamez.

Ex-Officio Member Heatley requested clarification on the process of proposing strategies to create a uniform way of presenting items to the Board.

Ms. Loft indicated the Task Force has developed the priorities and the subcommittees are charged with presenting to their respective committee to create strategies. The ideas will be taken back to the Task Force, and as a group, they will discuss the best way of approaching and accomplishing the priorities.

Member Grant questioned if there was a process to introduce the other issues. Ms. Loft indicated the top three will be addressed first and over time, the other issues will be reviewed by the entire group and they will define the process.

Member Grant questioned the timeline of addressing the top issues. Ms Loft indicated the Subcommittees and Task Force would not be rushed and there is no closing time frame. The Task Force will however, provide a mid-year report to Administration and Finance Committee.

Chairperson Morrow expressed concern with the information CTA has received in the past. Ms. Loft suggested the group collectively develop some solutions to achieve the priorities.

Ex-Officio Member Heatley addressed the need to develop standardized ways to present ideas and have transparent movement of information.

Member Grant questioned if developing an annual report would be a way CTA could communicate to the Board what was done and what the areas of interest are. Jim Unites, CTA Liaison, indicated the Workplan is developed to present issues the CTA would like to address.

Member Grant indicated input is not made in the development stage where CTA could present more information and possibilities.

Member Gouveia expressed concern with the Task Force noting the information coming back has not always been concise and makes it hard to participate in the discussion.

Member Stahl indicated the information is brought back from the Task Force to get input from CTA.

Member Grant expressed concern with regards to Board Members reading the material and the committee comments. Member Stahl suggested the committee comments and recommendations be placed on the first page of the Board memo and not the last.
Ex-Officio Member Heatley suggested the structural flow and timeliness of getting the information out to the committees be reviewed.

Member Grant expressed concerns with the inability to pursue issues not favorable with staff due to other constraints and indicated information needs to be provided to the Committees so they can advise staff.

Chairperson Morrow indicated he will review the recording from the meeting and take some of the strategies back to the ACE Subcommittee.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee received an update and provided direction to the CTA Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) subcommittee members on strategies to achieve the Task Force priorities.

Chairperson Morrow left his seat at 2:27 pm and the meeting was recessed.

Chairperson Morrow took his seat at 2:29 pm and the meeting was reconvened.

9. **Provisional Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Mission Statement**

Chairperson Morrow indicated he met with staff regarding the Mission Statement and they were not in favor of adding the words “economically disadvantaged”.

Chairperson Morrow made a motion to approve the provisional mission statement to read, “The Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) advises the Board of Directors and staff on transportation options and all matters under VTA’s purview pertaining to equal access, accessibility, availability, and affordability to public transportation to meet the mobility needs for individuals with disabilities, seniors, and economically disadvantaged persons.”

Member Jensen questioned the advantage of removing economically disadvantaged persons from the mission statement. Ms. Loft indicated other advisory committees review that aspect as they review fares.

Member Stahl requested an amendment to the provisional mission statement to change the “Committee for Transit Accessibility” to the “Committee for Transportation Accessibility”, and Member Gouveia requested an additional amendment to delete the words “under VTA’s purview” from the provisional mission statement.

Chairperson Morrow made a new motion to include the amendments which was seconded by Member Saltman.

**M/S/C (Morrow/Saltman)** to consider amending the provisional Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Mission Statement to include the indicated modifications requested by CTA members subsequent to CTA adoption of the provisional Mission Statement.

Chairperson Morrow expressed his concern with the Mobility Options Task Force, noting that it is covered under the purview of the mission statement. He noted in October 2007, a motion was made by former CTA Chairperson Randy Tamez and seconded by Member Slack, that all issues in regard to the Mobility Options Training program would fall under the purview of a CTA subcommittee. He questioned the lack of involvement of CTA members and inclusion of VTA staff and contractors and expressed concern with the lack of public process.
Chairperson Morrow indicated there is a brochure and travel training video which were created and questioned why they have not been presented to the Committee. He noted as the Vice Chairperson, he instructed the Mobility Options Task Force be a standing item on the CTA Agenda and it’s been pushed out to a quarterly review process.

Chairperson Morrow made a motion that the Mobility Options Task Force be stopped and the whole program be brought back under the purview of the CTA. He referenced a memo from former TPO Chairperson Sandoval, to Mr. Tamez which states CTA is to develop, in conjunction with staff, the Mobility Options program.

Chairperson Morrow indicated on March 31, 2009, he sent a message to Jim Unites, CTA Liaison, expressing concern in regards to the Mobility Options program process. He was by Mr. Unites asked who else he would like to have participating in the program. Chairperson Morrow indicated he tried to slow down the process and got shunned and noted his displeasure with staff.

Member Grant requested Dan Smith, Chief Operating Officer, address the issues and concerns of Chairperson Morrow.

M/S/C(Morrow/Jensen) to immediately cease and desist the current make-up of the Mobility Options Task Force and to force staff to bring the purview back to the CTA.

10. **Advisory Committee Enhancement Process Update**

   On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the Advisory Committee Enhancement Process Update.

11. **Committee Workplan**

    Jim Unites, CTA Liaison, provided a brief update on the Committee Workplan noting the Quarterly Legislative Report will be added and the Farebox item will be placed back on the Workplan to allow CTA to review the choices.

    On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the Workplan Update.

**REPORTS**

The Agenda was taken out of order.

15. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Morrow provided a brief report noting he met with TPO Chairperson, Greg Sellers, to discuss CTA concerns and indicated a letter will be drafted and forwarded to the Committee. He noted CTA is aware of the economic downturn and conveyed how important the paratransit program is to the county.

Member Grant questioned the legal implications and role of contractors who sit on the Travel Training Committee and other VTA Committees.

Chairperson Morrow requested staff provide the information with the Mobility Options program update in May. Dan Smith, Chief Operating Officer, indicated contractors may sit on a committee as a non-voting member.
Mr. Unites requested clarification of the information CTA was requesting questioning if it pertained to the contractor doing Travel Training. Chairperson Morrow confirmed it was the issue but indicated the Mobility Options program was not on the agenda; therefore they would need to refrain from having a lengthy discussion on the topic.

Chairperson Morrow indicated he has met with senior staff on many occasions and requested Mr. Smith meet with the entire committee to have an open discussion regarding the problems that exist.

Chairperson Morrow announced his upcoming meeting with Michael T. Burns, General Manager, to address CTA’s pressing issues, notably the Mobility Options Task Force.

On Order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the Chairperson’s Report.

12. City of San Jose Disability Advisory Commission (DAC) Report

On Order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee deferred the City of San Jose Disability Advisory Commission (DAC) Report.

13. Board of Directors Report

Christina Fernandez, Staff Aide to Ex-Officio Board Member Reed, provided a written report which was placed on the dais.

Member Saltman suggested the Board of Director’s Report be placed at the beginning of the Agenda to accommodate Ms. Fernandez’s schedule.

On Order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the Board of Directors Report as contained on the dais.

14. Committee Staff Report

Jim Unites, Deputy Director, Operations and Staff Liaison, announced the Board Workshop on April 24, 2009 and invited the CTA to attend, noting the budget will be presented.

Ex-Officio Member Heatley indicated the MTC will have a number of drills and exercises for emergency planning that will use persons with disabilities and requested CTA be informed when that comes into focus.

Dan Smith, Chief Operating Officer, provided follow-up information regarding the March CTA meeting, noting a referral has gone out to address the Bus Procurement item and recommended it be agendized for the May meeting.

On Order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee Staff Report was received.

OTHER

16. Announcements

There were no Announcements.
17. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Menominee L. McCarter, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
Call to Order at 4:40 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Blaylock</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Elias</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Hashimoto</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Hughan</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jacobvitz</td>
<td>CAC Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Larsen</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaye Morando</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Powers</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Probst</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Rogers</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Schulte</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Skinner</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Tebo</td>
<td>CAC Chairperson</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

The Committee of the Whole noted Agenda Item #13, Status and Progress of the Advisory Committee Enhancement Process to Date and Agenda Item #14, Update from the Committee's Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee, would be presented after Agenda Item #2, Orders of the Day.

The Agenda was taken out of order.

13. Advisory Committee Enhancement Update: April

The Committee of the Whole received an update on the Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) process.

The ACE Subcommittee reported ACE Task Force members reviewed and prioritized 36 items of importance to the advisory committees. ACE Task Force members will discuss the top three items with their advisory committee members and at the next ACE Task Force meeting a discussion will be held on the mechanisms of implementation.
The **ACE Subcommittee reported**: 1) cohesiveness among Task Force members; 2) improved communication between advisory committees is needed; 3) an annual joint meeting of the advisory committees should be scheduled; 4) Chairperson Sandoval has communicated her support of the ACE Task Force; and 5) Board Vice Chairperson Liccardo has attended an ACE Task Force meeting.

The **Committee of the Whole noted** advisory committee members should be required to present an annual report to their represented cities to ensure their awareness of the role of the VTA advisory committees.

14. **Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Report**

The **Committee of the Whole noted** the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) members' diverse-group representation and suggested other community groups might also benefit from representation on the CAC.

The **Committee of the Whole suggested** time should be set aside for a future discussion on unrepresented groups.

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz left the meeting at 5:02 p.m.

3. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

There were no Public Presentations.

4. **Staff Report**

The **Committee of the Whole received** a report from Greta Helm, Chief of External Affairs and Staff Liaison, in which she noted: 1) a recent presentation from VTA lobbyists regarding level of support VTA can expect in Congress; 2) an eight billion shortfall in current State budget; 3) the March public policy poll showed the only majority public-supported measure was capping salary increases; 4) the General Manager will present budget information at the April 24, 2009, Board Workshop; 5) a budget meeting calendar will be emailed to CAC members; 6) a tour of the planned BART line, from Warm Springs to Santa Clara, is being coordinated for CAC members on August 12, 2009, at 1:30 p.m.; 7) a BART corridor rail-realignment groundbreaking will occur on May 8, 2009; 8) the Mary Avenue Bicycle Footbridge Grand Opening Ceremony is scheduled for April 30, 2009, at 3:00 p.m. in Cupertino; and 9) the Borregas Avenue Bicycle Bridge Grand Opening Ceremony is scheduled for April 22, 2009, at 10:30 a.m. in Sunnyvale.

5. **Chairperson’s Report**

The **Committee of the Whole welcomed** Erik Larsen, the CAC’s new South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council representative.
BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER

COMBINED CAC AND 2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE CONSENT AGENDAS

6. The Committee of the Whole deferred the Minutes of March 11, 2009.

7. Monthly Legislative History Matrix
   The Committee of the Whole received the Monthly Legislative History Matrix.

8. Bill Position:  AB 798 (Nava)
   The Committee of the Whole received Bill Position: AB 798 (Nava).

9. Bill Position:  AB 338 (Ma)
   The Committee of the Whole received Bill Position: AB 338 (Ma).

10. CAC Quarterly Attendance Report
    The Committee of the Whole received the Q1 2009 CAC Quarterly Attendance Report.

2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA

11. 2009 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan
    The Committee of the Whole received the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan.
    Staff provided a PowerPoint Presentation including: 1) Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives; 2) VTA Service Design Guidelines; 3) VTA BRT Branding; 4) Corridor Evaluation; 5) Transit Sustainability Policy; 6) Most Promising Options; 7) Daily Ridership; 8) Total Operating Cost Estimate; 9) O&M Cost/Passenger; 10) Capital Improvement Analysis; 11) Major Findings; 12) Design Principles; and 13) Photo Simulations of proposed stations.

    The Committee of the Whole questioned regarding space availability for BRT stations. Staff indicated the use of medians and widening of intersections to accommodate stations. Staff noted the plan does not recommend taking through-traffic lanes out.

    The Committee of the Whole questioned regarding removal of on-street parking and its effect on small businesses. Staff stated the concern was being addressed.

    The Committee of the Whole questioned regarding the BRT fare costs. Staff stated the BRT fare would equal the VTA Rapid 522 fare.
The Committee of the Whole questioned regarding off-board fare collection. Staff stated off-board fare collection would reduce dwell time.

The Committee of the Whole encouraged the use of a single-ticket system.

The Committee of the Whole questioned regarding planning and funding for the I-880 / Stevens Creek Boulevard Interchange Project. Staff stated VTA is aggressively pursuing Federal funding.

The Committee of the Whole noted VTA should research the Community Foundation’s Smart Growth Planning Grants.

12. Light Rail Systems Analysis Project Update

The Committee of the Whole received the Light Rail Systems Analysis Project Update.

The Committee of the Whole questioned the overall goal for the Light Rail Systems Analysis. Staff stated the overall goal is an improvement of the existing system, including increased efficiency and flexibility.

The Committee of the Whole suggested future planning take into consideration the places where people travel, including colleges, hospitals, and major shopping centers.

COMBINED CAC AND CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE ITEMS

15. Citizens Advisory Committee and Citizens Watchdog Committee Work Plans

The Committee of the Whole reviewed the Citizens Advisory Committee and Citizens Watchdog Committee Work Plans.

OTHER

16. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.

17. ADJOURNED at 6:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Garcia, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Wednesday, April 8, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Chairperson Walton in Auditorium, Building A, 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>Cheryl Bunnell</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Entin</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Fernandez</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Hagenmaier</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Ginzton</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerri-Ann Meyer</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Muniz</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Sacco</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Simons</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Stallman</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sullivan</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Swent</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Wadler</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Walton</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Winter</td>
<td>SVBC</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Zavala</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.
4. **Committee Staff Report**

Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, reported the following:

- There will be an Orientation for Members who have been appointed in the last 12-18 months on May 2009. Other Members are welcome to participate;

- Staff met with Chairperson Walton and Vice Chairperson Stallman and discussed the following: No Bike Left Behind Subcommittee, Complete Streets, Trails Status Update, Funding for Pedestrian Improvements on Expressways, Potential Guest Speakers at BPAC Meetings, Project Monitoring and Delivery, BART/SVRT Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues, and bike accommodation on New Bus Purchase;

- Staff conducted a press release for the Bicycle E-lockers;

- BRT Strategic Plan will be forwarded to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review;

- The 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP) Project List will be updated to include the Page Mill/I-280 Interchange Improvement Project. As a result, Project B28 - McKean Road Shoulder Improvement Project will be underfunded;

- Transit to Trails Magazine will be available at VTA and Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC) energizer stations on Bike to Work Day; and

- The BART Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is now available for public comment. There are currently 17 streets that cross the right-of-way. All will be grade separated in the future with the exception of Able and Calaveras and North of Tradezone Boulevard.

Member Simons referred to the Member Orientation and suggested VTA have a regular schedule of Orientation for new members in the future.

Vice Chairperson Stallman referred to the BART Project and suggested staff contact the Cities of Milpitas and San Jose to ensure they are aware of the potential crossing issues. He noted of ensuring compliance to Routine Accommodations to roadway projects.

- **Highway Program Update**

  There was no Highway Program Update.

- **Conditions of Approval Update**

  There was no Conditions of Approval Update.

- **County Report**
Dan Collen, Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department, reported the ongoing efforts within the Santa Clara County Counsel’s Office regarding a potential change to the Parade Ordinances to deal with special events such as the Tour of California. He suggested the proposed changes to be reviewed by BPAC.

5. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Walton reported the following:

- The Flat Tyre Newsletter announced the opening of the Mary Avenue Bridge on April 30, 2009;

- He made the following suggestions to Corinne Winter, SVBC: a) conduct a VTA sponsored SVBC countywide study of bicycle and pedestrian accidents in the last five years to determine factors that lead to the accident and preventive measures that could be taken to avoid accidents; and b) conduct a VTA sponsored SVBC Bicycle Education and Training for children and Bicycle Safety Refresher Courses for Adults; and

- He suggested VTA to include a bicycle safety information in its website and requested staff to agendize the topic for discussion next month.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

6. **Minutes of March 11, 2009**

M/S/C (Simons/Stallman) to approve the Minutes of March 11, 2009.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

7. **Advisory Committee Enhancement Update: April**

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, reported the Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Task Force selected the following as the top three priorities: 1) include Advisory Committee vote and major comments and concerns to all Board Memos; 2) Advisory Committees should be able to submit for Board consideration future trends or future areas of concern; and 3) Advisory Committees should review and provide input to projects/issues earlier in the process. The fourth ACE Task Force will meet on April 29, 2009, 11:30 a.m. and will discuss the possible strategies for the identified priorities. Board Vice Chairperson Liccardo will be in attendance at that meeting.

On order of Chairperson Walton and there being no objection, the Committee received a brief update on the status and progress of the ACE Process to date.
8. **BPAC Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Report**

Member Simons reported the low priorities at the ACE Task Force are: 1) proposal to combine the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC); and 2) Put term limits for all Advisory Committees with the exception of CAC.

Vice Chairperson Stallman referred to the timing of Committee reviews to projects/issues and expressed concern the BART EIS and the New Bus Procurement were not brought to BPAC for review. Members Ginzton and Wadler noted BPAC can provide input on bike accommodation on the new buses.

Ying Smith, Transportation Planning Manager and Staff Liaison, noted BPAC's focus are bicycle and pedestrian issues. However, the Committee can comment on bike connection and accommodation in buses. She added the public can make comment on the BART EIS during the public comment period.

Paul Goldstein, SVBC and Interested Citizen, commented there should be more education on the distinct responsibilities and functions of each Advisory Committees.

**On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the Committee received the BPAC ACE Subcommittee Report.

9. **Regional Transit-Oriented Bike Share Pilot Program Update**

Ms. DeRobertis noted John Brazil from the City of San Jose indicated the City remains interested in the Bike Sharing Pilot program with Diridon Station as a possible site. VTA does not have the actual cost of the study to date. To reduce costs, VTA staff will be the prime consultant for the study and will focus on market study, bike sharing models evaluation, and determination of funding partners.

**On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Bike Sharing Pilot Program Update.

10. **BPAC Over and Under Tour - Bike to Work Week Event**

Member Meyer noted the objective of this Tour is to provide awareness to the public about the existing and new bicycle facilities available. She requested volunteers help plan the route and act as a liaison for their respective cities.


Member Simons requested staff provide the Tour route to the VTA website, if possible.

11. **Report from the Traffic Safe Communities Network**

Travis Smith, Santa Clara County Public Health Department Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group, discussed the Traffic Safe Communities Network. He noted elementary and middle schools can apply for the 2009-2010 Traffic Safety Mini-Grant. Up to $3,500
can be awarded to schools for projects that will encourage its students to either bike or walk to school.

Upon inquiry of Member Simons, Mr. Smith responded the grant is limited to public schools at this time. Member Simons suggested coordination with private schools in the future.

Member Swent commented traffic conditions and driver behaviors affect the decision whether to bike or walk to school. He noted public schools need more assistance and added there are creative and technological ways to encourage students to bike or walk to school.

**On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the Committee received the report on the Traffic Safe Communities Network.

12. **County Roads Capital Projects Update**

Mr. Collen announced the following:

- The Capitol Expressway Pavement Rehabilitation Project between Highway 87 and Seven Trees Boulevard opened for bids on March 26, 2009 and received 18 bids. The lowest bid was 23 percent below engineer’s estimate.

- Oregon-Page Mill Expressway Pavement Repair and Foothill Expressway Loyola Bike Pedestrian Improvements Projects bid openings are scheduled for April 9, 2009 and target award date for both contracts is slated on May 5, 2009.

**OTHER**

13. **BPAC Work Plan**

Ms. DeRobertis noted the Funding strategies for County Expressways and Bike Capacity on Buses will be discussed in May 2009. She informed the Committee VTA submitted a $200,000 grant application to Caltrans to enhance the Complete Streets Program.

Vice Chairperson Stallman inquired when the Highway Semi-Annual report will be forwarded to BPAC. He requested staff to invite Yves Zutty regarding connections of trails.

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

14. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Member Meyer announced the Mountain View BPAC will organize the energizer station for Bike to Work Day and it will be at Downtown Mountain View Transit Center.
Member Simons announced the dedication of Sunnyvale's Borregas Avenue Bridge on April 22, 2009.

Member Swent noted the efforts to convert Park Boulevard into a Bike Boulevard. Palo Alto is also moving forward with the Sign Project with possible Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funding.

Member Sullivan noted the Reach 3 of the San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail construction is expected to finish by the end of April 2009, with the ribbon cutting event slated for May 2009. Bids for the first part of Reach 4 (pedestrian path along San Tomas Expressway from Monroe to Cabrillo) have been received.

Member Muniz announced Gilroy's next BPAC meeting is scheduled for April 22, 2009.

Member Stallman noted the City of Saratoga's City Council will be presented with the updated Bike Map next week. The updated map includes Class 1 route proposals such as the Saratoga Creek Trail between Hakone Gardens and where Pierce Road meet Big Basin Way.

Chairperson Walton noted Cupertino will have two energizer stations on Bike to Work Day in front of Community Center and entrance to Mary Avenue Bridge.

15. **ADJOURNMENT**

On order of Chairperson Walton and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine F. Baltao, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, April 9, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Chairperson Witthaus 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>Representing</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Armendariz</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajeev Batra</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Capurso</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Chen, Alternate</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cherbone</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Collen, Alternate</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Connolly, Alt. Ex-Officio</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Dey</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Jenkins</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kass</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Larsen, Alternate</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Likens, Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lind</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Rowe, Alternate</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Slintak</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Stillman, Alternate</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Taubeneck, Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Witthaus, Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

Member Cherbone took his seat at 1:36 p.m.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.
3. **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

Alternate Member Larsen took his seat at 1:37 p.m.

There were no Orders of the Day.

4. **Committee Staff Report**

Amin Surani, Principal Transportation Planner, distributed a document entitled, “Santa Clara County American Recovery & Reinvestment Act 2009 (ARRA) Local Streets & Roads System Preservation Funds,” and provided an overview, highlighting:

1) Additional $5.08 million in Tier II funds are available that will be distributed based on Board approved percentages as shown on the document; and
2) Deadlines for Tier I money is May 30, 2009, and Tier II money is November 30, 2009.

John Ristow, Chief CMA and Staff Liaison, asked the Committee Members to contact Mr. Surani if there are any questions regarding the certification process.

Member Dey recommended Mr. Surani contact Caltrans to find out where each Member Agency stands in the process.

Mr. Surani noted the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) approved the following projects in Santa Clara County:

1) $6 million for VTA’s Project - I-237/I-880 Connector Project; and
2) $12 million for Caltrans project of improvements on I-280.

Vice Chairperson Likens took her seat at 1:45 p.m.

Steven Fisher, Senior Transportation Planner, distributed a presentation document entitled, “High-Speed Train (HST) Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Outreach Strategy and Schedule, San Francisco to San Jose,” and provided an overview.

Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a report on the Transportation System Monitoring Program. He reported on the e-mail sent to TAC on April 8, 2009, highlighting the following:

1) Memorandum defining the proposed performance measures to be included in VTA’s Transportation System Monitoring Program; and
2) Transportation System Monitoring Program for Santa Clara County Inventory & Maintenance Expenditure Survey to be completed by the local jurisdictions. The survey submittal deadline has been extended to May 15, 2009. The survey will be placed in a user friendly format and will be re-sent to TAC via e-mail. Mr. Maeda recommended the TAC inform their respective PAC members regarding the development of the program.

In regards to the survey, Vice Chairperson Likens expressed concern regarding making a request to other City of Palo Alto Departments to collect the data without understanding what is going to happen to the data and how the data is going to be presented in a context Countywide.

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Committee Staff Report was received.
5. **Chairperson’s Report**

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

6. **Reports from TAC Working Groups**

   - **Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

     There was no Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Working Group Report.

   - **Systems Operations & Management (SOM) Working Group**

     Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, reported the Systems Operations & Management (SOM) Working Group is moving forward on updating the Deficiency Plan Guidelines.

     Member Dey referenced the amount of time the SOM Working Group has spent working on the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines, noting the Guidelines were approved by the VTA Board of Directors. He expressed concern regarding the issues experienced with Caltrans pertaining to the TIA Guidelines process. Member Dey also expressed concern regarding the letter the City of Gilroy received from Caltrans informing the City of Gilroy to follow a particular process and if requirements were not met, Caltrans would not issue an encroachment permit to the City of Gilroy. He requested the issue be addressed at a higher level within VTA, such as the Deputy Director level, to determine the next steps to address the issues with Caltrans.

     Mr. Ristow asked Member Dey to provide VTA staff with a copy of the letter the City of Gilroy received from Caltrans.

     Chairperson Witthaus queried if a meeting should be scheduled between Caltrans and VTA. Mr. Ristow noted a meeting with Caltrans has been scheduled on April 22, 2009.

     **On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Report from the SOM Working Group was received.

**BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

7. **Minutes of March 12, 2009**

   M/S/C (Batra/Dey) to approve the Minutes of March 12, 2009.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
8. **Bureau of State Audits – Review of Planning Procedures**

M/S/C (Batra/Dey) to review CMA List of policies and procedures.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

9. **Adopt 2009 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan**

John Ristow, Chief CMA and Staff Liaison, reported the item was presented at the March 12, 2009, TAC meeting and noted TAC requested the item be deferred for a month and to also place the item on the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Agenda.

Steven Fisher, Senior Transportation Planner, referenced Page 2 of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan PowerPoint Presentation, and provided an overview on the BRT Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives. He noted VTA staff has met with all the cities that will receive the BRT service.

In response to TAC’s request, Mr. Fisher indicated VTA staff met with the Grand Boulevard Project Committee and the Committee concurred with the BRT Strategic Plan. In response to TAC’s concern regarding an environmental clearance, Mr. Fisher noted the BRT Strategic Plan process falls into the Regional Transportation Plan category and does not require an environmental clearance process.

Member Batra expressed concern regarding the approval of the BRT Strategic Plan and the possibility of being locked into a plan. He indicated the City of Santa Clara is in the process of updating its General Plan to 2035 and does not want anything to happen that will affect its General Plan. Mr. Fisher indicated a particular alignment would not be locked in, noting VTA is trying to achieve travel time savings. He referenced the (BRT) Strategic Plan PowerPoint Presentation, Page 8, Most Promising Options - Objective: 30% Travel Time Savings Over Local Service, and provided an overview. Member Batra also expressed concern about looking at one specific mode and its cost.

Alternate Member Larsen indicated the City of San Jose is very supportive and committed to developing a good network of Bus Rapid Transit systems. The City of San Jose is concerned about the way the strategy is written, noting it is technically focused and directed towards the goal of moving buses fast through the corridor. In reference to the Santa Clara/Alum Rock Project, there is tension between what the community or cities want in the corridor. The City of San Jose would prefer a softer approach in terms of looking at the investments; more towards a multi-modal investment that clearly supports a quick efficient transit service through the corridor, and balancing the needs of the community and the district affected.

Member Dey indicated the High Speed Train is the first major step forward for South County to have decent rail service. He asked, as the High Speed Rail Project goes forward, to take South County seriously, noting this is the only project that is reasonable and viable.
Chairperson Witthaus noted the item will go through an environmental process and concerns should be addressed at this time. He highly recommended when presenting the item to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) to transmit TAC’s comments.

Member Batra expressed concern regarding the name, Bus Rapid Transit Strategic Plan, and recommended the name be changed. Chairperson Witthaus recommended changing the name to “Corridor Feasibility Study.”

M/S/C (Batra/Likens) to recommend the Board of Directors adopt the 2009 VTA Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan. Further, directed VTA staff to incorporate TAC’s comments and to start using another title, such as Corridor Feasibility Study.

10. **Adopt 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program Project List**

John Ristow, Chief CMA and Staff Liaison, reported the item was presented to TAC at their March 12, 2009, meeting and noted TAC requested the item be deferred for a month.

Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, distributed a document entitled, Attachment A – 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) Project List, Updated April 8, 2009, and provided an overview of the changes. There is now a total of 72 Projects for the 2009 BEP for a total allocation of $160.7 million.

Member Batra referenced the updated Attachment A – 2009 BEP Project List, Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035 ID #B22, City of Santa Clara – Santa Clara Caltrain Undercrossing Project, and noted the Project is a VTA Project. He referenced VTP 2035 ID #B23b – San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail – Monroe Avenue to Cabrillo Avenue to Southern City Limit Project, BEP Programmed To-Date (Million) column - $0.00, and noted the Project is missing monies already programmed.

Member Kass referenced a City of Campbell Project being moved from the Local Streets and Roads pot of the VTP 2035 to BEP. It is portals underneath Highway 17, which is primarily on Campbell Avenue. He noted the Project is not contained on the 2009 BEP Project list.

Alternate Member Larsen referenced Attachment B – Projects Submitted But Not Scored, VTP 2035 ID #B56, City of San Jose – Thompson Creek Trail (Yerba Buena to Eastridge Transit Center) Project, and expressed concern about the Project not being considered a priority. The Project is a bike feeder to the Eastridge Transit Center and serves very high profile destinations. The Project was identified as one of the City of San Jose’s top five trail improvement priorities. Alternate Member Larsen referenced VTP 2035 ID #B70 - Capitol Caltrain Station Crossing Project and noted the Project is not a high priority. He requested the VTP 2035 ID #B56, City of San Jose – Thompson Creek Trail (Yerba Buena to Eastridge Transit Center) Project be added to the eligibility list. He commented if there is a need to balance the dollars, the City of San Jose is willing to drop one of its Projects.

Member Jenkins referenced Attachment B – Projects Submitted But Not Scored, and requested an explanation be provided on why Projects were rejected.
Alternate Member Collen noted he would support the 2009 BEP Project List going forward with the inclusions of the Cities of San Jose and Campbell Projects.

Member Jenkins referenced Attachment B – Projects Submitted But Not Scored, VTP 2035 ID #B48, City of Mountain View – Permanente Creek Trail Undercrossing of Charleston Road and Extension of the Trail South from Old Middlefield Way to Middlefield Road, and requested the Project be funded.

Vice Chairperson Likens referenced high priority projects not contained on the 2009 BEP Project List and projects contained on the List and noted it would make sense to be able to swap out like funds for like funds.

Member Dey referenced Attachment B – Projects Submitted But Not Scored, and recommended Member Agencies who have Projects on this list have the opportunity to meet with VTA staff and discuss how it does or does not fit into the regional and countywide perspective. The Member Agencies can then identify which projects can be swapped.

Member Kass commented each city will decide which projects they are going to propose and submit on the competitive grant process. Mr. Ristow referenced the VTP 2035 which rolls into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and noted it does need to be a fiscally constrained balanced amount. VTA had to balance the $160.7 million funding estimate against highway, local streets and road, and pavement projects to fit within the targeted fund. Member Kass recommended Attachment B be re-labeled to indicate the projects are unconstrained.

Chairperson Witthaus commented the City of Sunnyvale virtually had its entire bike plan rejected and recommended the cities be given some flexibility. He queried if it is possible for VTA to allow cities to still submit projects when specific funding opportunities arise if they are on an unconstrained list.

Member Dey recommended the item be moved forward, because VTA still has to be concerned about the sanctity of the whole process.

Alternate Member Larsen recommended the item be deferred for a month to allow time to go through the process.

Upon query of Member Kass, Mr. Ristow noted if the item is delayed a month, it would be forwarded to the June 4, 2009, Board of Directors meeting.

**M/S/C (Kass/Larsen)** to defer recommending the Board of Directors adopt the 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program Project List as shown in Attachment.

### 11. **2008 Monitoring and Conformance Report**

Chairperson Witthaus noted Attachment A, Draft 2008 Monitoring and Conformance Report – Santa Clara County Congestion Management Agency, was not included in the Agenda Packet. The booklet was distributed at the meeting.
Upon query of Committee Members, John Ristow, Chief CMA and Staff Liaison, indicated the item could be deferred for a month, noting there was no time constraint.

Alternate Member Rowe referenced the Draft 2008 Monitoring and Conformance Report, Page 3, Table of Contents, and noted the “CMP Intersections” item begins on Page 18 instead of Page 14. The “Freeways” item begins on Page 30 instead of Page 28. He also referenced Page 43, Table 4.2 - 2008 Freeway Level of Service, AM, “US 101 NB Burnett Avenue (Lane Drop)”, and noted a lane should be added to Cochrane Road in the northbound direction.

Mr. Ristow asked Committee Members to submit their comments to Adam Burger, Transportation Planner III. He noted Mr. Burger would send Committee Members an e-mail asking for their comments.

M/S/C (Collen/Likens) to defer recommending the Board of Directors approve the Draft 2008 Monitoring and Conformance Report.

12. **CMP Work Program Review Draft of New Work Program**

Alternate Member Collen left the meeting at 3:14 p.m.

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, referenced Attachment A – Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Congestion Management Program (CMP) Work Program for Fiscal Year 2010 (FY 2010), and provided a brief report on the major tasks the CMP will address during FY 2010. He noted the item would be brought back to TAC for action in May 2009.

Member Kass expressed concern regarding the increase in CMP fees and recommended the fees remain flat. He requested staff provide a report back indicating the consequences if the fees were to remain flat.

Member Batra requested staff provide a progress update on the completed tasks.

Chairperson Witthaus requested staff to look at the overall program and to think very hard about what elements are discretionary versus what elements are truly necessary to meet Congestion Management law.

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the draft Fiscal Year 2010 Congestion Management Work Program was reviewed.

13. **Light Rail Systems Analysis Project Update**

Andrew Ittigson, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a PowerPoint Presentation entitled, “Light Rail System Analysis”, highlighting: 1) Project Background; 2) Project Schedule; 3) Project Background – Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA); 4) COA – VTA Board Policy; 5) Service Design Guideline Criteria; 6) VTA Light Rail System Overview; 7) Light Rail System; 8) Light Rail System Capital and Operations Constraints; 9) Light rail System: Constraints; 10) Peer Comparison-Boardings and Route Miles; 11) Peer Comparison-Boardings Per Revenue Hour; 12) Ridership Growth;
13) Market Analysis; 14) Existing Travel Patterns-Total Trips; 15) Existing Travel Patterns-LRT (Light Rail) Trips; 16) Market Opportunities-Near Term; 17) Potential Solutions; 18) Draft Scenario; and 19) Next Steps as follows: a) Develop up to 10 scenarios for further analysis; b) Technical Analysis-VTA Model and On-Track simulation; c) Cost-Benefit Analysis; and d) Refine Scenarios.

Ex-Officio Member Taubeneck left the meeting at 3:26 p.m.
Members Armendariz and Batra and left the meeting at 3:40 p.m.
Alternate Member Stillman left the meeting at 3:41 p.m.

Alternate Member Larsen indicated since many of the concepts affect the City of San Jose, he encouraged VTA staff to work with the City of San Jose Transportation and Land Use Planning staff. He recommended VTA staff provide the presentation to the City of San Jose.

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, information on the Light Rail System Analysis was received.

14. **Regional Transit-Oriented Bike Share Pilot Program Update**

Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief update on the Regional Transit-Oriented Bike Share Pilot Program, noting the general components of the study to be conducted and timelines.

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, an update on the Bike Sharing Pilot Program was received.

15. **Advisory Committee Enhancement Update: April**

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, reported on the third Task Force meeting held on March 25, 2009. In reference to Best Practices for Advisory Committees, the Task Force reviewed the 36 priorities that were developed through the Subcommittee process. Ms. Loft distributed a document containing the top three priorities voted on by the Task Force Members. The Task Force Members will discuss how to implement the priorities at the April 29, 2009 meeting.

Member Dey referenced the concern about the recommendation to combine the TAC and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) about a year or two ago. He commented the discussion is now about combining the PAC and the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, a brief update on the status and progress of the Advisory Committee Enhancement process to date was received.
16. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee Report

There was no Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee Report.

OTHER

17. MTC Activities and Initiatives

There was no report on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives.

18. Committee Work Plan

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Committee Work Plan.

19. Announcements

Chairperson Witthaus announced the City of Sunnyvale has scheduled a Grand Opening on April 22, 2009, at 10:30 a.m. for its two new bicycle and pedestrian bridges.

20. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracene Y. Crenshaw, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
CALL TO ORDER
The Regular Meeting of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chairperson Abe-Koga 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>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whittum (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen King (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Cortese</td>
<td>SCC Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael F. Kotowski</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Baker (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Wang</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Wong (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Woodward</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Tucker (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Satterlee</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Carpenter (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Pirzynski</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane McNutt (Alt)</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete McHugh</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Anstandig</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Wright (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marby Lee</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Tate (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Abe-Koga</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Macias (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Burt</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Klein (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansen Chu</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Matthews</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie McLeod (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.
2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

There were no Public Presentations.

4. Committee Staff Report

Jim Lawson, Senior Policy Advisor, reported 1) VTA’s Employee Association will celebrate Cinco de Mayo on May 5, 2009, at the Cerone Division. Board Chairperson Dolly Sandoval will be the key speaker; 2) The Board will consider the Fiscal Year 2010/2011 recommended budget at the April 24, 2009 workshop; 3) The Administration & Finance Committee will hear an update on the Governance issue; 4) The High Gain Solar Pilot Project at Cerone Division is near completion. The Public Private partnership with Skyline Solar of Mountain View will provide VTA $15,000-$20,000 of electricity per year; 5) The sheep and goats grazing project at Cerone are doing an exemplary job; and 6) Provided a brief overview of the April 2, 2009 Board of Director’s Regular meeting.

Scott Haywood, Policy and Communications Manager, provided an update on the American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and the various funds that have been or are expected to be allocated to Santa Clara County to date. These funds include revenues for transit rehabilitation, local streets & roads, ramp meters for I-280 and the SR 237/I-880 HOT Express Connector project.

Member Moylan requested clarification how the projects were selected. Mr. Haywood stated the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) identified the selected projects as Regional priorities.

Steven Fisher, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief overview of the High Speed Train (HST) Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Outreach Strategy and Schedule.

Mr. Fisher commented on the proposed Scoping, Alternatives Analysis, Draft Environmental Document, and Final Environmental Document. He recognized the agency coordination that will include regional, county, city planning agencies, transportation agencies, State, and Federal resource agencies.

Alternate Member Wright inquired about public outreach and public opinion regarding the HST. Mr. Fisher responded public as well as neighborhood meetings have been held regarding the scoping process.

Member Burt commented the Ad-Hoc Coalition of Peninsula Cities in Santa Clara County and San Mateo Counties meet periodically to discuss the HST.

5. Chairperson’s Report

Vice Chairperson Page provided a brief summary of his report to the Board of Directors the March 12, 2009 PAC meeting.
6. **City Grouping Report**
   There was no City Grouping Report.

**BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

7. **Minutes of March 12, 2009**
   
   M/S/C (Pirzynski/Page) to approve the Minutes of March 12, 2009. Member Moylan and Alternate Member Wright abstained.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

8. **Adopt 2009 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan**
   
   Steven Fisher, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief overview of the BRT highlighting: 1) Background; 2) Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives; 3) Service Design Guidelines; 4) Explanation of the Two Tiers of BRT Service; 5) Vision of VTA BRT Branding; 6) Corridor Evaluation; 7) Transit Sustainability Policy Update; and 8) Ridership Updates.

   Mr. Fisher further reported on the following: 1) Operating Cost Estimates, 2) Capital Improvement Analysis; 3) Design Principles; and 4) Overview of the proposed corridors and public outreach efforts.

   Alternate Member Wright requested clarification regarding BRT costs in comparison to Light Rail costs. Mr. Fisher stated BRT costs would be more economical than Light Rail.

   M/S/C (Pirzynski/Wright) to adopt the 2009 VTA Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan.

   
   John Ristow, Chief Congestion Management Agency Officer, provided a brief report highlighting: 1) Background; 2) Responsibilities of the Congestion Management Agencies (CMA) noting the Management Program must contain the following elements: Capital Improvement Program (CIP), Congestion Management Program (CMP) Conformance, and Land Use and Transportation Integration.

   Mr. Ristow provided an overview of the Work Program, the CMP Budget and Fee Process, and Development Impact Fee/Deficiency Plans.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Member Burt requested clarification regarding the different incentives and mandates created by the CMA.

**On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga** and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Draft Congestion Management Work Program.

10. **Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Update: April**

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, provided a report regarding the Advisory Committee Enhancement Update for April.

Ms. Loft reported the ACE Task Force held a meeting on March 25, 2009 to discuss the Advisory Councils booklet and identify each member’s 6 most important items and those to be removed from the “Items for Discussion list.”

**On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Advisory Committee Enhancement Update: April.

11. **Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Report**

Member Moylan commented the ACE Task Force is not unified in its recommendations. Ms. Loft agreed.

**On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga** and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Report.

**OTHER**

12. **Committee Work Plan**

*On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga* and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Work Plan.

13. **Announcements**

There were no Announcements

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

*On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga* and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5: 40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline F. Golzio, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors