THE FOCUS OF THIS BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING IS THE FISCAL YEAR 2010-2011 BUDGET.

ANY ITEM REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA WILL BE DEFERRED TO THE NEXT REGULAR BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING SCHEDULED FOR JANUARY 7, 2010.

PLEASE CONTACT THE OFFICE OF THE BOARD SECRETARY AT (408) 321-5680 OR E-MAIL: BOARD.SECRETARY@VTA.ORG IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS.
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. RECEIVE NOMINATIONS FOR AND ELECT A VICE CHAIRPERSON FOR A TERM TO EXPIRE ON JANUARY 7, 2010 WHEN THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS WILL ELECT A NEW SLATE OF OFFICERS.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

4. AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS
   ACTION ITEM - Approve the attached resolutions of appreciation for outgoing VTA Board Chairperson and Board Members.

5. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS
   This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Board of Directors on any item within the Boards 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.

6. REPORT FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER (Verbal Report)

7. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON (Verbal Report)

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


CONSENT AGENDA

10. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of November 5, 2009.

11. ACTION ITEM - Approve the 2010 VTA Board of Directors Meeting Schedule.


14. ACTION ITEM - Approve the project list to program Community Design & Transportation Program Capital Grants as shown in Attachment A.
15. ACTION ITEM - Approve the 2010 STIP Program as presented by VTA staff in this memorandum.

16. ACTION ITEM - Modify the criteria used to evaluate and select projects for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager fund and review the status of ongoing Santa Clara County TFCA projects.

17. ACTION ITEM - Adopt the 2009 Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP).

18. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council of San Benito County Governments to formalize the Mobility Partnership committee to provide direction on the development of a SR 152 Trade Corridor and a new alignment of SR 152 between SR 156 and US 101.

19. INFORMATION ITEM - Review high-speed rail bills that were introduced in the California State Legislature in 2009.

20. ACTION ITEM - Approve the reappointments of Emma Eljas (2010-2011), Sandra Gouveia (2010-2011), Troy Hernandez (2009-2010), Martin Lasich (2010-2011), Aaron Morrow (2009-2010), Thomas Slack (2009-2010), and Barbara Stahl (2010-2011) to the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) for specified two-year terms. Each of these incumbents represents persons with disabilities. Approve the appointments of Donald Hunter (2010-completing the second year of a two-year term recently vacated) and Walter Schinke (2010-completing the second year of a two-year term) to the CTA for specified terms, representing persons with disabilities.

Approve the reappointments of the Independence Network (2009-2010), Los Gatos Senior Center (2010-2011), Silicon Valley Independent Living Center (2009-2010), and Vista Center for the Blind & Visually Impaired (2010-2011) and the appointment of the Barbara Lee Senior Center in Milpitas (2010-2011) to the CTA for specified two-year terms.

21. ACTION ITEM - Ratify the following new appointments and reappointments to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee to a two-year terms starting December 2009:

**New Appointment**
- Erik Wilhelmsen, Town of Los Gatos
- Jim Bell, City of San Jose

**Reappointment**
- Corinne Winter, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
- Carl Hagenmaier, City of Los Altos
22. ACTION ITEM - Review and accept the Fiscal Year 2010 Quarterly Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the period ending September 30, 2009.

23. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute an agreement with UBS Global Asset Management for the management of the US Core Real Estate portfolio portion of SCVTA - ATU Pension Plan assets.

24. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Lamar Corporation to sell, display and manage the advertising program on VTA Bus and Light Rail Vehicles for a three-year term beginning on January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2012, with an option for VTA to extend the contract for two additional one-year periods for 2013 and 2014.

25. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Shimmick Transit, the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of $5,833,770 for the construction of the Caltrain Safety Improvements - JPB Crossings. This contract is 100% Measure A funded.


27. ACTION ITEM - Approve the attached resolution to amend the Joint Powers Agreement for the Administration of the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program dated December 1, 1994 (JPA), and direct staff to forward the amendment to each member agency and the County of Santa Clara for their approval.

REGULAR AGENDA

28. ACTION ITEM –
   1. Reduce appropriation for the VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Operating budget in the amount of $7.5 million in FY 2010 and $7.5 million FY2011; and,
   2. Reduce appropriation in the Measure A Transit Improvement Program budget for the procurement of 40 articulated hybrid diesel electric buses by $25.0 million from $43.25 million to $18.25 million and increase appropriation to direct such funds to support VTA operations; and,
   3. Waive the provisions of the VTA Transit Enterprise Debt Reduction Policy restricting the uses of the Debt Reduction Fund and authorize use of the Debt Reduction Funds for operating requirements for a period not to exceed June 30, 2011; and,
   4. Direct staff to return to the Board with additional recommendations in April 2010 if anticipated STA funding and updated Sales Tax Revenue projections are insufficient to provide FY 2011 ending Operating Reserves of $20.0 million; and,
5. Appoint an Ad-hoc Committee of the Board of Directors consisting of 3-5 members, supported by a representative group of business, labor, Advisory Committees and other stakeholders, to develop recommendations for consideration at a future board meeting that address VTA’s structural deficit beyond FY 2011 to insure the continued sustainability of transit services in Santa Clara County.

OTHER ITEMS

29. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

30. MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE HISTORY MATRIX

31. 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

32. 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)

33. 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
34. 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

35. ANNOUNCEMENTS

36. ADJOURN
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Board Secretary Sandra Weymouth

SUBJECT: Board Resolutions of Appreciation

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the attached resolutions of appreciation for outgoing VTA Board Members.

BACKGROUND:

VTA is fortunate to have local elected officials who are willing to serve on the VTA Board of Directors. Serving on VTA’s Board requires dedicating additional time and energy beyond their regular duties required as council members.

DISCUSSION:

The attached resolutions are a token of VTA’s sincere appreciation for the dedicated service of our outgoing board members. Through their valued leadership, VTA is able to provide transportation services, program and projects to the citizens of Santa Clara County.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no financial impact.

Prepared by: Scott Haywood
Memo No. 2396
RESOLUTION

By the Board of Directors of the SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA) a Special District of the State of California relative to commending the

Honorable Dolly Sandoval

WHEREAS, Dolly Sandoval is completing her term on the VTA Board of Directors after many years of dedicated and responsible service representing the Cities of Cupertino, Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos and Campbell; and

WHEREAS, She served with distinction as chair for 2009 and vice chair for 2008 of the VTA Board of Directors; and

WHEREAS, She served as chair of the Transit Planning and Operations Committee; and

WHEREAS, She provided leadership in advancing VTA’s capital program, including reentry of the BART project in the federal New Starts funding process; and

WHEREAS, She oversaw the completion of constructing and opening of the Mary Avenue Bicycle & Pedestrian Bridge, the De Anza Transit Center and the Light Rail Platform Upgrades;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the VTA Board of Directors hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to Dolly Sandoval for her exemplary service; and

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

ADOPTED by the VTA Board of Directors this tenth day of December 2009.

_____________________________
Sam Liccardo, Vice Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
RESOLUTION

By the Board of Directors of the SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA) a Special District of the State of California relative to commending the

Honorable David Casas

WHEREAS, David Casas is completing his second term on the VTA Board of Directors after many years of dedicated and responsible service representing the Cities of Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, and Palo Alto; and

WHEREAS, He served with distinction on the Administration and Finance Committee; and

WHEREAS, He served with dedication as co-chairperson of the Governance Subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, He served as a founding member of the VTA Audit Committee; and

WHEREAS, He provided leadership in selecting VTA’s Auditor General; and

WHEREAS, He tirelessly worked on financial and auditing matters to improve VTA’s finances;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the VTA Board of Directors hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to David Casas for his exemplary service; and

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

ADOPTED by the VTA Board of Directors this tenth day of December 2009.

______________________________
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
RESOLUTION

By the Board of Directors of the SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA) a Special District of the State of California relative to commending the

Honorable Yoriko Kishimoto

WHEREAS, Yoriko Kishimoto is completing her term on the VTA Board of Directors after many years of dedicated and responsible service representing the Cities of Palo Alto, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, and Mountain View; and

WHEREAS, She served with distinction as Vice Chairperson for the Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee; and

WHEREAS, She served with dedication on the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority Governing Board; and

WHEREAS, She served on the Dumbarton Rail Corridor Policy Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, She served as Chair for the North County City Grouping; and

WHEREAS, She tirelessly worked on multi-modal transportation planning issues, including the start of VTA’s Bikeshare Program;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the VTA Board of Directors hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to Yoriko Kishimoto for her exemplary service; and

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

ADOPTED by the VTA Board of Directors this tenth day of December 2009.

_____________________________
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
RESOLUTION

By the Board of Directors of the SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA) a Special District of the State of California relative to commending the

Honorable Greg Sellers

WHEREAS, Greg Sellers is completing his term on the VTA Board of Directors after many years of dedicated and responsible service representing the Cities of Morgan Hill, Gilroy and Milpitas; and

WHEREAS, He served with distinction as chair of the Transit Planning and Operations Committee; and

WHEREAS, He served with dedication as co-chairperson of the Governance Subcommittee; and

WHEREAS, He served as a founding member of the VTA Audit Committee; and

WHEREAS, He served on the Nominating Committee; and

WHEREAS, He worked tirelessly to bring transit improvements to Morgan Hill, including the launch of the Community Bus Program;

NOW THEREFOR BE IT RESOLVED, that the VTA Board of Directors hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to Greg Sellers for his exemplary service; and

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

ADOPTED by the VTA Board of Directors this tenth day of December 2009.

____________________________ 
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
RESOLUTION

By the Board of Directors of the SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA) a Special District of the State of California relative to commending the

Honorable Dominic Caserta

WHEREAS, Dominic Caserta is completing his term on the VTA Board of Directors after many years of dedicated and responsible service representing the Cities of Santa Clara, Palo Alto, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Sunnyvale, and Mountain View; and

WHEREAS, He served with distinction as Vice Chairperson of the Transit Planning & Operations Committee; and

WHEREAS, He served with dedication on the Caltrain Capital Needs Study Committee; and

WHEREAS, He participated in the development and adoption of the Valley Transportation Plan 2035 to guide transportation planning and investment over the next 25 years; and

WHEREAS, He worked diligently to secure federal and state stimulus funds totaling $100 million;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the VTA Board of Directors hereby commends and expresses its sincere appreciation to Dominic Caserta for his exemplary service; and

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

ADOPTED by the VTA Board of Directors this tenth day of December 2009.

______________________________________________
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, November 5, 2009

MINUTES

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>Present</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>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Livengood</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</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>Dolly Sandoval</td>
<td>Chairperson</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>
</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. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Chairperson Sandoval made the following changes to the Agenda: 1) Move Agenda Item #27, Report from the Nominating Committee, before any other Action Items; and 2) Rearranged the order Regular Agenda to start with Agenda Item #19, Joint Development Portfolio & Priority Schedule, followed by Agenda Item #20, VTA Governance, and Agenda Item #18, Appointment of AD-HOC Committee of the Board.

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

3. AWARDS AND COMMENDATION

Employees of the Month for November 2009

Chairperson Sandoval recognized and presented award to Jerry Horner, Technical Trainer, Guadalupe Administration; and Kirpal Atwal, Coach Operator, Chaboya Division, as Employees of the Month for November 2009.

Board Member Kishimoto took her seat at 5:42 p.m.

4. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

John Vandervort, Interested Citizen, expressed concern about buses that run ahead of schedule, drivers who do not know certain stops, and drivers who do not call-out stops. He recognized two Line 63 bus drivers named Sue and Peggy for providing excellent customer service.

Alice Frayne, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding the lack of lighting in front of the County Building.

Joyce Weissman, Interested Citizen, expressed concern on VTA’s Revised Service Reduction Plan. She requested an evening southbound trip for Line 63 departing downtown San Jose around 10:00 p.m. to Almaden Expressway and Camden. Her comment card was accompanied by a petition with 303 signatures.

Dimetri Grant, VTA Employee, encouraged clarity and honesty from staff regarding VTA’s financial crisis. He acknowledged the financial challenge VTA faces and recommended the following: 1) continue to provide transit for the County; 2) support additional tax to create funding for transportation; 3) encouraged the public to utilize and promote public transportation; and 4) avoid laying off highly trained mechanics.

5. General Manager’s Report

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

- Ridership for the month of September 2009 continuous to go on a downward trend due to the recession and unemployment. Overall system average weekday
boarding is down 9.3 percent, bus boarding is down 9.2 percent, and Light Rail boarding is down 9.7 percent.

- VTA’s inter-agency partners ridership figures are also on a downward trend. Caltrain boarding is down nine percent, Altamont Commuter Express boarding is down 26 percent, Monterey-San Jose Express boarding is down 32 percent, Highway 17 Express is down seven percent, and Dumbarton Express is down four percent.

- Track replacement in downtown San Jose continues. Bus bridges are in place to maintain service. This weekend, the work takes place at the area of the Children’s Discovery Museum, Convention Center, Paseo de San Antonio, and Santa Clara Street.

- Board Secretary Deborah Harrington is leaving VTA mid December and will be replaced by Sandra Weymouth.

- Requested the Board review the list of dates for the Proposed 2010 Meeting Schedule, which will be on the December Board of Directors meeting agenda for adoption.

6. Chairperson’s Report

There was no report from the Chairperson.

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

There was no report from the Citizens Advisory Committee Chairperson.

8. Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairperson’s Report

Chuck Page, PAC Vice Chairperson, provided the following report about the October 8, 2009 PAC meeting: 1) a vote of nine to two, recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt the new funding program for County Expressways Pedestrian Projects; 2) recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt the Joint Development Portfolio & Priority Schedule; 3) PAC will be reviewing recommendations on the Light Rail Systems Analysis at its November meeting; and 4) received update on the status of the Silicon Valley Express Lane Program and discussed future policy issues.

The Agenda was taken out of order.

27. Nominating Committee Report

Board Member Gage reported that as per the rotation schedule, the position of the VTA Chair for the 2010 term is assigned to one of the San Jose representatives and the position of Vice Chair is assigned to one of the small city group representatives. Since the small city groups have not completed their appointments, the Committee will present its recommended nomination for Chair and Vice Chair at the December meeting. In addition, any Board Member can nominate from the floor at that time.

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole accepted the report from the Nominating Committee.
19. **Joint Development Portfolio & Priority Schedule**

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer, provided a presentation highlighting the following:

Board Member Kishimoto inquired if the staff recommendation includes the condition proposed by the Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee. Mr. Ristow noted the CMPP proposed evaluating parking replacement on transit station properties, improve access to transit stations, determine the parking ratio, and develop multi-modal transit stations that are pedestrian and bicycle friendly. He stated policies should be in place before the properties are developed.

Chairperson Sandoval inquired about the needed policies for the Joint Development. Mr. Ristow responded the policies would be site specific with guiding principles on parking.

Board Member Gage recommended conducting an analysis and developing a long range plan to ensure that there will be no future need for properties sold under the Joint Development. Mr. Ristow responded the disposition of properties would be presented to the Board on a case-by-case basis with complete analysis. He explained that properties contained on the list for disposition are not being used for transit operations. He added that an analysis would be conducted on properties located on transit sites to ensure that transit operation and service are not affected.

Board Member Kalra took his seat at 6:12 p.m. and a quorum was declared.

Board Member Sellers commented the Joint Development is good way to generate income for VTA. He noted the property in the City of Morgan Hill that is under the Joint Development received a lot of good offers from developers through the request for proposal process. He stated the following goals are being met: 1) Transit Oriented Development; 2) Multi-modal hub; and 3) Parking concerns.

Chairperson Sandoval inquired about the Joint Development process and policy. Mr. Ristow responded a policy is already in place. He stated revenues from the Joint Development would go on a separate account to be used for Joint Development or other budgetary purpose under the Board’s direction.

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, stated revenues from the Joint Development would go into VTA’s development fund. The policy states that VTA’s development fund should be utilized to support future developments in purchasing properties. He noted the Board has authority to allocate the use of those funds under the budget cycle. He stressed staff recognizes the value of the properties and would conduct a detailed analysis to convert them into productive assets.
Vice Chairperson Liccardo took his seat at 6:17 p.m.

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to approve the Joint Development Portfolio & Priority Schedule as recommended by staff and amended to include the following: 1) evaluate parking replacement on transit station properties; 2) improve access to transit stations; 3) determine the parking ratio; 4) develop multi-modal transit stations that are pedestrian and bicycle friendly; and 5) conduct an analysis and study a long range plan on properties under the Joint Development.

CONSENT AGENDA

9. Board of Directors’ Regular Meeting Minutes of October 1, 2009

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to approve the Board of Directors’ Regular Meeting Minutes of October 1, 2009.

10. Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Member Appointment

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to ratify the appointment of Aaron Faupell as the City of Milpitas representative on the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC).

11. (Moved to the Regular Agenda)

Contract Award: Four to Six Color Offset Printing Services

12. Funding Program for County Expressway Pedestrian Projects

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to adopt New Funding Program for County Expressways Pedestrian Projects.

13. Ramp Metering – Professional Services Contract Amendment

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract amendment with Mark Thomas & Company in an amount not to exceed $303,395, for a new contract amount of $1,244,677 for engineering services to implement ramp metering on I-880 between SR 237 and I-280 in the PM peak period.


M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to adopt revisions to the distribution strategy of the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) local streets and roads funds to accommodate cost savings.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
15. **1996 Measure B Transportation Improvement Program – Landscaping and Long Term Maintenance Project**

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Restoration Resources, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $276,060 for the Landscaping and Long Term Maintenance Project.

16. **Express Lanes Program Update**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Express Lanes Program Update was received.

17. **Security Guard Qualification and Training Internal Audit**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Security Guard Qualification and Training Internal Audit Report was received.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

20. **VTA Governance**

Jim Lawson, Government Affairs Manager, provided background information regarding the VTA Governance. He reported there are two alternatives for the Board’s consideration.

a. Reconfiguring the Small City Groupings – based on population and geography.
   - North West – One seat comprised of Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Mountain View and Palo Alto.
   - North East – Two seats comprised of Milpitas, Santa Clara and Sunnyvale.
   - South County – One seat comprised of Gilroy and Morgan Hill.
   - West Valley – One seat comprised of Campbell, Cupertino, Los Gatos, Monte Sereno and Saratoga
   - The groupings for the City of San Jose and Santa Clara County would remain unchanged.

b. Selection by VTA Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) – the PAC will select the five Board Members and three Alternates to represent the small cities.

   Board Member Pyle took her seat at 6:21 p.m.

Ex-Officio Board Member Chu stated the minutes of the Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee that tackled the Governance was presented to the Council of the City of Sunnyvale for discussion. He noted the Council voted four to one, with two abstentions to retain the current policy that states: 1) Recommend that VTA have a directly elected Board; 2) Follow the PAC proposal; and 3) Remain the status quo.

Board Member Reed took his seat at 6:25 p.m.
Board Member Gage stressed the importance of moving forward with the Governance.

Board Member Herrera took her seat at 6:28 p.m.

Bob Livengood, Mayor of the City of Milpitas, expressed that Option 1a, reconfigure the Small City Groupings, is the best alternative for the City of Milpitas. He stated that after the next census, the Cities of Milpitas, Sunnyvale and Santa Clara may be the second, third and fourth largest city in the County. The cities in the proposed North East Group have commonality, sharing a Light Rail line and a transportation corridor along SR 237.

Pete McHugh, Vice Mayor of the City of Milpitas, expressed that he is in favor of Option 1a. He stressed on the commonality of interest between the cities in the proposed North East Group. He noted the proposed North East Group has a transit oriented development that would contribute to the success of the transportation system.

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, expressed his support for Option 1b, selection by VTA Policy Advisory Committee.

Margaret Abe-Koga, Mayor of the City of Mountain View, expressed her support for Option 1b. She stated that Option 1b eliminates the issue of board member inexperience with transportation and parochialism.

Board Member Caserta expressed his appreciation to staff, Jim Lawson, Board Member Sellers and Alternate Board Member Moylan for their work on the Governance. He stated the Council of the City of Santa Clara unanimously supports Option 1a. He also recognized the need to move on with the Governance selection.

Board Member Sellers expressed the importance of having representation from all parts of the County which Option 1a provides. He noted that Option 1a may not be the perfect solution but it offers an improvement to the current governance structure.

Board Member Kishimoto stated Option 1b was an innovative solution developed by the Governance Committee. She noted Option 1b is a process that would empower Advisory Committees and give them a role in policy making. The delegates selected by the PAC would be chosen by their contribution and knowledge of transportation.

Board Member Reed expressed his support for Option 1a. He stated the proportionate representation issue because of the population spread between cities is not a valid reason not to support Option 1a. He noted if the Board representation is based on population, the City of San Jose is being misrepresented having 55 percent of the County’s population.
Vice Chairperson Liccardo recognized the comment made by Board Member Kishimoto to engage the PAC, but expressed concern on the impact that proportionate voting would bring. He stated that he would be supporting Option 1a.

Alternate Board Member Moylan expressed support for Option 1b. He stressed that Option 1b was recommended by a large majority of the PAC and the Governance Committee on a vote of five to one. He stated that Option 1b solves the following: 1) Milpitas, Gilroy, and Morgan Hill (MGM) problem; 2) provincialism problem; and 3) expertise problem. He stated that Option 1a does not solve the three city grouping problem, and it violates the principle of equal representation. He stressed the importance of having a regional perspective in selecting Board representation.

Board Member Kalra expressed his support to Option 1a. He recognized that Option 1a is not the perfect solution, but it is an improvement to the current structure. He expressed concern that Option 1b does not produce a represented outcome. He noted that with a regional perspective, the structure of Option 1a would be a success.

Chairperson Sandoval expressed appreciation for the work done by Board Member Sellers and Alternate Board Member Moylan on the governance. She noted the cities in the West Valley Group all expressed support for Option 1a.

M/S/F (Kishimoto/Moylan) on a vote of 2 ayes to 9 noes to substitute the motion on the floor to vote on Option 1a, reconfigure the small city groupings to include a new city group comprised of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and Milpitas, that would appoint two Board Members and one alternate; and replace it with Option 1b, implement a new process where the VTA Policy Advisory Committee will select the five Board Members and Alternates to represent the small cities. Board Member Caserta, Board Member Gage, Board Member Herrera, Board Member Kalra, Board Member Pyle, Board Member Reed, Board Member Sellers, Vice Chairperson Liccardo and Chairperson Sandoval opposed.

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) on a vote of 9 ayes to 2 noes to consider Option 1a, reconfigure the small city groupings to include a new city group comprised of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and Milpitas, that would appoint two Board Members and one alternate. Board Member Kishimoto and Alternate Board Member Moylan opposed.

M/S/C (Caserta/Liccardo) a resolution to amend the Joint Powers Agreement for the Administration of the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program will be prepared by staff for the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors’ meeting.

NOTE: M/S/F MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND FAILED.
18. **Appoint of AD-HOC Committee of the Board**

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, provided background information on the Ad Hoc Financial Stability Committee established in December 2002. He noted most of the work of that Ad Hoc Committee is still relevant, especially the recommendations made regarding revenues. He stressed several Board Members expressed that the entire Board should be involved in setting the direction to address VTA’s financial condition. Staff recommends that a subcommittee not be formed tonight to allow staff to go back and work on a series of strategies, actions and options to present to the Board for consideration at the December 10, 2009 meeting. Staff would then work with the entire Board or a subcommittee and invite stakeholders to participate.

Mr. Burns provided a presentation highlighting the following: 1) FY10 and FY11 adopted budget appropriation levels by funding source; 2) FY10 and FY11 adopted budget measure taken; 3) Sales tax related revenue update; 4) Current updated picture appropriation levels by funding source; 5) Sources and uses of funds comparison; and 6) Next steps.

Board Member Caserta inquired about the stakeholders that would participate in the committee. Mr. Burns responded the previous Ad Hoc Committee had representatives from labor, business community, advisory committees and staff.

Ex-Officio Board Member Chu inquired if the dollar figures presented include the funds from the California Transportation Commission (CTC) lawsuit. Mr. Burns responded the funds from the CTC lawsuit are not included in the presentation, but staff expects that VTA would receive some funds. More details would be presented at the December 10, 2009 meeting. He explained the amount of funds diverted by the State of California from the transit industry for the last four years is around three billion dollars.

Alternate Board Member Moylan inquired on the rationale behind establishing an Ad Hoc Committee. Mr. Burns responded VTA is facing a similar financial condition back in 2002 and 2003. He added the success of the Ad Hoc Committee formed back then is the rationale to form a similar Ad Hoc Committee. He explained staff would present strategies to the entire Board in December and pursue the Board’s direction.

Board Member Kishimoto provided the following suggestions and requested for a report back: 1) create a sustainable model for transportation and transportation planning; 2) generate demand for transportation and create a sustainable transportation funding; 3) envision a pedestrian and bicycle friendly communities; 4) revisit Capital Programs and capital spending; and 5) have a VTA representative on the Altamont Corridor Committee for the High Speed Rail.

Board Member Gage noted that he will be representing VTA for the Altamont Corridor Committee for the High Speed Rail. He stressed the importance of involving the whole Board on making decisions regarding VTA’s financial condition.
Mark Knollmueller, VTA Employee, expressed concern about the threats of layoffs and cuts to employee benefits. He suggested cutting the budget for paratransit. He requested an oversight committee that would include members from Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), and Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA).

Karen Grimes, VTA Employee speaking in behalf of David White, expressed concern about layoff threats even after employees agreed to furloughs and raise freezes.

Karen Grimes, VTA Employee, commented that there is overspending in VTA. She stressed the importance of involving labor groups if an Ad Hoc Committee will be created.

Ralph Rapp, VTA Employee, requested to consider labor groups as one of the stakeholders if an Ad Hoc Committee will be appointed.

Steve Barber, VTA Employee, expressed concern regarding overspending in VTA, contracting of consultants, and outsourcing of jobs. He stated that involving labor groups in the Ad Hoc Committee will provide the Board with more information and options in improving VTA’s financial condition.

Phil Asgedom, VTA Employee, encouraged the Board to create an Ad Hoc Committee and involve stakeholders before a declaring a fiscal emergency.

Tammy Dhanota, VTA Employee, expressed concern regarding the continuous decrease of SEIU members in the VTA workforce. She stressed the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee is the best hope for employees to have a fair leadership in the VTA Organization.

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, commented that reduction of service to make up for the budget shortfall is not a good idea. He noted that Santa Clara County could not take any further reduction beyond what has been approved. He recommended finding other ways to reduce cost or increase revenue. He reported the one car Light Rail train from Old Ironsides and Tasman recently had a lot of standees.

John Carlson, AFSCME Chapter President, comment that all the unions are present at this Board meeting for one cause, and that is to support the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee. He stated that without the Ad Hoc Committee, employees will not be heard. He expressed that funds used to purchase buses should have been used for employees.

Jeffrey Ballou, VTA Employee, commented that AFSCME supports the creation of an Ad Hoc Committee. He expressed AFSCME’s willingness to participate if an Ad Hoc Committee is formed. He provided the following suggestions to avoid the economic emergency: 1) Measure A allocation to transit operations should be increased; 2) use stimulus funds to sustain VTA jobs instead of purchasing buses; and 3) provide monetary incentive to perspective retirees.
Ross Signorino, Interested Citizen, inquired if there are projects that would be held back due to the financial crisis and would it affect federal and state funding. Mr. Burns responded that projects and funding would be part of the strategies presented at the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors meeting.

Mr. Burns explained the use of stimulus funds has limitations and only ten percent could be used for operations. He stated his commitment to replace the bus fleet which represents a key part of VTA infrastructure.

Chairperson Sandoval provided the following comments: 1) Stressed the importance of appointing an Ad Hoc Committee at the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors meeting; 2) Include stakeholders to participate in the committee; 3) Expressed concern regarding the continuous decrease in ridership; and 4) Stressed the importance of having proper infrastructure when the economy recovers.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo inquired if VTA have a process enabling its employees to provide cost saving suggestions. Mr. Burns responded the suggestion process would be reactivated on the VTA website.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo requested to receive information regarding the cost saving suggestions received by staff. Mr. Burns responded a report would be prepared which would also include the results from the previous suggestion process and staff’s response.

Board Members Kalra and Herrera noted the Board’s need to receive input from the bargaining units. They stressed the importance of hearing cost saving suggestions from the employees, and involving the stakeholders in the Ad Hoc Committee.

Ex-Officio Board Member Chu commented that per Congress’s stipulation, the federal stimulus funds cannot be used for operating expenses except for a limited portion. VTA used the allowable amount, which is ten percent for operations related expenses.

Board Member Gage suggested following staff’s recommendation to defer the appointment of an Ad Hoc Committee, present strategies at the December 10, 2009 meeting incorporating the comments and recommendations previously made.

**On Order of Chairperson Sandoval** and there being no objection, the Board of Directors supported staff’s recommendation go back and work on a series of strategies, actions and options to present to the Board for consideration at the December 10, 2009 meeting.

11. **Contract Award: Four to Six Color Offset Printing Services**

Vice Chairperson Liccardo expressed concern on the amount of maps being printed out. He asked if there is a way to reduce the contract award by printing fewer maps without impacting our customers? Michael T. Burns, General Manager, explained the contract award was already reduced by 30 percent, this is on top of staff having reduced its use of paper by 20 percent. He noted staff continues to look for opportunities to reduce printing cost and continually evaluates these numbers.
Vice Chairperson Liccardo inquired if a study was conducted to determine how the public get route information, and if they need to have their own copy of the system route map. Greta Helm, Chief External Affairs Officer, responded that type of study has not been conducted. She provided information on the continuous reduction in printing maps. She noted staff is shifting to use the internet as a means to get system route information, but an ample amount of maps are still printed out for people who do not have access to the internet.

M/S/C (Liccardo/Sellers) to authorize the General Manager to execute on-call task order contracts with three printing firms for four to six color printing services to be utilized on an as-needed basis. Each contract shall be for a period of up to three years, with an option to extend the contract for an additional two-year term. The total amount for all three contracts shall not exceed $1 million for a total of five years.

OTHER ITEMS

21. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, inquired what fare media would be accepted on the two substitute bus trips on the Mountain View leg of the Light Rail. He commented riders should not be inconvenienced by paying two fares to ride Light Rail. Chairperson Sandoval responded that issue has been taken into consideration and riders would only need to pay one fare.

22. Monthly Legislative History Matrix

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Monthly Legislative History Matrix was received.

23. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Administration and Finance Committee

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the October 15, 2009 Administration and Finance Committee Meeting Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda packet.

B. Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the October 15, 2009 Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee Meeting Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda packet.

C. Transit Planning and Operations Committee

There was no report from the Transit Planning and Operations Committee.
D. Audit Committee

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the October 1, 2009 Audit Committee Meeting Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda packet.

24. Reports (Unapproved Minutes) from Advisory Committees

A. Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA)

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the October 7, 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 October 7, 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 October 7, 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 October 8, 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 October 8, 2009 Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting Minutes were accepted as contained in the Agenda packet.
25. REPORTS FROM JOINT POWERS BOARDS (JPBs) & REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

A. Peninsula Corridor JPB

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the November 5, 2009 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 October 28, 2009 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.

26. REPORTS FROM VTA POLICY ADVISORY BOARDS (PABs)

A. Vasona Light Rail PAB

There is no report from the Vasona Light Rail PAB.

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

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

C. Downtown East Valley PAB

There is no report from the Downtown East Valley PAB.

D. Highway PAB South

There is no report from the Highway PAB South.
28. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.

29. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Dairesco, Board Assistant
Office of the Board Secretary
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: N/A

FROM: Sandra A. Weymouth, Board Secretary

SUBJECT: 2010 VTA Board of Directors Meeting Schedule

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the 2010 VTA Board of Directors Meeting Schedule.

BACKGROUND:

The VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting is generally scheduled on the first Thursday of the month in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, or as otherwise posted. There are a few exceptions to the regular schedule in 2010.

1. Two Workshop Meetings are proposed to be held on Friday, March 26 and Friday, September 24, 2010, at 9:00 a.m.

2. Two Regular Board/Workshop Meetings are proposed to be held on Friday, June 25 and Thursday, December 9, 2010 at 9:00 a.m.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact.

Prepared by: Sandra A. Weymouth
Memo No. 2397
**PROPOSED**
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
Board of Directors  
2010 Meeting Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, January 7</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 4</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, March 4</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, March 26</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Board Workshop Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, April 1</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, May 6</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, June 3</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, June 25</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board/Workshop Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, August 5</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, September 2</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, September 24</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Board Workshop Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, October 7</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 4</td>
<td>5:30 p.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, December 9</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>Regular Board/Workshop Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for July-September 2009

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

VTA has two project review programs: 1) the Development Review Program which reviews environmental documents and development proposals submitted by Member Agencies; and 2) review of the Congestion Management Program’s (CMP) Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) reports of proposed projects meeting TIA guideline requirements.

The Proactive CMP (“Proactive”) Process integrates these two VTA review processes prior to project development approval by Member Agencies. As part of the Proactive process, VTA has for a number of years produced quarterly reports on land-use approvals consisting of two parts:

- **Comments on Selected Projects Reviewed by VTA (Part 1):** A list of the projects reviewed by the Congestion Management Program and Development Review Program with relevant VTA comments.

- **City/County Responses Quarterly Report (Part 2):** A list of the projects recently approved by Member Agencies with relevant VTA comments and the Member Agency’s responses for each project that improve CMP facilities and promote alternative transportation modes.

The Discussion section below contains a summary of the July through September 2009 Proactive CMP Quarterly Report. The summary is intended to highlight key themes and topics contained in the full report. Following the summary, the full report is provided as an attachment.

DISCUSSION:

**Summary of the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report - July through September 2009**

The following are highlights of several items in this edition of the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report:
VTA commented on 19 projects between July and September 2009. The largest number of projects were in the City of San Jose (4 projects), the City of Gilroy (4 projects) and the City of Morgan Hill (3 projects).

Of the 19 projects upon which VTA commented, 13 included environmental documents such as Notices of Preparation (NOPs), Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs), and Negative Declarations or Mitigated Negative Declarations. Four projects involved Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) reports or TIA Notification Forms, and four involved other planning submittals such as Planned Development Permits, bus stop plans, informal review documents. Some projects involved the review of multiple documents this quarter (e.g., both a TIA and an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration).

Five out of the 19 projects upon which VTA commented, or about 26%, were transportation, infrastructure, or public facility projects. This includes an Urban Service Area Amendment related to future plans at Gavilan College in Gilroy, a new library in Los Gatos, roadway improvements to West Dunne Avenue in Morgan Hill, reconstruction of a library/community center in Palo Alto, and bridge work associated with flood control improvements by the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

Other key projects and plans that VTA reviewed and commented on during the past quarter included the following:

- The City of Morgan Hill Downtown Specific Plan: VTA staff expressed its support for the City’s effort to intensify land use development in downtown and encourage transit- and pedestrian-oriented uses. The comment letter also re-stated VTA’s position of maintaining Line 68’s operations on Monterey Road. In the Final Master EIR (issued in early October), the City addressed all of VTA’s comments, including deleting the text in reference to the diversion of bus service from Monterey Road to other streets. The final Specific Plan is scheduled for City Council hearing on November 4 and VTA staff will fully support the Specific Plan as amended.

- The City of Morgan Hill Circulation Element Update: The City of Morgan Hill is in the process of updating the Circulation Element of its General Plan. VTA’s comments focused on the multimodal approach and Level of Service (LOS) policy proposed by the City; the relationship of the Circulation Element Update to the South County Circulation Study; the role of transit; and automobile parking policies.

- 49ers Stadium Project in Santa Clara: The San Francisco 49ers have proposed the construction of a 68,500 seat football stadium and associated improvements in the City of Santa Clara near the intersection of Tasman Drive and Centennial Drive. VTA’s comments focused on the project location and land use/transportation integration; the Transportation Management Plan (TMP) and transit; transit demand; transit buses & shuttles; light rail; other transit services; roadway congestion and consistency with the VTA Congestion Management Program (CMP); Transportation Demand Management (TDM); and pedestrian and bicycle accommodations.
Ohlone Mixed Use Project in San Jose: A private development team has proposed the construction of up to 800 multi-family residences and 30,000 square feet of commercial use on a 8.23 acre site located in the Midtown area near the intersection of West San Carlos and Sunol Streets. VTA currently owns a portion of the project site and is in contract with the project applicant for the purchase and sale of VTA's ownership interest in that portion of the project site. VTA's comments on this project, which was at the TIA report stage last quarter, focused on transportation mitigation measures; project traffic volumes and existing transit service; pedestrian facilities; and automobile parking and TDM.

Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update: The City of San Jose is currently undertaking a comprehensive update of its General Plan, and during the past quarter circulated the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the update. VTA's comments on the NOP focused on the proposed goals and policies; the extent of analysis in the Draft EIR; land use/transportation scenario evaluation; roadway network/Complete Streets considerations; and LOS policy and protected intersections.

Three projects on which VTA previously provided comments were approved during this quarter, all three of which were located in the City of Santa Clara. The following is a brief description of VTA’s comments on the City's responses on these projects.

In July 2009, the City of Santa Clara approved the 3300 Olcott Street Office Building project, which involves the demolition of an existing 102,000 square foot industrial office/warehouse building and construction of a 179,000 square foot office building. VTA had requested that the City and the developer work to provide sidewalks along the project frontage and along the remainder of Olcott Street to connect to the existing sidewalk system on Scott Boulevard. VTA also suggested that the City require bicycle parking according to VTA's Bicycle Technical Guidelines and other TDM measures as conditions of approval of the project . The City concurred with VTA's recommendations in its responses in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, and required most of these improvements as conditions when approving the project.

In August 2009, the City of Santa Clara approved the Gallery at Central Park project, south of Kaiser Drive and west of Kiely Boulevard. This project would develop the site with 806 housing units, including 45 single-family residences, 152 townhomes, 73 row houses and 536 multi-family units. VTA's comments on the Draft EIR focused on pedestrian and bicycle connections between the project site and surrounding areas; the analysis of potential usage and impacts on VTA's nearby bus routes; impacts to a nearby bus stop; automobile parking; and the transportation analysis. In its response to VTA's comments in the Final EIR, the City addressed most of VTA's concerns - for instance, noting that City staff will continue to work with the applicant to provide pedestrian connections and stating that the project would include TDM measures such as a Transportation Coordinator and extensive information about all travel options at the leasing and sales office.
In July 2009, the City of Santa Clara approved the Scott Boulevard Office project, which involves the demolition of two vacant industrial buildings totaling 114,000 square feet and the construction of a new 5-story, 215,520 square foot Class A office building. VTA's comments focused on pedestrian access within the site and to the nearest bus stop, bicycle parking, TDM, bus stop improvements, and avoiding negative impacts to pedestrians with proposed mitigation measures at the Scott Boulevard/San Tomas Expressway intersection. The City addressed most of VTA's concerns in its response in the Final EIR, including incorporating a direct pedestrian path between the building, the existing sidewalks and the nearest bus stop, conditioning the project to provide bicycle parking consistent with VTA guidelines, including TDM measures and bus stop improvements, and evaluating possible pedestrian and cyclist safety elements in the design of the Scott/San Tomas intersection.

STANDING/ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

This item was on the regular agenda at the November CAC, BPAC, TAC, and PAC meetings. Staff gave a brief presentation at the BPAC, TAC and PAC meetings, while the item was deferred at the CAC meeting.

At BPAC, a question was raised about whether VTA considers pedestrian accommodations both along street frontages and internal to sites when it reviews projects, and staff confirmed that their review includes both.

At TAC, there were no questions or comments on this item.

At PAC, committee members had several questions and comments on the item. A comment was made regarding the extent of VTA staff comments on the 49ers Stadium project in Santa Clara, and it was also noted that three projects that VTA commented on in the City of Gilroy (Urban Service Area amendments) have been voted on and not approved by the City Council. A question was raised about whether VTA comments on land use mix as it pertains to congestion management and reducing automobile trips, and staff confirmed that their review includes this area where appropriate. A question was also raised about Transportation Demand Management (TDM)-related comments on the San Antonio Center project in Mountain View, and staff clarified that these comments applied to employees and patrons of retail uses, since the residential portion was not reviewed this past quarter.

The Congestion Management Program & Planning (CMPP) Committee considered this item as part of the Consent Agenda at its November meeting and had no discussion on the item.

Prepared By: Robert Swierk
Memo No. 2066
VTA Development Review Program

Proactive CMP Quarterly Report
July, August and September of 2009
# Development Review Projects Summary

## July – September of 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map No.</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Project Name/Location</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Doc. Type</th>
<th>VTA Comment Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>AMBAG0901</td>
<td>2010 Monterey Bay Area MTP</td>
<td>Regional transportation plan for Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito counties.</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Consistency with VTA long range transportation plan projects; potential future developments near county borders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>GI0505</td>
<td>Machado Subdivision</td>
<td>Construction of a 16-lot commercial/industrial subdivision on a 59.7-acre lot.</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Transportation analysis; bus service; TIA report; on-site planning and design; bicycle accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>GI0901</td>
<td>Lucky Day Urban Service Area Amendment</td>
<td>Amendment to Gilroy's USA boundary to include 284.7-acre project site. No development is proposed at this time.</td>
<td>DSEIR</td>
<td>Transportation analysis; development design &amp; land use mix; greenhouse gas reduction &amp; alternative transp. improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>GI0902</td>
<td>Wren Investors Urban Service Area Amendment</td>
<td>Amendment to Gilroy's USA boundary to include 48-acre site. No development is proposed at this time.</td>
<td>DSEIR</td>
<td>Transportation analysis; development design &amp; land use mix; greenhouse gas reduction &amp; alternative transp. improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>GI0903</td>
<td>Gavilan Joint Community College District Urban Service Area Amendment</td>
<td>Amendment to Gilroy's USA boundary to include 148-acre site. No development is proposed at this time, but College has conceptual site plan for development.</td>
<td>DSEIR</td>
<td>Transportation analysis; development design &amp; land use mix; greenhouse gas reduction &amp; alternative transp. improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>LG0902</td>
<td>Town Library</td>
<td>Demolish 6 houses and construct a 30,000 SF library on a 1.86-acre site.</td>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>TIA report; transportation impacts &amp; mitigation measures; transit analysis; bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>MH0901</td>
<td>Morgan Hill General Plan Circulation Element Update</td>
<td>General Plan Circulation Element Update including modification to planned future roadway improvements within the city and the City's LOS policies for roadways.</td>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>Multimodal approach and LOS policy; relationship of Circulation Element Update to South County Circulation Study; US 101 interchange at Middle Avenue; role of transit; parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>MH0903</td>
<td>Morgan Hill Downtown Specific Plan</td>
<td>Plan to guide development of 115-acre area downtown.</td>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>Land use/transportation integration; transit service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>CMP ID</td>
<td>Project Name/Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Doc. Type</td>
<td>VTA Comment Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>MH0904</td>
<td>West Dunne Avenue Improvements</td>
<td>Roadway widening/improvements along Dunne Avenue.</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>MV0901</td>
<td>425 &amp; 455 W. Evelyn Avenue</td>
<td>Demolish existing Minton's Lumber to construct two residential buildings totaling 214 units</td>
<td>Informal Review</td>
<td>TDM and transit incentives; TIA and future planning submittals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>MV0905</td>
<td>San Antonio Center</td>
<td>Construction of approximately 430,000 SF of new retail space and below-grade and on-grade parking, to replace approximately 214,000 SF of retail and on-grade parking, on 16 acres</td>
<td>Informal Review</td>
<td>Site density and land use mix; pedestrian accommodations and site design; bicycle accommodations; TDM; TIA report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>PA0902</td>
<td>Mitchell Park Library/Community Center</td>
<td>Replacement of existing facilities with larger building, with associated signal and intersection changes</td>
<td>Other/Bus Stop</td>
<td>Bus stop dimensions &amp; design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>SC0805</td>
<td>49ers Stadium Project</td>
<td>Construction of a 68,500 seat football stadium, relocation of an existing electric substation, arrangements for off-site surface parking, and construction of a six-story parking garage.</td>
<td>DEIR/TIA</td>
<td>Project location &amp; land use/transportation integration; description of existing transit; TMP and transit; transit demand; transit buses &amp; shuttles; light rail; other transit services; roadway congestion/consistency with VTA CMP; TDM; pedestrian &amp; bicycle accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>SC0903</td>
<td>3300 Olcott Street Office Building Project</td>
<td>Demolition of an existing 102,227 SF industrial office/warehouse and construction of a 179,100 SF office building</td>
<td>IS/MND/TIA (project approved this quarter)</td>
<td>TIA – existing transit facilities; pedestrian accommodations; bicycle parking; TDM; TIA – traffic volume at intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
<td>SCVWD0501</td>
<td>Guadalupe River Flood Control Project - Construction of Temporary Bike Trail</td>
<td>Construction of a two-lane vehicle bridge on the Guadalupe River at site of former UPRR Bridge No. 3 to replace loss of access to UPRR property from</td>
<td>Revised Draft EA/FONSI</td>
<td>Affected resources and environmental consequences – recreation and traffic/transportation; bicycle detour posting and routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map No.</td>
<td>Lead Agency</td>
<td>CMP ID</td>
<td>Project Name/Location</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Doc. Type</td>
<td>VTA Comment Topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0824</td>
<td>Ohlone Mixed Use</td>
<td>Rezoning to allow up to 800 multi-family residences and 30,000 SF of commercial use on an 8.23-acre site.</td>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>Mitigation measures; project traffic volumes; existing transit service; pedestrian facilities; automobile parking &amp; TDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0907</td>
<td>Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update</td>
<td>Update of the City of San Jose's General Plan to the year 2040.</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Goals &amp; policies; extent of analysis; land use/transportation scenario evaluation; roadway network/Complete Streets; LOS policy/protected intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0908</td>
<td>Hacienda Gardens Commercial</td>
<td>Planned Development Permit to construct a total of 121,870 SF of retail commercial uses on an 8.96-acre site.</td>
<td>PD Permit</td>
<td>Bus service; land use and site design; bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0912</td>
<td>Sunol Court Studio Apartments</td>
<td>Construction of up to 117 multi-family studio units above a podium garage, and 2000 SF of commercial on 1.32 acres.</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>Site density and land use mix; potential future West San Carlos light rail station; transit incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>SC0809</td>
<td>Gallery at Central Park</td>
<td>Planned Development Master Community to develop site with 806 housing units, incl. 45 SFRs, 152 townhomes, 73 row houses, and 536 multi-family units.</td>
<td>DEIR/FEIR (project approved this quarter)</td>
<td>Existing transit service; impacts &amp; mitigation measures – ped. &amp; bicycle facilities, transit service; bus stop improvements; trip generation &amp; operational impacts; CMP intersections; parking; freeway segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>SC0902</td>
<td>Scott Boulevard Office Project</td>
<td>Demolition of two vacant industrial buildings totaling 114,000 SF and construction</td>
<td>DEIR/FEIR (project approved this quarter)</td>
<td>Site design &amp; ped. access; bicycle parking; TDM; intersection LOS &amp; mitigation; bus service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2010 Monterey Bay Area MTP
Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito counties

Description: Regional transportation plan for Monterey, Santa Cruz, and San Benito counties.

VTA Comments:
Please note that VTA has approved a long range transportation plan in January 2009. Within the plan there are a few projects in Southern Santa Clara County that connect with the border of San Benito County. These projects are the SR 152/SR 156 interchange project and the US 101 Widening project between SR 25 and SR 129. The SR 152/SR 156 project is currently under construction, while the US 101 Widening project is currently undergoing environmental review.

In the land use inputs to the MTP and associated Supplemental EIR, please be aware of possible future development projects near the border of Santa Clara County and San Benito County. Most recently there was the Ranch San Benito Development Project, a 6,800-unit planned community proposed off Highway 25 near the Santa Clara County line. Although this project was withdrawn, there may be future projects, similar in size, that may have an effect on traffic conditions in Santa Clara County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Agency File #</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
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<th>VTA Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Machado Subdivision
East of US 101, north of SR 152, and east of Camino Arroyo

Description: Construction of a 16-lot commercial/industrial subdivision on a 59.7-acre lot.

VTA Comments:
Transportation/Traffic Impacts & Analysis:
The Revised Notice of Preparation and Initial Study does not appear to address alternative modes of transportation (transit, walking or cycling) - either the project’s impacts on alternative modes, or the potential for these modes to reduce demand for single-occupant vehicle travel to and from the project site. The EIR should address the role that transit, walking, and cycling can play in reducing automobile trips generated by the project,
as well as accommodations such as sidewalks, bus stops, bicycle lanes, and bicycle parking, and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that may be applicable to the project.

Bus Service:
VTA operates regularly scheduled bus service (Route 14) on Camino Arroyo and State Route 152. The street design should allow adequate width for the combined curb lane and bike lane of 22 feet or incorporate bus duckouts, per VTA design standards, to minimize potential traffic conflicts. The bus duckouts or 22-foot curb lanes should incorporate PCC bus stop pavement pads per VTA standards.

Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Report:
VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. Based on the information provided on the size of the project, a TIA may be required. VTA’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines should be used when preparing the TIA. These guidelines include the analysis of bicycle facilities, parking, site circulation and pedestrian access, as well as roadways, and may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Technical Guidelines. For more information on TIA guidelines, please call Shanthi Ganji of VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.

On-Site Planning and Design:
VTA looks forward to reviewing future development plans for this site once they become available.

VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual should be used when designing future developments on the project site. This document provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. The CDT Manual is available upon request to any agency staff. For more information on the VTA CDT program, please call Robert Swierk of VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.

The VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines should also be used when designing future developments at this site. This document provides guidance on estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle storage facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact Michelle DeRobertis of VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.
Lucky Day Urban Service Area Amendment
East of Burchell Road, north of Hecker Pass Highway (SR 152), adjacent to the Municipal Golf Course

Description: Amendment to Gilroy's USA boundary to include the 284.7 acre project site. No development is proposed at this time.

VTA Comments:

Transportation Analysis:
VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. We understand that the Traffic Analysis that was prepared for this Urban Service Area amendment in March 2009 was not intended to be a full TIA, and that a full project-specific TIA meeting VTA’s TIA Guidelines will be prepared when a specific development on the site is proposed. When such a TIA is prepared, per VTA’s TIA Guidelines, it must include an analysis of transit service and facilities; bicycle and pedestrian transportation; site circulation and access; and automobile parking.

For more information on TIA guidelines, please call Shanthi Ganji of VTA's Development & Congestion Management Division.

Development Design:
VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual should be used when designing any development within the Lucky Day Urban Service Area. The CDT Manual provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. The CDT Manual is available upon request to any agency staff. For more information on the VTA CDT program, please call Robert Swierk of VTA's Development & Congestion Management Division.

VTA recommends that any subsequent development plans pay close attention to street connectivity and pedestrian and bicycle accommodations as a means of reducing single-occupant automobile trips. VTA looks forward to the opportunity to review future development plans for this site once they become available.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan and Alternative Transportation Improvements:
VTA supports the City’s requirement that until such time as the City adopts a Climate Change Program, future developers of the project site will be conditioned to prepare a project-specific GHG Reduction Plan which could include alternative transportation improvements. VTA would like the opportunity to review and provide input on a project-specific GHG Reduction Plan once it becomes available.
Wren Investors Urban Service Area Amendment
Bounded by Vickery Avenue to the north, Wren Avenue to the east, and Tatum Avenue to the west and south.

Description: Amendment to Gilroy's USA boundary to include the 48-acre site. No development is proposed at this time.

VTA Comments:
Transportation Analysis:
VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. We understand that a Traffic Analysis was not prepared for the proposed Urban Service Area amendment because the land uses and traffic impacts were accounted for in the Gilroy General Plan EIR, but that a full project-specific TIA meeting VTA’s TIA Guidelines will be prepared when a specific development on the site is proposed. When such a TIA is prepared, per VTA’s TIA Guidelines, it must include an analysis of transit service and facilities; bicycle and pedestrian transportation; site circulation and access; and automobile parking.

For more information on TIA guidelines, please call Shanthi Ganji of VTA's Development & Congestion Management Division.

Development Design and Land Use Mix:
VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual should be used when designing any development within the Wren Investors Urban Service Area. The CDT Manual provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. The CDT Manual is available upon request to any agency staff. For more information on the VTA CDT program, please call Robert Swierk of VTA's Development & Congestion Management Division.

VTA recommends developing this site at the maximum possible density, given its location within one-half mile of a corridor with high-frequency bus transit service. We also recommend that any subsequent development plans pay close attention to street connectivity, pedestrian access to transit, and bicycle accommodations as a means of reducing single-occupant automobile trips. VTA looks forward to the opportunity to review future development plans for this site once they become available.

Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan and Alternative Transportation Improvements:
VTA supports the City’s requirement that until such time as the City adopts a Climate Change Program, future developers of the project site will be conditioned to prepare a project-specific GHG Reduction Plan which could include alternative transportation improvements. VTA would like the opportunity to review and provide input on a project-specific GHG Reduction Plan once it becomes available.
**Gavilan Joint Community College District Urban Service Area Amendment**

5055 Santa Teresa Boulevard

**Description:** Amendment to Gilroy's USA boundary to include the 148-acre site. No development is proposed at this time. However, Gavilan has a conceptual site plan for campus housing for students, faculty, and staff, and a senior learning facility.

**VTA Comments:**

**Transportation Analysis:**
VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. We understand that the Traffic Analysis that was prepared for this Urban Service Area amendment in March 2009 was not intended to be a full TIA, and that a full project-specific TIA meeting VTA’s TIA Guidelines will be prepared once specific development of the site is proposed. When that TIA is prepared, per VTA’s TIA Guidelines, it must include an analysis of transit service and facilities; bicycle and pedestrian transportation; site circulation and access; and automobile parking.

For more information on TIA guidelines, please call Shanthi Ganji of VTA's Development & Congestion Management Division.

**Development Design and Land Use Mix:**
VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual should be used when designing any development within the Gavilan College Urban Service Area such as the future campus housing and a Lifelong Learning Center identified in the District’s master plan. The CDT Manual provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. The CDT Manual is available upon request to any agency staff. For more information on the VTA CDT program, please call Robert Swierk of VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.

VTA recommends that any subsequent development plans following the District’s master plan pay close attention to street connectivity, pedestrian access to transit, and bicycle accommodations as a means of reducing single-occupant automobile trips. VTA looks forward to the opportunity to review future development plans for this site once they become available.

**Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan and Alternative Transportation Improvements:**
VTA supports the City’s requirement that until such time as the City adopts a Climate Change Program, future developers of the project site will be conditioned to prepare a project-specific GHG Reduction Plan which could include alternative transportation improvements. VTA would like the opportunity to review and provide input on a project-specific GHG Reduction Plan once it becomes available.
<table>
<thead>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>LG0902</td>
<td>TIA Notification Form</td>
<td>7/9/2009</td>
<td>7/31/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Town Library**  
**Villa Avenue and Fiesta Avenue**

**Description:** Demolish 6 houses and construct a 30,000 SF library on a 1.86-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**

Transportation System Planning and Design

Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Report:
VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. Based on the information provided on the size of the project, a TIA may be required.

VTA recommends using the 2008 TIA Guidelines update for preparing the TIA for this development. This document includes updated procedures for the analysis of bicycle facilities, parking, site circulation and pedestrian access, as well as roadways. For more information on TIA guidelines, please call Shanti Ganji of VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.

Description of Impacts and Recommendations:
There is potential significant impact identified under the transportation/traffic section of the NOP for the Draft EIR. Any mitigation measures for automobile impacts should not adversely affect bike or pedestrian access and safety. For example, the following mitigations should be avoided: eliminating or narrowing of existing bicycle facilities and sidewalks.

Transit Analysis:
Three VTA bus routes (Local Route 76 and Community Bus Routes 48 and 49) operate on Main Street adjacent to the site of the proposed Town Library. The EIR should include documentation of the existing transit system in the project area, as well as an evaluation of the potential for the project to generate demand for new services and identification of pedestrian facilities that would provide better access to transit services and bus stops.

Bicycle Parking:
VTA commends the Town for including bicycle parking in the proposed project, as noted on pages 3 and 5 of the Initial Study. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the library. We suggest that the Town consider including both bicycle racks for short-term parking for library patrons, and bicycle lockers for long-term parking for library staff. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting, and design of bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact Michelle DeRobertis of VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.
Morgan Hill General Plan Circulation Element Update

Entire city

Description: General Plan Circulation Element Update including modification to planned future roadway improvements within the city and the City's LOS policies for roadways.

VTA Comments:

1. Multimodal Approach and LOS Policy:
VTA supports the general direction of the City in modifying the future circulation system based on the City’s updated transportation model, updated land use projections, and new multimodal design standards for arterial roadways. These changes are consistent with the principles of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) program. VTA supports the proposed modification to the City’s LOS Policy to provide a tiered approach to acceptable LOS standards. The revised policy would be more consistent with VTA’s Congestion Management Program LOS Policy and would help support the City’s planned revitalization of the downtown area.

2. Relationship of Circulation Element Update to the South County Circulation Study:
The City of Morgan Hill was a key participant in the South County Circulation Study (SCCS) who helped shape the recommendations for transportation improvements identified in this study as part of a collaborative effort. One of the goals of the SCCS study was to develop plans to improve local circulation in the study area including the City of Morgan Hill based on land use changes and travel patterns.

VTA supports the inclusion of roadway extensions as identified in the SCCS in the Circulation Element Update for improved connectivity of local arterial roads. Similarly, VTA recommends that new east-west crossings across US 101 be considered as a priority to reduce congestion at key US 101 interchanges by diverting local vehicular and non-vehicular (pedestrian and bicycle) traffic away from freeway facilities, thereby reducing turning movements at ramps and improving merging and weaving operations and safety on US 101. As such, VTA recommends that the City of Morgan Hill include these east-west crossings in the Circulation Element Update and the FEIR, including Maple Avenue, Diana Avenue, Half Road, San Pedro Avenue, and Fisher Avenue as potential east-west crossings.

3. US 101 Interchange at Middle Avenue:
The DEIR does not list the conversion of Middle Avenue overcrossing to an interchange, as identified in the current General Plan Circulation Element and the SCCS. Please provide added clarification if the City of Morgan Hill is not including this in the Circulation Element Update.

4. Role of Transit in Supporting Non-Automotive Travel:
The updated Circulation Element includes policies and actions to engage VTA in providing transit services to Morgan Hill. Since VTA is the transit operator of bus and light rail services in Santa Clara County and is also a partner of the Caltrain Joint Powers Board, it is very important that the City work in partnership with VTA in developing effective policies and actions to promote public transit use.
VTA believes that one of the most effective policies to make transit a viable option is one that encourages and incentivizes transit-supportive land use patterns. We strongly recommend that the City continue to adopt policies that are consistent with VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) best practice principle of "Target Growth to Cores, Corridors and Station Areas." The Downtown Specific Plan that the City is currently developing is a good example of this type of transit-supportive land use planning.

Cooperative funding alternatives are also essential in securing quality transit services. Please consider a policy to encourage opportunities for partnerships between the City, private enterprises and VTA to provide enhanced transit services or infrastructure in Morgan Hill.

We also suggest that actions to provide transit preferential treatments be included in the Circulation Element Update; for example, the discussion of multimodal improvements to key arterial streets such as Santa Teresa and Monterey Road could mention bus curb lanes or duckouts, enhanced stop amenities, transit signal priority, and supporting pedestrian improvements. These improvements would help make transit a more attractive option for Morgan Hill residents and workers and help reduce single-occupant automobile travel in the City.

As requested in our comment letter on the NOP, we suggest that the City revise the text of the updated Circulation Element to acknowledge that light rail service to the South County is not included in VTA’s long-range transportation plan, VTP 2035.

5. Parking:
VTA would like to encourage the City to consider policies and strategies to more effectively manage parking and to encourage alternatives to single-occupant vehicle use in Morgan Hill. Many cities in the Bay Area and around the country have adopted progressive parking policies and strategies which improve the economic vitality of their business districts, help make better use of scarce land resources, and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation.
Specific Plan is also consistent with VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework which identifies VTA and local jurisdiction priorities for locating concentrated mixed-use development in the County. The CDT Program was developed through an extensive community outreach strategy in partnership with VTA Member Agencies, and has been endorsed by all 15 Santa Clara County cities and the County, and we feel Morgan Hill’s Downtown Specific Plan land use elements demonstrate leadership in implementing the CDT concepts and principles.

Transit Service:
We believe VTA’s transit services will help the City achieve its vision for downtown by providing a viable travel option for residents, workers and visitors to downtown. However, for this to work effectively, it is very important that Monterey Road continue to be a multimodal corridor that embraces transit services. Accordingly, we are concerned to see the Specific Plan state that "to create a more pedestrian-friendly atmosphere along Monterey Road and to better connect to the train station, bus routes running along Monterey Road should be diverted to Depot Street or Butterfield Boulevard via Main Avenue and/or Dunne Avenue." This suggestion seems to contradict the City’s plans for an active and multimodal downtown and it is inconsistent with VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy and Service Design Guidelines that were adopted by the VTA Board in 2007. In addition, this suggestion appears to conflict with the City’s efforts to improve the pedestrian connections between the Caltrain Station and Monterey Highway for which the City has received over $4m in grants through MTC’s Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program. Pedestrian-friendly environments are also transit friendly environments - and the presence of transit along Monterey Highway, we think, represents unique economic and community-building opportunities for the City.

As communicated to the City of Morgan Hill in past discussions, VTA does not support rerouting one of our core transit routes off this main arterial. Monterey Highway is part of the arterial street network in the County and is utilized by VTA’s bus line 68. This line operates from Gilroy through Morgan Hill and terminates at the San Jose Diridon Caltrain Station. The line operates seven days a week with 15 to 20 minute frequencies during most of the weekday and every 30 minutes on weekends. Service starts at 4:30 am on weekdays and 6:00 am on weekends. Service ends at about 12:30 am on all days. This route averages about 2,700 passengers per weekday.

We believe the proposal to connect line 68 with the other transit services at the Morgan Hill Caltrain Station would degrade transit service to most passengers. The proposed deviation is not supported by VTA’s Board adopted Service Design Guidelines for route types like line 68 as it is one of VTA’s core arterial services and should be as direct as possible. Line 68 provides an important regional connection for passengers traveling within South County and to Downtown San Jose. The deviation onto Depot Street would impact about 1,200 weekday passengers who are traveling along this section of Monterey Highway to access other areas. The benefit of improving the connection of line 68 to the Caltrain Station, which is only 1/8 mile from Monterey Highway - about a three minute walk - for a small numbers of passengers does not seem to outweigh the impact to the 1,200 passengers who would be inconvenienced by this out of direction travel. Also about 150 passengers who currently use the three pairs of stops along Monterey Highway would be impacted. Only three weekday round trips trains and no local VTA bus lines currently serve the Caltrain Station, so moving line 68 there would not provide much benefit for transferring passengers.
West Dunne Avenue Improvements  
Dunne Avenue between Monterey Road and Peak Avenue

**Description:** Roadway widening/improvements along Dunne Avenue.

**VTA Comments:**
VTA supports the proposed inclusion of bicycle lanes and pedestrian access improvements. These improvements will help encourage alternative modes of transportation.

**Lead Agency**  
City of Morgan Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency File #</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>Document Received</th>
<th>VTA Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EA-08-17</td>
<td>MH0904</td>
<td>IS/ND</td>
<td>9/1/2009</td>
<td>9/16/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

425 & 455 W. Evelyn Avenue  
425 & 455 W. Evelyn Avenue

**Description:** Demolish existing Minton's Lumber to construct two residential buildings totaling 214 units

**VTA Comments:**
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) staff has reviewed the informal submittal of plans for 214 residential units on a 3.6-acre site bounded by W. Evelyn Avenue, Bush Street, and Villa Street. We appreciate the opportunity to review the full set of plans. VTA staff provided comments on a previous informal review for this project on April 15, 2009. We have a few additional comments which are as follows.

**Transportation Demand Management & Transit Incentives:**
VTA has reviewed the GreenPoint Checklist that was included in the plan set as Sheet A0.3, and commends the applicant for incorporating a number of features in the project design that increase its GreenPoint sustainability rating. We encourage the City to work with the applicant to explore additional Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that would reduce the number of single-occupant vehicle trips generated by the project and provide further incentives for project residents to take transit. Specifically, we encourage the applicant to provide EcoPasses and/or other transit passes to project residents on a continuing basis. We also encourage the applicant and the City to consider unbundling a portion of the automobile parking (i.e., charging a monthly or annual fee for a parking space) or listing the cost of parking as a line item on leases. Such measures can provide an effective incentive for the use of alternate modes including transit, walking, and cycling.

**Transportation Impact Analysis and Future Planning Submittals:**
As noted in our April 15, 2009 letter, it is anticipated that this project will require a Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) report because it may generate 100 or more peak-hour trips. VTA looks forward to the opportunity to review the TIA report and formal planning submittals for this project once they become available.
San Antonio Center
455 San Antonio Road at El Camino Real

Description: Construction of approximately 430,000 SF of new retail space and below-grade and on-grade parking, to replace approximately 214,000 SF of retail and on-grade parking, on 16 acres

VTA Comments:

Site Density and Land Use Mix:
VTA supports the proposed intensification of use and mix of retail spaces on this important site located along El Camino Real near an active transit center and planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station. El Camino Real is designated as a Corridor in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework, which shows VTA and local jurisdiction priorities for supporting concentrated development in the County. The CDT Program was developed through an extensive community outreach strategy in partnership with VTA Member Agencies, and was endorsed by all 15 Santa Clara cities and the county.

Pedestrian Accommodations & Site Design:
VTA commends the developer for proposing a site plan which strives to create an attractive pedestrian environment by placing buildings along most of the project frontages, locating most of the parking below grade, and using landscaping and hardscaping to create attractive plazas and walkways. These pedestrian accommodations will help make walking and transit access to the site more attractive and reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicle travel to, from and within the site. We have several suggestions for ways to further improve the pedestrian environment on the site:

* At the southwest corner (closest to El Camino & San Antonio) - The two retail pads and plaza at the corner are pedestrian-friendly additions, but as currently shown the plaza has no pedestrian to the center of the site (grocery market/drug store) except through the parking lot. We suggest establishing a strong pedestrian connection from this corner to the center of the site.

* Along the El Camino Real frontage - Other than the retail pad (Shop A) and plaza at the San Antonio Road corner, the frontage along El Camino Real as shown now is fairly unfriendly to pedestrians, consisting of a fuel station, surface parking, and several driveways. This frontage will be the most important access to the site for transit passengers coming from the future BRT station near Showers Drive & El Camino. The current design is not consistent with the Grand Boulevard vision of El Camino Real as a pedestrian, bicycle and transit-friendly roadway, or the principles of VTA’s CDT Program for an important multimodal thoroughfare. We suggest giving further attention to the pedestrian environment along this frontage, and considering removing any parking fronting directly on El Camino, relocating the fuel station to another portion of the site, or if that is not possible, screening the fuel station with an active use in the front. We have attached a file with a photo simulation showing how a gas station along an arterial can be screened with a building in front while preserving the station’s access and functionality. (The photo simulation was developed by Urban Advantage for the City of Hercules but modified for VTA use.)

* Along the east side (bordering the existing Trader Joe’s and other uses) - The current site plan appears to provide few if any pedestrian connections between the proposed development and the existing uses to the east, such as the Trader Joe’s and multi-story office building. While we understand the need for service access to the proposed retail stores, the lack of pedestrian connections is inconsistent with the statement in the Project Description about kick-starting redevelopment of the adjacent 56-acre retail center. We suggest that further attention be given to...
establishing pedestrian connections between the proposed development and the center to the east, and considering the shortest walking route between the two centers. In particular, we suggest providing pedestrian permeability in the Major A/Major B/Major C/Market area, and providing an attractive sidewalk/pathway along the rear of the Market to connect to the existing office building and the Trader Joe’s.

* The Project Description states that new sidewalks along the street will range in width from 6 to 10 feet. We recommend a minimum width of 10 feet for sidewalks along both street frontages.

Bicycle Accommodations:
VTA commends the developer for proposing secured bike racks, storage lockers, and employee shower facilities as a way of encouraging bicycle access to the site. We suggest that the Level 1 Site Plan (Sheet A7) be modified to show the quantity of both bicycle lockers and bicycle racks. The developer may find VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines helpful in considering the design and location of bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from [www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes](http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes). For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact Michelle DeRobertis of VTA’s Development and Congestion Management Division.

Transportation Demand Management:
VTA supports the inclusion of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project. Beyond the preferred carpool and hybrid parking and bicycle accommodations, VTA suggests the developer include a comprehensive TDM program in the project proposal. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to this project include:

* Parking Cash-Out
* Direct or Indirect Payments for Taking Alternate Modes
* Transit Fare Incentives such as Eco Pass and Commuter Checks
* Employee Carpool Matching
* Vanpool Program
* Preferentially Located Carpool Parking
* Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks
* Showers and Clothes Lockers for Bicycle Commuters
* Guaranteed Ride Home Program
* Space for Car sharing vehicles

Transportation Impact Analysis Report:
VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. Based on the information provided on the size of the project, a TIA may be required. VTA’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines should be used when preparing the TIA. These guidelines include the analysis of bicycle facilities, parking, site circulation and pedestrian access, as well as roadways. For more information on VTA TIA-related guidelines, please contact Shanthi Ganji of VTA’s Development and Congestion Management Division.
Mitchell Park Library/Community Center
Middlefield Road, opposite Mayview Avenue

**Description:** Replacement of existing facilities with larger building, with associated signal and intersection changes

**VTA Comments:**

VTA provides bus service on Middlefield Road and maintains a bus stop adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA supports the City recommendation to move the bus stop south of the intersection in front of the new building with the following improvements:

- An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad adjacent to the bus stop
- A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad according to VTA standards
- All trees or landscaping should be placed outside of the bus loading area
- Street lights or other lighting included in the bus stop area

City of Santa Clara

49ers Stadium Project
Southwest corner of Tasman Drive and Centennial Boulevard

**Description:** Construction of a 68,500 seat football stadium, relocation of an existing electric substation, arrangements for off-site surface parking, and construction of a six-story parking garage.

**VTA Comments:**

Cover Letter from Michael Burns, VTA General Manager, to Jennifer Sparacino, City Manager:

VTA has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for the proposed 49ers Stadium in the city of Santa Clara. We have a number of detailed comments on these documents, which are included in the attached memorandum. However, I would like to highlight here the key themes from our review.

First, from a transportation planning perspective we believe that the proposed 49ers stadium project offers an excellent opportunity to build on and make use of the existing transit and roadway network in the Great America Station area. VTA supports policies and projects that target growth around the established transportation cores, corridors, and station areas in Santa Clara County.
Second, we want to acknowledge the cooperation and responsiveness of the 49ers organization and the city of Santa Clara in recent weeks as VTA staff has reviewed the DEIR. We would also like to recognize the 49ers for their thorough attention to transportation matters in the DEIR, TIA, and associated Transportation Management Plan (TMP). We would like to note, however, that the analysis of transit in these documents was not as thorough and will require more in-depth investigation over the coming months. Our detailed comments on the transit analysis and assumptions are included in the attached memorandum, and provided below is a summary of the most salient points:

* The analysis of the potential transit demand from Alameda and Contra Costa counties to the proposed stadium via BART and connecting transit services, including the VTA light rail system, needs to be more fully developed.
* The DEIR and TMP should reflect certain current conditions and constraints on the VTA transit system, in particular the current light rail operating plan in which trains that operate to/from Mountain View past the proposed stadium are limited to two cars in length.
* For VTA to adequately plan light rail service for game day events, the development of a rail operating plan, including a rail simulation of different scenarios, is needed. This analysis would assist in identifying the level of service (frequency/capacity) that can be operated and whether any capital improvements are necessary. Without benefit of this analysis, we cannot now determine what improvements might be needed. Possible improvements could include storage tracks, crossover tracks, substations, signal improvements, station improvements or other similar items. Non-VTA funding would need to be identified to design and construct these improvements. In addition, resources (both staff and consultant assistance) would be needed to develop the operating plan and rail simulation.
* A more complete transportation management plan addressing weekday as well as Sunday events and covering all modes of transportation including VTA light rail and buses is needed. Accordingly, we suggest that a working group be formed, comprised of the 49ers, the city of Santa Clara, VTA, and other agencies, to ensure that all transportation needs—operational, physical improvements and funding—are addressed.
* Game day transit operations will require a significant resource allocation beyond the normal levels for standard Sunday or weekday service. Vehicles, operators, transit field supervisors, security personnel, customer service ambassadors, fare inspectors, and maintenance staff would all need to be added. It is likely that fare revenues received from games and events would not cover VTA’s additional operating expenses, and this additional operating funding would need to be provided by third parties.

VTA looks forward to a strong and effective partnership with the city of Santa Clara in the advancement of the proposed stadium project.

Attached Memorandum:

VTA has reviewed the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) for a 68,500-seat open-air stadium at the southwest corner of Tasman Drive and Centennial Boulevard in the City of Santa Clara. We previously commented on the original NOP for this project in a letter dated September 22, 2008, and on the revised Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this project in a letter dated March 18, 2009. The following is a summary of our comments on the DEIR and TIA for this project.

Project Location and Land Use/Transportation Integration:
VTA supports policies that target growth around the established transportation cores, corridors, and station areas in the County, as described in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program and CDT Manual. The CDT Program was developed through an extensive community outreach strategy in partnership with VTA Member Agencies, and has been endorsed by all 15 Santa Clara County cities and the County. Intensification of land uses in these areas can promote alternative transportation methods and help reduce vehicle miles traveled. The proposed 49ers stadium project offers an excellent opportunity to build on and make use of the existing transit and roadway network along in the Great America Station area. The stadium can benefit from the existing transportation infrastructure, although it may justify or require additional transportation improvements given the size of the project and highly peaked travel characteristics of its users, as noted below.
Description of Existing Transit:
The DEIR and the accompanying Transportation Management Plan (TMP) contain a number of out-of-date or inaccurate descriptions of the existing VTA transit routes that serve the project site. Most importantly, the TMP/DEIR does not show the current 2-car train light rail operating from Mountain View past the proposed stadium, through San Jose to the Winchester Station in Campbell. The shorter station platform lengths on the Winchester Line southwest of Diridon Station limit train lengths to 2 cars, not the 3-car trains assumed in the TMP/DEIR. Other VTA comments on the description of Existing Transit Services in the DEIR are listed below:
1. System map (Figure 33 on Page 139): This map should be updated to reflect that the Great America Shuttle no longer operates; the most current version of the VTA system map is dated July 2009.
2. Page 140 - Table 14: Line 60 should be shown with 30 minute headways (not 15 minutes) in the Great America area.
3. Page 140 - Line 55 description: The description should note that Line 55 operates 30 minute headways from 8 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. on Sundays.
4. Page 140 - Line 60 description: The description should note that Line 60 operates every 30 minutes during weekday peak periods in the project area (not 15 minutes).
5. Page 141 - Light Rail Service. There are many out-of-date statements and errors in the description of existing light rail service. We suggest replacing this paragraph with the following description:
The project area is served by two light rail transit lines, one that serves the project site directly and one that is available via a transfer. The Mountain View - Winchester LRT line operates along the center of Tasman Drive and directly serves the site with the nearest station to the project site at Great America Parkway near the Santa Clara Convention Center (approximately 650 feet from the nearest stadium entrance). This line generally operates every 15 minutes during weekday commute periods and every 30 minutes on weekends. The Alum Rock - Santa Teresa line operates in the center of Highway 87 and North First Street through downtown San Jose and connects with the Mountain View - Winchester line at the Tasman Station. This line generally operates every 15 minutes on weekdays and weekends.
6. Page 141 - Caltrain: This section incorrectly states that the Caltrain shuttle to Mission College Boulevard operates on Sundays, and should be corrected.

Transit Service, Operations and Infrastructure:
We note that the TMP assumes that approximately 13,000 patrons (out of a sold-out capacity of 68,500 seats) will take public transit to access the stadium. It appears that this assumption is based primarily on the 49ers experience at Candlestick Park, which has considerably fewer transit options than at the proposed site, supplemented by information from other stadiums in similar settings. This assumption about public transit usage is applied to the total trip generation of the stadium in the TIA, and is built into the discussion of transportation impacts and mitigation measures in the DEIR.

Based on the assumptions in the TMP, a number of which may require further verification, this transit mode split assumption appears reasonable; however further analysis should be done to better determine a mode share specific to the unique conditions in Santa Clara County. In addition, it is likely that a number of conditions would need to be met in terms of transit service and operations for this transit mode split to be achieved. It is also possible that certain infrastructure improvements would be needed to make the required transit service and operations possible.

The following are VTA’s comments regarding transit service, operations and infrastructure based on our review of the DEIR and TMP. They are divided into several sections as noted below.
Transportation Management Plan and Transit:

1. The Draft TMP, dated July 13, 2009, has been developed at a very general level and is more a collection of possible transit options than a plan that could be directly implemented. VTA would like to coordinate with the City of Santa Clara, the 49ers and other transit operators to develop a complete transit plan for game days and other events.

2. VTA suggests that the 49ers and the City of Santa Clara continue to develop a complete transportation management plan. Given the projected time frame for opening the stadium, there is time to complete this task. However, it would be best to start the process now to ensure that all needs - operational, physical improvements and funding - are addressed.

3. The HP Pavilion management instituted an Arena Events Operations Committee (AEOC), which included representatives from VTA and the city of San Jose, to assist with developing their transportation plan, and this group continues to meet to address event-specific needs. VTA suggests that a similar group be developed for the proposed 49ers stadium in Santa Clara. One very helpful aspect of the AEOC is that it includes the traffic management personnel from the city of San Jose, including both traffic engineering and police representatives who would handle the game day traffic and parking management.

4. VTA requests that the transportation management plan address weekday night games and other events, in addition to Sunday afternoon games (which are the focus of the current draft TMP). We assume that the 49ers would like to schedule Monday or Thursday night games and VTA will need to plan accordingly. The day of the week will have significant implications for the transit plan as the weekday night games/events will typically occur within VTA’s normal weekday PM peak commute period. Our ability to provide sufficient resources, both personnel and vehicles, is a concern on weekdays. The impact of changing our operations to accommodate a weekday game while still providing our normal transit services has not yet been determined. This will require further analysis, which may include studying how transit systems have handled this in other NFL cities. In addition, the transportation management plan will need to provide further information on how each street in the stadium vicinity would be impacted, so that VTA can develop or modify bus routes and determine the impact on our light rail operation.

Transit Demand:

1. Based on VTA’s review of the TMP and DEIR, it appears that the transit analysis did not consider the potential demand from Alameda and Contra Costa counties to the proposed stadium via BART and connecting transit services. VTA expects that this demand would be significant in the opening year, from either the existing Fremont Station or the new Warm Springs Station, and would increase further in 2018 with the opening of the Milpitas and Berryessa Stations. This flow of ridership from BART could place an additional strain on the VTA light rail system from the east, which is not addressed in the TMP and DEIR. Further analysis of demand from BART to the east of the stadium will be required. For this analysis to be most useful, it should cover both the opening year scenario (from Fremont or Warm Springs Station) and the 2018 scenario (from the Milpitas Station).

Transit Buses and Shuttles:

1. VTA needs to more closely review FTA regulations that prohibit public transit operators from providing "charters" to sporting events under certain situations. While we have stopped operating this type of service to Candlestick, there may be some other available options for the new stadium since the games are now in our regular service area. More study is needed on this issue to determine what VTA can provide and what service private carriers would operate.

2. Further study on specific routes to games is needed, including how many vehicles would be required to provide the service and where the routes would originate. Automobile parking at the origin will need to be identified, either at current VTA park-and-ride lots or at other locations.

3. More detail is needed on how the bus parking on Stars & Stripes Boulevard would operate and how many vehicles this location could accommodate. This location is of particular concern as it is the busiest station on the Altamont Commute Express (ACE) line. VTA as well as private companies provide numerous shuttles to this location bringing passengers from employment sites throughout Santa Clara County. Those shuttles will need access to the station during games on weekdays.
4. Many transit passengers currently use the parking lot adjacent to the Great America ACE Station. This lot along with the extension of Stars & Stripes was funded, constructed and made available to ACE and Capitol Corridor passengers as part of a cooperative agreement with the City of Santa Clara. These rail passengers need to continue to have access to this parking. Typically this is overnight parking, where the passengers leave vehicles to be used after getting off the train in the morning and returning to the station in the afternoon. This constraint needs to be taken into account in the transportation management plan.

5. As noted above, further study of bus and shuttle circulation and related operating needs is required. This may lead to the identification of physical improvements necessary to support bus and shuttle operations. They could include bus bays, passenger amenities, wayfinding signage, and real-time information; all of these could be organized into a centralized transit center near the stadium site.

Light Rail:

1. As noted above, the TMP/DEIR does not show the current rail operating plan that uses 2 car trains to operate from Mountain View past the proposed stadium and onto the Winchester Station in Campbell. Due to shorter station lengths in Campbell, trains are restricted to 2 car trains, not the 3 car trains included in the TMP. The TMP/DEIR further assumed a load per light rail car of 150 passengers, a condition which may be acceptable for a few trains under game-day crush load conditions but should not be used as an assumption for average loading over a longer period. Given the experience of other systems in carrying departing patrons via transit after stadium events, we believe that the majority of transit passengers will need to be cleared in a 30 to 60 minute window after a game; further analysis of the implications of these demands on light rail vehicle loading will be required for the proposed 49ers stadium.

2. A rail operating plan is needed for VTA to adequately plan light rail service during events. VTA has access to a rail simulation program of its current light rail system and different operating scenarios should be tested to determine the best plan to meet the expected ridership demand. The simulation would also assist in identifying if any capital improvements are necessary and what level of service (frequency/capacity) could be operated.

3. As indicated above, the operating plan would also assist in identifying potential infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate the planned passenger demand and rail service. Without the benefit of the analysis, we cannot now ascertain what improvements might be needed. Possible improvements could include storage tracks, crossover tracks, substations, signal improvements, station improvements or other similar items.

4. During a recent meeting between representatives of the 49ers, the City of Santa Clara, and VTA, two possible improvements were identified by the 49ers. These are (1) fencing the light rail right-of-way in the area of the Great America Station and the stadium and (2) constructing a new game day at-grade pedestrian crossing of the tracks, east of Great America Station, to connect the new parking garage at the golf course to the stadium. These and other improvements must meet VTA design standards, operational policies and be safety certified. The new at-grade pedestrian crossing would be subject to safety review by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). Given the expected use of this crossing, it is likely that the CPUC will require the installation of automatic warning devices such as flashers, bells, and possibly gates. Static signs and pavement makings will also be a requirement. Because of the high level of pedestrian use on game days, and the likelihood of special VTA train service, the effect on VTA’s system-wide schedules must also be taken into consideration.

5. VTA encourages the applicant and the City to consider the full breadth of alternatives to a new pedestrian grade crossing (which might meet significant opposition from the CPUC). This could include improvements to the existing grade-separated pedestrian crossing under Tasman Drive (along San Tomas Aquino Creek) to make it as attractive and accessible as possible, or potentially the construction of a pedestrian bridge across Tasman Drive. (Note comments on Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations below.)

6. Passenger access to Great America Station, including the possibility of using Tasman Drive for passenger queuing (as proposed in the TMP) also needs further review. Both physical improvements and operational strategies need to be explored to determine how this could work effectively and safely, and to avoid excessively long train dwell times that could impact service reliability.
7. VTA would also need to be involved in the City’s plans to monitor and adjust traffic signal timing before and after games as necessary. Impacts on our light rail signal priority and on transit service in general is a concern especially with the frequent service that would be needed on game days. The TMP states that manual overrides of traffic signals and/or transit signal priority will be required to achieve the required headways on the light rail system to serve stadium events. While transit signal priority is already in place along significant portions of the light rail system in the vicinity of the project site, it is not in place in all areas. Further analysis of intersection operations including increased light rail frequencies and vehicular traffic, as well as coordination with VTA, local municipalities, and Santa Clara County will be necessary.

8. VTA would require a significant resource allocation for game day/special event operations. Additional vehicles, operators, transit field supervisors, security personnel, customer service ambassadors, fare inspectors, and maintenance staff would be needed. It is likely that fare revenues received from games and events would not cover our additional expenses, and this additional operating funding would need to be provided by third parties.

Other Transit Services:

1. VTA is a partner, through formal agreements, with the Capitol Corridor, Caltrain and ACE. As mentioned earlier, the initiation of a transportation working group would be helpful for all involved.

2. The TMP includes an assumption that 3,000 patrons would take Caltrain to reach the stadium. While the TMP discusses three possible ways of allowing these patrons to reach the stadium (since Caltrain trains currently do not serve the stadium area), each of these discussions is problematic. For direct service, trains would need to make a reverse move near Diridon Station and travel on the UPRR tracks to the station area; such a move is likely to take long enough that it will make this trip unattractive in terms of travel time. A transfer from Lawrence Station to shuttle buses is possible, but Lawrence Station has far too little space to accommodate the shuttle buses to carry these passengers. It is more likely that patrons would transfer to the VTA light rail system at Mountain View; however, the transit analysis in the TMP does not account for these additional 3,000 patrons on VTA light rail, which would place a significant additional strain on the system. Further analysis of how patrons would reach the proposed stadium from Caltrain is required, including coordination with VTA and Caltrain staff.

Given the limited information in the DEIR, TMP and TIA about transit, it is difficult for VTA to confirm how transit would serve the proposed stadium. However, we believe that it should be possible through close coordination and further study to address these issues as the project progresses through the development process. Identification of the specific transit service, operations, and infrastructure requirements to serve the proposed stadium adequately will require considerable analysis and coordination between the project applicant, the City of Santa Clara, VTA, and other agencies.

Roadway Congestion/Consistency with the VTA Congestion Management Program:

Based on our review of the TIA, TMP, and DEIR, VTA has the following comments on congestion-related impacts of the project and the project’s consistency with the VTA Congestion Management Program (CMP).

1. It appears that the TMP primarily covers Sunday game conditions, while the TIA and DEIR address both Sunday and weekday game conditions. While we understand the rationale for assuming a worst-case scenario in terms of roadway congestion for the CEQA analysis, we believe it will be very important to develop a thorough management plan for weekday conditions as well, covering both pre-game and post-game periods. VTA encourages the project applicant to develop such a plan, in coordination with the City, VTA, and other agencies as the project moves through the development process.

2. The DEIR notes (on pages xi and xii) that the project would cause Significant and Unavoidable Impacts in terms of roadway congestion on 2 CMP intersections during at least one weekend study period on up to 20 NFL event days per year. It also notes that for a maximum of four times per year (depending on whether one team or two plays at the stadium) the project would exceed the adopted LOS threshold on all 16 directional freeway segments and one HOV lane during at least one of the weekday study periods. The DEIR then states that the project does not propose to
implement any physical improvements to mitigate roadway congestion impacts, and the TIA notes (on page 170) that "the infrequency of occurrence... does not justify the implementation of costly physical improvements." While VTA agrees that significant but very infrequent impacts are not necessarily inconsistent with the Congestion Management Program, we recommend that the applicant work with VTA, the City, and Caltrans to identify possible measures that could lessen the project’s impacts on roadway facilities, and conduct an analysis of a possible fair-share contribution to these improvement measures. In addition, we encourage the City to require the project applicant to implement measures from the Immediate Implementation Action List in the VTA TIA Guidelines to minimize roadway congestion impacts. Further discussion of immediate actions such as Transportation Demand Management programs is included in the next section.

3. The first bullet on page 85 of the TIA states that the stadium will include a traffic control center that will be connected and integrated into the City of Santa Clara’s existing electronic traffic control system. VTA recommends that the traffic control system for the stadium include the installation of CCTV cameras at nearby intersections to allow real-time monitoring of vehicular traffic as well as light rail vehicles, transit and charter buses, and pedestrians.

4. The last paragraph on page 76 of the TIA states that all employees utilizing private vehicles will be required to park in locations east of Lafayette Street and along Tasman Drive. Currently parking is not allowed along on Lafayette Street and Tasman Drive in the project area. The documents should clarify where on Lafayette Street and Tasman Drive the employees would park, and how additional on-street parking may impact vehicular movement or transit operations.

Transportation Demand Management:
VTA urges large employers and large trip generators to implement transportation demand management (TDM) programs in order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips they generate. In particular, VTA encourages the project applicant to provide incentives for patrons and employees to take public transit to stadium events, as part of the TDM program described on page 230 of the DEIR. VTA encourages the applicant to consider offering season ticket holders the option to either purchase reserved parking spaces or buy transit passes to the games. Pre-purchasing season or game-specific transit passes would provide for easier, quicker boarding of transit vehicles and also provides VTA with information on transit demand. VTA has coordinated with the 49ers in the past to provide season ticket holders with information on how to purchase transit passes to the games, when VTA did provide direct bus service from Santa Clara County to Candlestick Park.

In addition, VTA supports the inclusion of a small component of ground floor commercial space in the stadium, as described on page 12 of the DEIR. This space could potentially accommodate a restaurant or retail use that could serve employees at nearby office buildings, visitors to the Santa Clara Convention Center, or patrons of Great America, making the area more convenient and attractive for pedestrians, transit riders, and cyclists, and reducing the need for single-occupant vehicles for lunchtime trips or errands.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations:
VTA encourages the development of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations in order to improve access and connectivity of these important modes. We support the inclusion of the new pedestrian/bicycle bridges across the San Tomas Aquino Creek in the proposed project. We also recommend that the project applicant and the City work together to consider the full breadth of alternatives to a new at-grade pedestrian crossing of the light rail tracks on Tasman Drive near the stadium. This could include making the pedestrian/bicycle crossing under Tasman Drive near the project site as attractive as possible, or possibly constructing a pedestrian bridge across Tasman Drive; both of these improvements would lessen the demand for pedestrians and cyclists to cross Tasman Drive near the stadium around game times. In addition, VTA suggests that the project applicant provide secure, guarded bicycle parking close to the proposed stadium on game days.
**3300 Olcott Street Office Building Project**

**3300 Olcott Street**

**Description:** Demolition of an existing 102,227 SF industrial office/warehouse and construction of a 179,100 SF office building

**VTA Comments:**

Transportation Impact Analysis - Existing Transit Facilities:

The summary of existing bus and shuttle routes in Section 2.2.1 of the Transportation Impact Analysis incorrectly states the span of service of VTA Local Bus Route 58. This route operates only in the peak periods on weekdays. In the northbound direction, it operates from 5:43am to 10:10am and from 2:50pm to 7:04pm. In the southbound direction, it operates from 5:57am to 9:21am and from 3:15pm to 8:17pm.

Pedestrian Accommodations:

VTA commends the project applicant for including a number of new pedestrian connections on the site, in particular a walkway that would directly connect the building to Olcott Street to the south. These connections will help promote safe and convenient pedestrian access, which will help reduce single-occupant automobile trips to the site. VTA suggests that the City work towards the eventual goal of establishing sidewalks on Olcott Street to connect to the existing sidewalk system at the Olcott Street/Scott Boulevard intersection. Towards this end, VTA suggests that the City consider requiring the project applicant to include sidewalks along the short stretch of the Olcott Street cul-de-sac on the project site, to connect with potential future sidewalks on neighboring properties.

Bicycle Parking:

VTA commends the project applicant for proposing bicycle conveniently located bicycle parking in quantities consistent with VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from [www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes](http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes). For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact Michelle DeRobertis of VTA's Development & Congestion Management Division. VTA suggests that the City require these bicycle racks and lockers a condition of approval of the project.

Transportation Demand Management:

While the IS/MND discusses two measures to encourage ‘Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation’ in the Global Climate Change Strategies table on p. 3-21, it does not address other TDM measures that would further reduce the automobile trip generation. In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the City consider requiring a comprehensive TDM program as a condition of approval of this project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the project include:

* Transit fare incentives such as Eco Pass and commuter checks
* Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks
* Showers and Clothes Lockers for Bicycle Commuters
* On-site or walk-accessible employee services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
* On-site or walk accessible restaurants

---
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Traffic Volume at Intersections 2:
In exhibit 9 of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) report, Southbound PM volume at Highway 101 SB ramp/Bowers Ave intersection should be 2,815 vehicles to balance the volumes instead of 815 vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Agency File #</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>Document Received</th>
<th>VTA Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Guadalupe River Flood Control Project - Construction of Temporary Bike Trail**
Location is within the project boundaries of the Guadalupe River Flood Control Project between Coleman Avenue and New Julian Street.

**Description:** Construction of a two-lane vehicle bridge on the Guadalupe River at the site of the former UPRR Bridge No. 3 to replace loss of access to UPRR property from removal of Bridge No. 3 during the flood control project in 2004.

**VTA Comments:**
Affected Resources and Environmental Consequences - Recreation and Traffic/Transportation:
The Guadalupe River Trail is an important route for more than recreation uses. It is used by bicycle commuters to and from downtown San Jose, North San Jose and surrounding areas. Please address the loss of this connection during construction in the Transportation section of the EA. Consideration should be given to both recreational and commuter users when developing detour routes and mitigation measures for the construction period.

Also the future closing of the trail should be posted 30 days in advance and the detour routes should be designed in conformance with the VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines (BTG) and coordinated with the City of San Jose. In addition, if the alternate route is a significant increased distance or travel time than using the trail, consideration should be given to allowing bikes to traverse the site by dismounting as an option to using the detour, as discussed in the BTG. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes <http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes>. For more information on the BTG, please contact Michelle DeRobertis of VTA’s Development and Congestion Management Division.
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**Ohlone Mixed Use**  
**Southwest corner of West San Carlos Street and Sunol Street**

**Description:** PD Rezoning from HI Heavy Industrial Zoning District to A(PD) Planned Development Zoning District to allow up to 800 multi-family residences and 30,000 SF of commercial use on an 8.23-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**

VTA has reviewed the TIA for this Project on an 8.25 gross acre site at the southwest corner of West San Carlos Street and Sunol Street which would include up to 800 multi-family residential units and 30,000 square feet of retail space. Before we discuss our comments and concerns regarding the TIA, we wish to highlight several facts relevant to our involvement on this Project.

Firstly, VTA is the Congestion Management Agency ("CMA") for Santa Clara County (the "County"). In this capacity, VTA has a statutory role in reviewing and commenting on development proposals that have the potential to impact Congestion Management Program ("CMP") facilities, and a responsibility to foster integrated transportation and land use planning in the County. Secondly, VTA is the transit service provider for the County. In this capacity, we have an interest in reviewing this and other development proposals in the County for their respective compatibilities with existing and planned transit service and infrastructure. VTA has Board-adopted programs for reviewing development proposals in these roles, which include commenting on site design, transportation and land use integration, and compatibility with transit, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.

Finally, VTA is the owner of an extensive portfolio of real estate assets along key transit corridors in the County. In this proprietary capacity, VTA has an interest in promoting transit-oriented development on its assets which generate additional revenue for VTA’s many functions. This Project is reflective of these proprietary interests, in that our agency is in contract with the Project applicant for the purchase and sale of VTA’s ownership interest in a portion of the Project site. We note that the contractual payment structure for VTA’s proprietary interest in the land includes a variable component correlated to the number of units built by the Project applicant such that VTA will receive additional monies if more than 713 units are built on the Project site.

While VTA has many roles on development projects in the County, in this case, VTA, acting in its capacities as a CMA and a transit provider in the County, offers the following comments and concerns on the TIA:

**Mitigation Measures:**

The report states that proposed mitigation measures at Delmas Avenue and Park Avenue intersection would require significant modifications to the traffic signal. Please clarify if the proposed modifications impact VTA light rail operations in any way. Any mitigation measures for automobile impacts should not adversely affect transit facilities and operations.

**Project Traffic Volumes:**

In Figure 10 of the TIA, the traffic volumes for intersection 19 and 20 do not balance; we recommend checking these figures to ensure that the volumes balance under project and background scenarios.
Existing Transit Service:
The summary of existing transit services should include VTA’s Local Bus Route 22, which operates approximately 0.6 miles north of the project site along The Alameda. Route 22 provides service between the Eastridge Transit Center and the Palo Alto Transit Center, along the same alignment as the 522 Rapid Bus. Route 22 operates seven days a week and offers 12-minute headways during weekday commute and midday hours.

Pedestrian Facilities:
Establishing a safe, direct, convenient, and attractive pedestrian route between the project site and the Race Street LRT station is an important opportunity for affirming the project’s Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) qualities. Page 56 of the TIA notes that the applicant plans to work with City staff on off-site capital improvement plans (i.e., sidewalks, etc.) and will contribute a fair-share contribution toward those improvements; it is assumed this statement includes sidewalks along Auzerais Avenue between Lincoln Avenue and Sunol Street. Accordingly, VTA assumes that the project will construct or improve sidewalks along the entire project frontage along Auzerais Avenue, Sunol Street, and West San Carlos Street, and that these improvements would be of sufficient urban design quality to help the project establish a sense-of-place and community identity. We suggest re-wording this section of the TIA to clarify these assumptions, and recommend that the City require these improvements as Conditions of Approval of the project at the appropriate time.

Automobile Parking and Transportation Demand Management:
Page 55 of the TIA notes the applicant proposes to meet the City of San Jose parking standards by working with City staff during the project review process. VTA encourages the City and applicant to work together to arrive at a quantity that takes advantage of the reduction in off-street parking allowed by the City’s zoning code for projects located within 2,000 feet of an existing rail station. VTA also encourages the applicant to consider establishing a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program as a way of reducing single-occupant trip generation by the project, and potentially as a way of reducing the project parking requirements as allowed by the City’s zoning code. Lastly, we encourage the City and applicant work collaboratively to consider and use where possible avant-garde parking design and technologies such as stacked, vertical or automated parking systems. The creative application of these systems could yield mutually beneficial results for the City, applicant and community.

As we have noted in past letters on this project, this development represents a significant opportunity for the applicant, the City and VTA to work together to promote a transit-oriented development that can help meet the City’s housing needs and contribute to the revitalization and sustainability of the Midtown area. This Project also has the potential to embody the principles laid out by our state legislators in the recently enacted California Senate Bill 375. VTA strongly encourages the Project applicant to design the proposed development according to the principles of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (“CDT”) Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use, as well as VTA’s Pedestrian Technical Guidelines and Bicycle Technical Guidelines.

Unquestionably, from many respects, VTA has an interest in seeing this development move forward, in a form that reflects exemplary design principles and maximizes benefits in terms of environmental sustainability and community livability. We hope that our comments help propel the Project towards this goal and look forward to continuing to work together to produce an exemplary transit-oriented development on this important urban infill site.
Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Update

Citywide

**Description:** Update of the City of San Jose's General Plan to the year 2040.

**VTA Comments:**

Goals and Policies:

VTA strongly supports the emphasis of the Envision San José 2040 process in directing growth at transit nodes and corridors. Focusing growth near transit is supportive of transit use, congestion management, and greenhouse gas reduction objectives, and is consistent with the principles of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program. The CDT Program was developed through an extensive community outreach strategy in partnership with VTA Member Agencies, has been endorsed by all 15 Santa Clara cities and the County, and we are pleased to see Santa Clara County’s largest city taking such supportive policy actions. In addition, the Envision San José 2040 strategy of focusing growth around transit supports regional goals established by MTC and ABAG, and establishes San José as a leader with respect to the goals of AB 32 and SB 375.

Extent of Analysis:

It is our understanding from page 2 of the NOP that the City does not intend to conduct a "significant review" of areas that are covered by Specific Plans and Area Development Policies in the General Plan Update and PEIR. VTA recommends that the City address these areas explicitly in the General Plan Update and PEIR, as many of these areas are near transit stations and corridors, and can play a large role in encouraging focused growth around transit.

Land Use/Transportation Scenario Evaluation:

VTA recommends that there be a feedback loop in the analysis of land use/transportation scenarios in the PEIR. As stated in the NOP, the initial analysis will involve four land use/transportation scenarios. VTA, along with other stakeholders, would be interested in reviewing the results and providing input on the initial analysis of the four scenarios. This feedback can then be considered during the refinement of the alternatives through the General Plan Update and PEIR process.

Modeling indicators that should be used in the analysis of the alternatives include: Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT), roadway Level of Service (LOS), transit boardings, delay (person-hours), and air quality emissions. Where appropriate, indicators should be expressed per capita, to highlight the differences between the impacts of various growth scenarios.

The City’s model for PEIR analysis should use the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035 committed projects for both the roadway and transit network. VTA can provide the GIS layers from VTP 2035; please contact Ya Wang in the Congestion Management Agency Division at (408) 321-5660 for assistance. Based on the map included in the NOP, some adjustments are needed to the transit network for the PEIR and the General Plan documents. For consistency with VTP 2035, light rail (LRT) should not be shown beyond Nieman Boulevard, and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) should be added on Stevens Creeks Boulevard and Monterey Highway. We suggest that the PEIR and General Plan documents include descriptions of various existing and planned transit services, including BRT, and the map of the transit network should be revised to more clearly...
show corridors with planned BRT service. The PEIR model should also include the planned Express Lane projects that are included in VTP 2035, including Express Lanes on all or portions of SR 85, SR 87, US 101, SR 237, I-680 and I-880 in Santa Clara County, as well as the SR 237/I-880 Express Connector project.

Roadway Network/Complete Streets:
VTA strongly supports the City’s efforts to adopt a multimodal approach in its General Plan Update, including an emphasis on local and regional transit service. VTA requests that the City address transit accommodations on multimodal roadways in the Update and accompanying PEIR. Consideration should be given to adopting a “transit first” policy for key LRT and BRT corridors, and to establishing an additional category of multimodal streets which would emphasize mobility for all modes and which would include enhanced stop amenities, transit priority treatments, and supporting pedestrian improvements. These improvements would help make transit a more viable option for San José residents and workers and help reduce single-occupant automobile travel in the City.

VTA encourages the City to explore improvements to the connectivity of the roadway system in the General Plan Update, in general and especially across freeways, for both motorized and non-motorized modes. Through and interconnected streets should be expanded and optimized, and street closures which result in a loss of connectivity and reduction in travel path choices should be avoided.

Level of Service Policy/Protected Intersections:
VTA encourages the City to continue to adopt a flexible approach to roadway Level of Service (LOS) in the General Plan Update and the PEIR. We recommend that the City’s approach to the inclusion of LOS protected intersections be addressed in the PEIR. In particular, protected intersections may need to be added along BRT corridors in order avoid introducing mitigation measures for traffic impacts that would adversely impact pedestrians, bicyclists, transit vehicles and users, or neighboring land uses.
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**Hacienda Gardens Commercial**  
**Southwest corner of Meridian and Foxworthy Avenues**  
**Description:** Planned Development Permit to construct a total of 121,870 SF of retail commercial uses on an 8.96-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**
**Bus Service:**  
VTA provides bus service on Meridian Avenue and maintains a bus stop at Meridian Avenue, south of Foxworthy Avenue. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, this bus stop should remain at its present location and the following improvements should be provided:

* Close the driveway approach at the north end of the bus stop and install a sidewalk to conform.
* Provide a 7’ X 25’ shelter pad back of the sidewalk according to VTA specifications, so the shelter can be located back of the sidewalk.
* Repair or replace PCC bus pad with a minimum 10’ X 55’ pad constructed to VTA specifications, including monolithic curb.
* Place all trees or landscaping features outside the bus loading area.
Land Use and Site Design:
VTA supports the proposed modest intensification of use on a site served by two VTA bus routes and within close proximity to a significant amount of residential development. The addition of neighborhood-serving retail at this location should help encourage trips by alternative transportation modes including walking, cycling, and transit. VTA commends the applicant for locating several new retail pad buildings close to street along Meridian Avenue and including direct pedestrian pathways between the sidewalk and the building entrances. These site design features are consistent with VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual. This document provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. For more information on the CDT Manual, please call Robert Swierk of VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.

Bicycle Parking:
The site plan in this Planned Development Permit application makes no mention of bicycle parking locations or quantities. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. VTA recommends that the City require the applicant to provide bicycle parking in the quantities specified in VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines as a condition of approval of the project. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact Michelle DeRobertis of VTA’s Development and Congestion Management Division.

Sunol Court Studio Apartments
NE corner of San Carlos Street and Sunol Street

Description: Construction of up to 117 multi-family studio units above a podium garage, and 2000 SF of commercial on 1.32 acres.

VTA Comments:
Site Density and Land Use Mix:
VTA supports the proposed density and mix of uses on a site within close proximity to two significant transit corridors, the West San Carlos corridor and the Vasona light rail corridor. Both of these corridors are included in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Cores, Corridors and Station Areas scheme, which shows VTA and local jurisdiction priorities for supporting concentrated development in the County. The CDT Program was developed through an extensive community outreach strategy in partnership with VTA Member Agencies, and has been endorsed by all 15 Santa Clara County cities and the County.
Potential Future West San Carlos Light Rail Station:
VTA encourages the City of San Jose to condition this project to provide a contribution to the construction of the potential future West San Carlos Light Rail Station, which would be located approximately 1,000 feet to the south of the proposed development. This would continue the framework of private development contributions that was established with the KB Homes development to the south and is continuing with the Green Republic Ohlone Mixed Use development to the southwest.

Transit Incentives:
VTA recommends that the City consider requiring the project applicant to provide transit incentives such as Eco Passes on a continuing basis, as a Condition of Approval of the project. Residential Eco Pass is a photo ID validated with an annual sticker to provide unlimited rides on VTA Bus and Light Rail seven days a week. VTA sells Eco Passes at a discount to housing developments like condominiums, apartments, townhouses, and neighborhood and community associations. For more information about VTA’s Eco Pass program, please contact Angela Sipp of VTA.
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**3300 Olcott Street Office Building Project**
3300 Olcott Street

**Description:** Demolition of an existing 102,227 SF industrial office/warehouse and construction of a 179,100 SF office building

**VTA Comments:**

Comment C-1: Transportation Impact Analysis - Existing Transit Facilities:
The summary of existing bus and shuttle routes in Section 2.2.1 of the Transportation Impact Analysis incorrectly states the span of service of VTA Local Bus Route 58. This route operates only in the peak periods on weekdays. In the northbound direction, it operates from 5:43am to 10:10am and from 2:50pm to 7:04pm. In the southbound direction, it operates from 5:57am to 9:21am and from 3:15pm to 8:17pm.

Comment C-2: Pedestrian Accommodations:
VTA commends the project applicant for including a number of new pedestrian connections on the site, in particular a walkway that would directly connect the building to Olcott Street to the south. These connections will help promote safe and convenient pedestrian access, which will help reduce single-occupant automobile trips to the site. VTA suggests that the City work towards the eventual goal of establishing sidewalks on Olcott Street to connect to the existing sidewalk system at the Olcott Street/Scott Boulevard intersection. Towards this end, VTA suggests that the City consider requiring the project applicant to include sidewalks along the short stretch of the Olcott Street cul-de-sac on the project site, to connect with potential future sidewalks on neighboring properties.

Comment C-3: Bicycle Parking:
VTA commends the project applicant for proposing bicycle conveniently located bicycle parking in quantities consistent with VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes <http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes>. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact Michelle DeRobertis of VTA's Development & Congestion Management Division. VTA suggests that the City require these bicycle racks and lockers a condition of approval of the project.

Comment C-4: Transportation Demand Management:
While the IS/MND discusses two measures to encourage 'Smart Land Use and Intelligent Transportation’ in the Global Climate Change Strategies table on p. 3-21, it does not address other TDM measures that would further reduce the automobile trip generation. In order to reduce the number
of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the City consider requiring a comprehensive TDM program as a condition of approval of this project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the project include:

* Transit fare incentives such as Eco Pass and commuter checks
* Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks
* Showers and Clothes Lockers for Bicycle Commuters
* On-site or walk-accessible employee services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
* On-site or walk accessible restaurants

Comment C-5: Traffic Volume at Intersections 2:
In exhibit 9 of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) report, Southbound PM volume at Highway 101 SB ramp/Bowers Ave intersection should be 2,815 vehicles to balance the volumes instead of 815 vehicles.

Comment C-6: Freeway Analysis:
Section 4.5.2 of the TIA report states that a freeway segment analysis is not required for the proposed development. However, VTA recommends including the analysis as shown in sample freeway analysis table, appendix B of the VTA Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines. VTA TIA guidelines may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Technical Guidelines. For more information on TIA guidelines, please call Shanthi Ganji of the CMP at 408-952-4224

Comment C-7: Vacant Development:
According to VTA TIA guidelines 2004 page 18, "if the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site with development rights, the number of trips originally associated with that development may be included in the background conditions". Or "if the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site without development rights, all trips generated by the proposed project would be project trips".

Please indicate that this development has development rights. If not existing land use trips reductions cannot be taken into consideration.

**City/County Response**

Response C-1: The summary of the span of service of VTA Local Bus Route 58 in Section 2.2.1 of the TIA has been corrected as requested.

Response C-2: The project will be conditioned to provide a sidewalk along the stretch of Olcott Street adjacent to the project site.

Response C-3: The project will be conditioned to provide both Class I and Class II bicycle parking consistent with VTA guidelines.

Response C-4: In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, the project will be conditioned to provide both Class I and Class II bicycle parking spaces consistent with VTA guidelines. In addition, based upon VTA’s suggestion to provide an improved TDM program, the following conditions of approval shall be added to the project:
1. The project shall provide showers and clothes lockers for bicycle commuters. The number of showers and clothes lockers shall be subject to the approval of the City Engineer.
2. The project shall provide priority parking for car-sharing vehicles. The number of parking spaces shall subject to the approval of the City Engineer.

Response C-5: Exhibit 9 of the TIA has been corrected as requested.
Response C-6: The proposed project is expected to add approximately 0.4% of the freeway segment along Highway 101. The VTA uses a threshold of at least one percent to identify potentially impacted freeway segments for inclusion in the transportation analysis. The project adds a maximum which is significantly lower than the threshold. Thus, a freeway segment analysis was not included in the analysis.

Response C-7: The proposed project site has development rights.
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**Gallery at Central Park Project**

**South of Kaiser Drive and west of Kiely Boulevard**

**Description:** Planned Development Master Community to develop the site with 806 housing units, including 45 SFRs, 152 townhomes, 73 row houses, and 536 multi-family units.

**VTA Comments:**

Transit Service and Site Design

Comment 6.1: Existing Transit Service:
Section 4.12.2.3, Table 4.12-1 and Figure 4.12-2 all omit several VTA bus routes that operate near the project site. VTA Lines 57 and 58 operate on Kiely Boulevard directly adjacent to the project site, and VTA Line 22 and Rapid 522 operate less than three-quarters of a mile from the project site - closer than VTA Limited Stop Route 328, which is currently addressed in the Existing Transit Service section. These routes provide important transit connections to many county destinations including downtown San Jose, Eastridge, Palo Alto, the Great America area, and West Valley College, and should be added to the Existing Transit Service discussion, summary table, and figure.

Comment 6.2: Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures - Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities:
The proposed pedestrian circulation system described in Section 4.12.4.4 and shown in Figure 3.0.7 provides good access from the project site to Kiely Boulevard and Kaiser Drive, but provides poor access to Pepper Tree Lane and areas to the west. Maintaining and enhancing pedestrian connectivity from neighborhoods to the west (for instance, along Pepper Tree Lane) is important to support transit use, walking and bicycling through the project site and surrounding neighborhoods.

Comment 6.3: Encouraging use of these alternative transportation modes is an important way of reducing the number of automobile trips generated by the project and their associated negative impacts on air quality, congestion, and energy use.

Comment 6.4: Specifically, VTA requests that the City require the applicant to provide pedestrian connections from Pepper Tree Lane to the new roadway serving the proposed cluster townhomes and single-family homes. These connections could be provided by extending the proposed pedestrian path north of the westernmost single-family homes (which appears to end just short of Pepper Tree Lane in Figure 3.0.7) and providing...
a new path just to the north between the westernmost sets of cluster townhomes. We also request that the City require a path to be provided through the single-family home area to the multi-use path on the southern boundary of the project site. These paths should be open to the public (‘Exterior’ paths) and be wide enough to accommodate both pedestrians and bicycles.

Comment 6.5: Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures - Transit Service:
The discussion of Transit Service in Section 4.12.4.4 omits several VTA bus routes that operate near the project site. A discussion of any potential impacts on VTA Lines 22, 57, 58 and Rapid 522 should be added to this section.

Comment 6.6: Bus Stop Improvements:
As mentioned in the Draft EIR, the bus stop adjacent to the project site on Kiely Boulevard should remain at its present location. In addition, there should be no tree wells or obstacles in the bus loading area.

Comment 6.7: Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures - Trip Generation and Operational Impacts:
VTA suggests that the City and the project applicant consider adding a small component of ground-floor retail into the project on the Kiely Boulevard frontage. This would allow residents of the new development as well as the surrounding neighborhood to accomplish some errands by walking, biking or transit and reduce the number of automobile trips generated by the project.

Transportation System Planning and Design

Comment 6.8: CMP Intersections:
VTA recommends inclusion of three CMP intersections to the list given in the TIA notification form for analysis:
CMP ID 1211 Lawrence Expressway (North) / Stevens Creek Blvd
CMP ID 1212 Lawrence Expressway (South) / Stevens Creek Blvd
CMP ID 1214 Lawrence Expressway / El Camino Real

This recommendation is based on VTA TIA guidelines that state, a CMP intersection shall be included in a TIA if the proposed development project is expected to add 10 or more peak hour vehicles per lane to any intersection movement.

Comment 6.9: Parking:
The project is proposing 1790 parking spaces for the development. The traffic study implies that the project is exceeding city code requirement by 123 parking spaces. VTA recommends a reduction in the number of parking spaces that is less than or at the least equal to that established by the City of Santa Clara code.

Comment 6.10: Freeway Segments:
VTA recommends including a list of freeway segments as part of the traffic analysis. In addition, VTA recommends using the latest 2007 Monitoring and Conformance Report for the freeway and expressway analysis. This report summarizes the existing conditions level of service (LOS) data for freeways, expressways in Santa Clara County. The document may be downloaded from http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmplereport2007/. For more information please contact the VTA CMP at 408-546-7923.
**City/County Response**

Response 6.1:
The existing transit service section, Section 4.12.2.3, Existing Transit Service, of the draft EIR has been revised to include VTA Routes 22, 57, 58, and Rapid 522. These changes are reflected in Section 2.0 of this final EIR.

Response 6.2:
As shown in Figure 3.0-7, Conceptual Pedestrian Circulation Diagram, in the draft EIR east-west pedestrian access to Pepper Tree Lane is provided via sidewalks on Kaiser Drive and a multi-purpose path along the southern edge of the project site adjacent to the proposed single-family homes and Saratoga Creek. A pedestrian path that terminates at a playground just east of Pepper Tree Lane would provide pedestrian access to Pepper Tree Lane, but would be equipped with a low fence next to the play area as an added safety measure for playground users.

Response 6.3:
See Response 6.2. The project site was selected for project development by the applicant to reduce automobile dependence, and encourage compact development, provide access to public space, walkable streets, and access to public transportation. The project would be located in an area that is already centrally located within a largely built-out city that is served by existing public services and facilities. The project would also implement energy performance standards including energy efficient standards for the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning system, and other appliances that could be installed in residential units and common areas of the site.

Response 6.4:
As stated on page 3.0-14 of the draft EIR, a 5-foot-wide public pedestrian path and 10-foot public multi-purpose path would be constructed within the 100-foot creek setback area and would extend in a southerly direction, south of the single-family homes to Pepper Tree Lane. The path also extends to the north providing access to the internal roadways and other portions of the site, including the multi-family units, town houses, and Kaiser Drive. Sidewalks would be provided on the north side of the single-family homes that would provide pedestrian and bicycle access to the proposed 13-foot multi-purpose public trail that would traverse the eastern portions of the site adjacent to Kiely Boulevard. City staff will continue to work with the applicant to further refine the final pedestrian connections with respect to the sidewalk between the local road and Pepper Tree Lane (adjacent to the playground between the proposed tow houses and single-family homes) and a pedestrian and bicycle connection through the single-family homes to the southern shared-use path to ensure adequate pedestrian circulation between the two streets.

Response 6.5:
The proposed project conservatively estimates an additional 12 to 24 new bus riders, based on 2.5 to 5 percent of the number of vehicles trips (474) during the AM and PM peak hours. This range of 2.5 to 5 percent is typical of Santa Clara County transit usage. Seven bus routes (22, 57, 88, 81, 328, 330, and Rapid 328) serve areas near the project site. The additional peak-hour bus riders would be distributed among the six buses, resulting in an additional average transit demand of approximately 2 to 3 riders per bus. According to the boarding data in the VTA's 2008 Short Range Transit Plan, the existing bus routes have adequate capacity to meet this new demand. Therefore, the project would not create a significant transit impact to these bus routes.

Response 6.6:
The bus stop adjacent to the project site is not being moved as part of the project, and no tree wells or obstacles would be located within the bus loading area.
Response 6.7:
Parcels 1 and 2 are designed Residential Medium Density (26 to 35 dwelling units per acre) by the City's general plan and/or Parks and Recreational and/or Institutional, and Parcel 3 is designated Residential Moderate Density (19 to 25 dwelling units). The application submitted is consistent with the current land use designation for the project site. Retail uses are not permitted land use at the site; however, retail uses are available within walking distance to the site.

Response 6.8:
The traffic analysis was prepared following the City of Santa Clara traffic impact guidelines (2008) and the VTA TIA Guidelines. VTA's travel demand forecasting model was used to estimate the major directions of approach and departure for the proposed project. Trip distribution was refined by identifying existing travel patterns and the relative locations of complementary land uses. Where it was determined that the project would add 10 or more peak-hour trips per plane to any intersection, that intersection was studied in the draft EIR. VTA's regional travel demand model was used for the distribution. The model found that the proposed project would not result in 10 or more new peak-hour trips per lane at the three intersections listed in the comment, and therefore were not evaluated in the project's TIA.

Response 6.9:
The comment is noted. The project complies with the City's standards for the Planned Development-Master Community (PD-MC) zoning district and provides all the required parking on the project site for the number of housing units proposed. The parking standard for the PD-MC is a minimum standard. The surrounding neighborhood has expressed concern regarding the overspill of parking from future residents of the proposed project to the surrounding neighborhood and to Central Park. In response to these concerns, the applicant has designed the project to include parking above the minimum standard. The project would also institute Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures that are intended to reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicle trips from the site. The cornerstone of the program is a Transportation Coordinator (TC) that would assist residents with their transportation needs. The TC would help identify transportation options including identifying bus and rail routes. The leasing and sales office would also have extensive information regarding all travel options.

Response 6.10:
The project expected to add less than 30 peak-hour trips to any mainline segment on Interstate 280 (I-280). According to the VTA TIA Guidelines, the project would have a significant impact if it added more than 1 percent of the freeway segment's capacity. One percent of the capacity of I-280 in one direction is 69 vehicles where the total capacity in one direction is 2,300 vehicles per lane per hour multiplied by 3 lanes. Therefore, the project would not have a significant impact on any I-280 freeway segment.

US Highway 101 is located approximately 20 miles from the project site. The project trip assignment shows that project trips at the intersections closest to this freeway would not exceed more than 10 peak-hour trips per lane. The trip assignment shows that project trips would disperse into other portions of the City prior to reaching US Highway 101, and the amount of trips using this freeway from the project would be negligible.
Scott Boulevard Office Project  
3240-3450 Scott Boulevard

**Description:** Demolition of two vacant industrial buildings totaling 114,000 SF and construction of a new 5-story, 215,520 SF Class A office building.

**VTA Comments:**

**Comment C1: Traffic and Circulation Impacts - Site Design and Pedestrian Access:**
VTA agrees with the assessment in Section 3.1.4.3 of the DEIR that the project site plan needs to be redesigned to include a direct pedestrian connection between the existing sidewalks along Scott Boulevard and the building entrance. We also suggest that the developer consider moving the building closer to Scott Boulevard and shifting more of the parking behind the building. This would help create a more active and pedestrian-friendly frontage along Scott Boulevard. As the project moves closer to implementation, VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual should be used when designing this development. This document provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. For more information on CDT Guidelines, please call the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division.

**Comment C2: Traffic and Circulation Impacts - Bicycle Parking:**
VTA supports requiring the project applicant to provide bicycle racks and lockers on-site as a condition of project approval, as noted on page 3.1-17 of the DEIR. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division.

**Comment C3: Transportation Demand Management:**
While the DEIR discusses Transportation Demand Management (TDM) in the section on consistency between the City’s General Plan and applicable Air Quality Management Plan Transportation Control Measures (pp. 4-8 and 4-9), it does not adequately address what TDM measures would be taken by the project itself.

In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the Lead Agency consider requiring a comprehensive TDM program as a condition of approval of this project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the project include:

* Transit fare incentives such as Eco Pass and commuter checks
* Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks
* Showers and Clothes Lockers for Bicycle Commuters
* On-site or walk-accessible employee services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
* On-site or walk accessible restaurants
* Parking for car-sharing vehicles
Comment C4: San Tomas Expressway and Scott Boulevard (Page 27 of TIA):
The report states that the intersection level of service could be improved by adding a second right-turn lane to west bound approach, and it is consistent with the latest Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study. Although the LOS improves at this intersection, VTA is concerned that this improvement will increase crosswalk distance and will increase duration of pedestrian and bicyclist exposure to motor vehicle traffic. Please consider reducing the crossing distance by narrowing the lane widths on Scott Boulevard to minimize the crossing distance. VTA agrees with the recommendation to include a "No Right Turn on Red" restriction to help minimize conflicts with both pedestrians and bicycles crossing Scott Boulevard.

Comment C5: Bus Service:
VTA provides bus service along Scott Boulevard and maintains a bus stop adjacent to the project site on eastbound Scott Boulevard, opposite Octavius Drive. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to maintain the bus stop at its current location and provide the following improvements:
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout consistent with VTA standards
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad consistent with VTA standards.
* An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad.
* Locate all trees outside bus loading areas.

City/County Response:

Response C1:
The proposed building has been located proximate to Scott Boulevard with the majority of the parking at the rear of the building. The building is setback 150 feet from Scott Boulevard and 400 feet from the rear property line. This 150-foot setback from Scott Boulevard provides for a pedestrian oriented arrival courtyard, as well as American with Disability Act (ADA) compliant parking within close proximity of the building's main entrance. As noted in section 3.1.4. And included in the project's Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), "Prior to building permit issuance, the project site plan shall be redesigned to include a direct pedestrian path or sidewalk between the existing sidewalks and the building entrance to clearly identify pedestrian space and vehicle space to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Inspection. This shall include a sidewalk from the existing bus stop at the project site to the parking area to eliminate any pedestrian from using the driveway to access the sidewalk and bus stop."

Response C2:
Thank you for your comment. The project will be conditioned to provide both Class I and Class II bicycle parking consistent with VTA guidelines.

Response C3:
In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, the project will be conditioned to provide both Class I and Class II bicycle parking spaces consistent with VTA guidelines. In addition, based upon VTA's suggestion to provide an improved TDM program, the following conditions of approval shall be added to the project:
1. The project shall provide showers and clothes lockers for bicycle commuters. The number of showers and clothes lockers shall be subject to the approval of the City Engineer.
2. The project shall provide priority parking for car-sharing vehicles. The number of parking spaces shall subject to the approval of the City Engineer.
Response C4:
In order to create a safer pedestrian and cyclist environment, if feasible and subject to the approval of the City Engineer, the project design may include the following elements:
1. Design the second westbound right-turn lane to minimize crosswalk distance with narrow right-turn lanes;
2. A no right-turn on red restriction shall be provided to minimize conflicts with pedestrians and bicycles crossing Scott Boulevard; and
3. Provide a pedestrian refuge island to further minimize crossing distance and accommodate waiting pedestrians and signal pole.

Response C5:
The project shall be conditioned to work with VTA and the Traffic Engineering Division regarding VTA bus stop improvements to existing bus stops on Scott Boulevard in front of project. These improvements may include construction of a concrete bus pad, bus duckout, and construction of bus shelter. Regarding the request for a bus duckout, it should be noted that the eastbound through lane at the existing bus stop has a 20 foot total width. As a result, a bus duckout may not be needed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agriculture Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Across Barrier Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Acre(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Altamont Commuter Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(PD)</td>
<td>Planned Development Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTG</td>
<td>Bicycle Technical Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDT</td>
<td>Community Design &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Commercial General Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI/C</td>
<td>Combined Industrial/Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Construction Staging Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>Citizen Watchdog Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH</td>
<td>Downtown Area Shuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Downtown Commercial Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>Draft Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>Deep Soil Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU/AC</td>
<td>Dwelling Units Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIR</td>
<td>Final Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>Future Transit Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High-Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITR</td>
<td>Industrial to Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Light Rail Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU/TD</td>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR</td>
<td>Monitoring and Conformance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND</td>
<td>Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVHDR</td>
<td>Multifamily Very High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollution Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Portland Concrete Cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>Planned Development Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPOS</td>
<td>Public Park/Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>Pedestrian Technical Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Planned Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-M</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right-Of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVHD</td>
<td>Residential Very High Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RZ</td>
<td>Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Site and Architectural Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVWD</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Site Development Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Square Foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>Single Family Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Specific Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRR</td>
<td>Southern Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRTC</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>Temporary Construction Easement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCR</td>
<td>Transit Corridor Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>Transportation Impact Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA NF</td>
<td>Transportation Impact Analysis Notification Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>Utility Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Every quarter, the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report is presented to the VTA Board of Directors and the Policy and Technical Advisory Committees. The objective of the report is to assist VTA staff, the Advisory Committees, the VTA Board and project sponsors in tracking progress of the projects funded through programming actions of the VTA Board.

The Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for July-September 2009 is attached for review. This report provides the latest status on discretionary funded projects. A project summary sheet highlighting projects with funds that expired in 2009 is also attached.

The project summary sheet identifies projects in three categories:

- Red - Projects at the risk of losing funds due to delivery difficulties.
- Yellow - Projects that may need extra attention or will risk running into difficulties.
- Green - Projects are progressing smoothly.

All of the projects with funds that expired in 2009 fall into the "green" category and are progressing smoothly.

Selection of federally funded projects for fiscal year 2010 (October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010) has been delayed pending the reauthorization of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) which expires this fall. Staff anticipates that projects will be programmed for 2010 and 2011 in the spring and summer of 2010.

The next Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report will be prepared for the quarter between October and December 2009.
ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW/RECOMMENDATION:

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) received this item as part of its consent agendas at the November 12, 2009 meeting. There was no discussion of this item.

STANDING COMMITTEE REVIEW/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Planning & Programming Committee (CMPP) received this item as part of its consent agenda. This item was not discussed.

Prepared By: Bill Hough
Memo No. 2238
Progress Summary Sheet
Funds Expiring in 2009

Red = Project at risk of losing funds due to delivery difficulties.
Yellow = Project may need extra attention or will risk running into difficulties.
Green = Project is progressing smoothly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Federal/State Funds</th>
<th>Obligation Deadline</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County-San Tomas Bicycle Shoulder Delineation</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070042</td>
<td>$249,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>County obtained E-76 for construction-working to get ready for advertisement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-Various non-Expressway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL050076</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>County obtained E-76 for construction-Anticipated award March 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy 6th Street Streetscape West</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070039</td>
<td>$459,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>City received the E-76 for construction approval from Caltrans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy Pedestrian Enhancement</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070010</td>
<td>$323,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas-So. Abel &amp; So. Main Streetscape Imps. - 1</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070037</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill-3rd Street Promenade</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070014</td>
<td>$1,520,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose - Jackson Street Pedestrian Imps.</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070040</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose State Univ. / Japantown Pedestrian Imps.</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL050061</td>
<td>$1,555,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose: Lower Guadalupe River Trail</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL050081</td>
<td>$1,377,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>PE at 95% stage of development. City working with Caltrans to secure E76 for construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga Village Pedestrian Enhancements</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070038</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>City going out to bid in November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga-Highway 9 Safety Improvements</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070050</td>
<td>$462,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>City received E76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale-Murphy Ave Streetscape Revitalization</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070036</td>
<td>$1,697,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA-Santa Clara Caltrain Station Pedestrian Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL090031</td>
<td>$1,467,827</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Funds transferred to FTA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
### July-September 2009

### Project Title: ACE Track Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALA010015</td>
<td>Construct 8,000 ft. passing siding between UPRR milepost 56.9 &amp; 30.8 in the Livermore Valley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $2,000 (ALA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $2,000 (SCL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local $2,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: ACE</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>ACE Track Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>10/02</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
<th>obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Schmidt</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>$6,100</th>
<th>00/01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>$6,100</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: ACE</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>3/23/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Project remains on hold. Working out issues with UPRR.
### Project: Guadalupe, riparian habitat

**Sponsor:** Caltrans  
**Project No:** SCL030008  
**Project Description:** Route 87 San Jose - monitor riparian habitat  
**Project Title:** Guadalupe, riparian habitat  
**Fund Source:** RIP $750  
**Manager Name:** Nick Saleh  
**Phone/Fax:** 510-286-6355/510-622-5460  
**E-Mail:** nick_saleh@dot.ca.gov  
**Sponsor:** Caltrans  
**Project No:** SCL050013  
**Project Description:** US 101 from SR 87 interchange to 0.4 km north of Trimble Road. Landscape mitigation.  
**Project Title:** US 101/SR 87 Trimble Road Landscaping  
**Fund Source:** TIP (FY11) $2,290  
**Manager Name:** Nick Saleh  
**Phone/Fax:** (510) 286-6355/ (510) 622-5460  
**E-Mail:** nick_saleh@dot.ca.gov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $750  
**Funds Expire:** 6/30/11  
**Last Updated:** 10/5/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$23</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $2,390  
**Funds Expire:** 6/30/11  
**Last Updated:** 7/8/2007

This project is for long-term monitoring of environmental commitments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>Caltrans</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Route 680 Southbound HOV Lane Between Route 84 and Route 237</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Construct final southbound HOV lane on I-680 between Rte 84 and Rte 237, including aux. lanes &amp; ramp metering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCL991077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTIP $11,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td></td>
<td>Emily Landin-Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td>(510) 286-5124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:emily_landin-lowe@dot.ca.gov">emily_landin-lowe@dot.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$8,308</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
<th>obligated/awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,308</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last Updated: 9/22/2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070022</td>
<td>East Campbell Ave from Railroad Ave to Union Ave; Reconfiguring intersection, widen</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the bridge over Los Gatos Creek, install bike lanes where feasible plus landscaping,</td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$712</td>
<td>2007/9</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>streetscaping &amp; public art.</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARRA $2,160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTA $270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local $1,278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Matthew Jue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-866-2154</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2,996</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>Funds Expire 11/30/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTHEWJ@ci.campbell.ca.u">MATTHEWJ@ci.campbell.ca.u</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated 10/2/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% design completed. Anticipated construction beginning in 1/10.
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
### July-September 2009

### Gilroy Pedestrian Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070010</td>
<td>Gilroy: Construct sidewalks and a pedestrian bridge across Miller Sough.</td>
<td>Gilroy Pedestrian Enhancement</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bridge prep work completed-awaiting delivery of pre-fab bridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Dey</td>
<td></td>
<td>408-846-0450</td>
<td><a href="mailto:don.dey@ci.gilroy.ca.us">don.dey@ci.gilroy.ca.us</a></td>
<td>CMAQ $323 Local $277</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gilroy 6th Street Streetscape West/East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070039</td>
<td>On 6th St. btw Eigleberry &amp; Monterey St. and Monterey &amp; Railroad Street; streetscape enhancements including decorative sidewalks, curb bulbouts, pedestrian lighting, banners, shade trees, bike racks &amp; street furniture.</td>
<td>Gilroy 6th Street Streetscape West/East</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gilroy has its E-76 approval for the Sixth Street Streetscape project, Eigleberry to Railroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don Dey</td>
<td></td>
<td>408-846-0450</td>
<td><a href="mailto:don.dey@ci.gilroy.ca.us">don.dey@ci.gilroy.ca.us</a></td>
<td>CMAQ $1174 Local $197</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $323 Local $277</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $1174 Local $197</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor:</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL070037</td>
<td>Implement roadway infrastructure, bike/ped, public transit and streetscape improvements on S. Abel &amp; S. Main Streets btw Great Mall Parkway &amp; Montague Expressway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Funds ($000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Ezeokeke</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(408) 586-3316</td>
<td>$888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:jezeokeke@ci.milpitas.ca.gov">jezeokeke@ci.milpitas.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>$988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>So. Abel &amp; So. Main Streetscape Impls. - Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $850</td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local $450</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funds Expire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obligated/awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9/30/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor:</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

**July-September 2009**

### Integrated Fueling Facility

**Project No:** 01SC04  
**Project Description:** This project will upgrade the City's CNG fueling facility, add a publicly accessible CNG dispenser, and construct a propane fueling facility.  
**Fund Source:**  
- Local $300  
- TFCA $300 (2001)  
**Manager Name:** Karen Bengard  
**Phone/Fax:** (650) 329-2636  
**E-Mail:** karen.bengard@cityofpaloalto.org  
**Fund Source:**  
- PE/ENV $0  
- Right of Way $0  
**Funds ($000):**  
- Construction $600  
**Schedule:**  
- Programmed Year:  
  - Start  
  - End  
- Current  
- Total $600  
**Comments:** Construction in progress. Expected completion in November 2009.

### Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade

**Project No:** SCL050091  
**Project Description:** Traffic signal upgrades requiring the installation of hardware and software at 9 major intersections in Palo Alto.  
**Fund Source:**  
- Earmark $368  
- Local $98  
**Manager Name:** Sam Peiris  
**Phone/Fax:** 650-329-2425  
**E-Mail:** Sam.Peiris@CityofPaloAlto.org  
**Fund Source:**  
- Planning $0  
- Right of Way $0  
**Funds ($000):**  
- Construction $373  
**Schedule:**  
- Programmed Year:  
  - Start  
  - End  
- Current:  
  - 09/10  
- Total $476  
**Comments:** Local assistance process has been initiated.
## Stanford Avenue-El Camino Real Intersection Project

### Project Title:

**Project Title:** Palo Alto: Intersection of Stanford Ave and El Camino Real; Design and Construction of intersection improvements including bulbouts, enhanced paving, lighting and storm drain outlet

### Project Phase:

- **Planning:**
  - Funds ($000): $140
  - Schedule: 07/08
  - Programmed Year: 4/09
  - Current: 1/10
    - Comments: Design/Environmental in progress.

- **PE/ENV:**
  - Funds ($000): $15
  - Schedule: 07/08
  - Programmed Year: 4/09
  - Current: 1/10

### Manager Name:

- **Shahla Yazdy**

### Phone/Fax:

- **650-617-3151**

### E-Mail:

- Shahla.Yazdy@CityofPaloAlto.org

### Funds Source:

- **Local ($334)**
- **TE ($1,334)**

### Funds Expire:

- 6/30/2010

### Project Costs:

- **Construction:**
  - Funds ($000): $1,513
  - Schedule: 09/10
  - Programmed Year: 8/10
  - Current: 8/11

- **Total:**
  - Funds ($000): $1,668

### Last Updated:

- 10/1/2009

---

City of Palo Alto
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

**July-September 2009**

### Silicon Valley Transportation Management Center (TMC)

**Project Title:** Construct a new regional Traffic Management Center in the SJ Civic Center that will allow for better integration of local & regional traffic management

**Current Year:** 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only element remaining is the enhancement of the video sharing system, which includes the upgrade of the Silicon Valley ITS Wide Area Network (SV-ITS WAN). Advertisement of the SVITS WAN Redesign and Implementation RFP is scheduled for Aug. 2009 with the design work began in Feb 2009 and project completion set for May 2010.

**Manager Name:** Lily Lim-Tsao

**Phone/Fax:** (408) 975-3269

**E-Mail:** lily.lim-tsao@sanjoseca.gov

**Sponsor:** City of San Jose

**Funds Expire:** obligated

**Last Updated:** 10/9/2009

### Almaden Expressway Pedestrian Bridge (BEP Project)

**Project Title:** Almaden Expressway, near Coleman Rd; Construct a 360 ft. Ped Bridge over Almaden Expressway to connect nearby trails and to the Almaden Light Rail Station.

**Current Year:** 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City met with Caltrans to update Field Review and Preliminary Environmental Study forms for a bridge extension that would span both the expressway and Guadalupe Creek. The City will send in an additional E76 request to receive the remainder of the funds allocated for this project since the increased scope has increased the consultant's fees.

**Manager Name:** Yves Zsutty

**Phone/Fax:** (408) 793-5561

**E-Mail:** yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov

**Sponsor:** City of San Jose

**Funds Expire:** no expiration

**Last Updated:** 9/22/2009
### San Jose State University/Japantown Pedestrian Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL050061</td>
<td>From San Jose State University and Japantown to Civic Center through the Hensley Historic District; Construct pedestrian improvements including street trees, lighting, etc. (TLC project).</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Under construction; completion anticipated in January 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Rufino Ortiz  
**Phone/Fax:** (408) 975-3285  
**E-Mail:** Rufino.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov  
**Fund Source:** CMAQ HIP $1,555  
Local $391  
**Funds ($000):**  
PE/ENV $1,887  
**Last Updated:** 10/6/2009

### Silicon Valley TIMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL050079</td>
<td>Transportation Incident Management Center: Implement subregional hub for traffic management activities including arterial traffic, incident management, traveler information and emergency incident management center. HPP #2017</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$1,719</td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Devin Gianchandani  
**Phone/Fax:** (408) 975-3254/292-6093  
**E-Mail:** devin.gianchandani@sanjoseca.gov  
**Fund Source:** Earmark $6,038  
Local $1,510  
**Funds ($000):**  
Construction $5,829  
**Last Updated:** 10/9/2009

**City received Section 106 Cultural Resources clearance on 10/2/07. City obtained NEPA clearance from Caltrans in Dec. 07. PE obligation was approved by Caltrans on May 28, 2008. Construction award anticipated for Dec. 2010.**
### Lower Guadalupe River Trail (BEP Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PE at 95% stage of development. Final environmental study in process to define any impacts as part of elevating Tasman Drive Under-Crossing. With receipt of NEPA, City to complete PSE and bid project for construction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL050081</td>
<td>Construct 6.4 mile trail including safety enhancement and improvements from I-880 to Gold Street in San Jose.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $1,377</td>
<td>Earmark $11,214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local $705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Manager Name</strong></th>
<th>Yves Zsutty</th>
<th><strong>Phone/Fax</strong></th>
<th>(408) 793-5561</th>
<th><strong>E-Mail</strong></th>
<th><a href="mailto:yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov">yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Bay Trail Reach 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PE and NEPA related studies underway.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL050082</td>
<td>Preparation of CNST and ENV documents for 1.2 miles of trail, a pedestrian bridge, and underpass with safety and enhancement improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Fund Source** |                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Earmark $675   | Earmark $2,365                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| Local $2,365   |                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Manager Name</strong></th>
<th>Yves Zsutty</th>
<th><strong>Phone/Fax</strong></th>
<th>(408) 793-5561</th>
<th><strong>E-Mail</strong></th>
<th><a href="mailto:yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov">yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

July-September 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sponsor:</strong></th>
<th>City of San Jose</th>
<th><strong>Project Title:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Lower Guadalupe River Trail (BEP Project)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Phase</strong></th>
<th><strong>Funds ($000)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Schedule</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$219</td>
<td>Prior Years</td>
<td>7/08 - 1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Programmed Year</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th>$13,296</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>9/22/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sponsor:</strong></th>
<th>City of San Jose</th>
<th><strong>Project Title:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Bay Trail Reach 9</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Phase</strong></th>
<th><strong>Funds ($000)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Schedule</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>06/07 - 3/08</td>
<td>9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>06/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Programmed Year</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th>$7,030</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>9/22/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

City of San Jose
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

### July-September 2009

**Coyote Creek Trail (BEP Project)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL050083</td>
<td>Master Plan, design of 9.8 miles transportation trail, including safety and improvements between SR 237 and Story Rd.</td>
<td>Yves Zsutty</td>
<td>(408) 793-5561</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov">yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>Earmark $3,774 Local $5,095</td>
<td>Planning: $0</td>
<td>Community meetings (4/16 and 8/20) conducted. Final community meeting scheduled for 10/7. With community process completed, master plan alignment to be finalized and environmental studies will commence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV: $270 08/09 9/08 9/11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way: $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jackson Street Pedestrian Imps.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070040</td>
<td>On Jackson Street between 1st &amp; 4th Streets: Construct pedestrian-oriented improvements including decorative sidewalks, bulbouts, lighting, banners, shade trees, bike racks &amp; street furniture.</td>
<td>Rufino Ortiz, Jr</td>
<td>(408) 975-3285</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rufino.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov">Rufino.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>CMAQ $1,300 Local $246</td>
<td>Planning: $37 2009</td>
<td>Under construction; completion anticipated in December 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV: $30 2009 complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way: $0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design: $10 2009 complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction: $1,469 2009 9/09 12/09 Funds Expire obligated/awarded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total $1,546</td>
<td>Last Updated 10/6/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Silicon Valley Smart Corridor - Highway 880 Enhancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL976002</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Smart Corridor, various highways, expressways and arterials - fiber optics, video cameras, changeable message signals, traffic sensors, data collection stations &amp; software upgrades.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Fund Source**:
  - CMAQ $500
  - Demo $1,409
  - FAU $1,187
  - TFCA $835 (1998)

- **Manager Name**: Lily Lim-Tsao
- **Phone/Fax**: (408) 277-2549
- **E-Mail**: lily.lim-tsao@sanjoseca.gov

- **Funds**: $3,931
- **Programmed Year**: 00/01
- **Current**: 11/09
- **Fund Expire Obligated**: Funds Expire obligated

- **Last Updated**: 10/9/2009

**Comments**: Design is anticipated to be finalized by October 2009. Construction award anticipated to occur in November 2009.
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## DeAnza Trail (BEP Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070026</td>
<td>Saratoga: DeAnza Trail between Saratoga-Sunnyvale Rd and Saratoga Ave; development and construct bike/pedestrian trail.</td>
<td>CAAG $1,400</td>
<td>John Cherbone</td>
<td>(408) 868-1241</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cherbone@saratoga.ca.us">cherbone@saratoga.ca.us</a></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8/2010</td>
<td>Saratoga rejected the bids for Phase 1 (October 2008), because of the PG&amp;E ROW and SCVWD easements issues. City decided to include both Phases 1 and 2 and go out to bid late November 2009 again.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund Source
- CMAQ $1,400
- Local $571

### Funds ($000)
- Planning: $0
- Right of Way: $190 (Complete)
- Total: $1,971

### Last Updated
- 9/29/2009

---

## Saratoga Village Pedestrian Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070038</td>
<td>Downtown; Bike/Ped enhancements including street crossing improvements minor sidewalk repair, bike racks, bus shelters and other enhanced pedestrian travel routes to bus stops.</td>
<td>CMAQ $425</td>
<td>Macedonio Nunez</td>
<td>408-868-1218</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mnunez@saratoga.ca.us">mnunez@saratoga.ca.us</a></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>City anticipates going out to bid November 2009 and starting construction early 2010.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund Source
- CMAQ $425
- Local $253

### Funds ($000)
- Planning: $0
- PE/ENV: $30 (2008, complete)
- Right of Way: $0 (complete)
- Total: $678

### Last Updated
- 9/29/2009
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Saratoga</th>
<th>Project Title: Highway 9 Safety Improvements (BEP Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL070050</td>
<td>Construct bike/ped safety improvements on SR9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fund Source</strong></th>
<th><strong>Manager Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>E-Mail</strong></th>
<th><strong>Phone/Fax</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonio Nunez</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mnunez@saratoga.ca.us">mnunez@saratoga.ca.us</a></td>
<td>408-868-1218/408-868-1281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Phase</strong></th>
<th><strong>Funds ($000)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Programmed Year</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$522</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>09/09 02/10</td>
<td>City obtained E76 for PE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Schedule</strong></th>
<th><strong>Funds Expire</strong></th>
<th><strong>Last Updated</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>9/29/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/09</td>
<td>02/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/10</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
<th><strong>Remarks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,522</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Saratoga
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### Mathilda Avenue Bridge Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Sunnyvale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL050006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>On Mathilda Avenue, over Caltrain/UPRR at Evelyn Ave. Widen structure along both sides, add south bound aux lane, realign, replace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>HBBR (10/11) $28,826 Local $3,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Manny Kadkhodayam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkadkhodayam@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us">mkadkhodayam@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Mathilda Avenue Bridge Replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds ($000)</td>
<td>Planning $0, PE/ENV $3,522, Right of Way $84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Programmed Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>E76 obtained. Advertise for bids in October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$33,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>9/29/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tasman/Fair Oaks Area Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Sunnyvale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL0700015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Sunnyvale: Area bounded by Tasman Drive, Morse Avenue, Weddell Drive and Fair Oaks Avenue; Enhancements including signage, lighting, sidewalks, curbs, crosswalks for pedestrian access to transit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local (453) TE (1,809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Richard Chen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rchen@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us">rchen@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>Tasman/Fair Oaks Area Enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds ($000)</td>
<td>Planning $82, PE/ENV $0, Right of Way $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Programmed Year:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>07/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>9/30/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Sunnyvale</th>
<th>Project Title: Murphy Ave Streetscape Revitalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL070036</td>
<td>In Sunnyvale: On Murphy between Evelyn &amp; Washington; Streetscape &amp; intersection improvements including sidewalk modification, street furniture, lighting, crosswalk paving, signage etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Manager Name** | **Design** | $787 | completed |
| Chuck Neumayer | | | |

| **Phone/Fax** | **Construction** | $3,981 | 2009 | 7/09 | 3/10 | \[Funds Expire\] | \[obligated/awarded\] |
| 408-730-7834 | | | | | | |

| **E-Mail** | **Total** | $4,768 | | | | \[Last Updated\] | \[9/30/2009\] |
| cneumayer@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us | | | | | | | |
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#### Various Non-Expressway Rehab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL050076</td>
<td>Various non-expressway roadways; Rehabilitation of pavement on various federal-aid eligible arterial/collectors.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>07/08 &amp; 08/09</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Manager Name:** Khoa Vo
- **Phone/Fax:** 408-494-1329/408-297-0530
- **E-Mail:** khoa.vo@rda.sccgov.org

**Project Description:**

Phase 1 construction complete. Phase 2 postponed due to it being primarily a pavement overlay project. With the oncoming cooler weather, County has decided to not advertise Phase 2 until February 2010. This would put Award at March 2010.

**Funds ($000):**

- **Total:** $2,023

**Last Updated:** 10/6/2009

#### Oregon-Page Mill Expressway Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL050080</td>
<td>Traffic improvements including traffic signal upgrade, optimizing timing plans &amp; bike and pedestrian facilities on Oregon-Page Mill Expressway between US 101 and SR 82.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>12/08</td>
<td>10/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Manager Name:** Mike Griffis
- **Phone/Fax:** 408-573-2492/408-441-0276
- **E-Mail:** mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org

**Project Description:**

Conceptual engineering is underway

**Funds ($000):**

- **Total:** $4,300

**Last Updated:** 9/22/2009
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### Almaden Expressway Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070005</td>
<td>Various improvements including adding northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes on Almaden Expressway from north of Branham Lane to south of Blossom Hill Road.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>Property acquisition and design underway. Construction is scheduled in summer 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7/08</td>
<td>3/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Mike Griffis</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>9/08</td>
<td>3/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-573-2492/408-441-0276</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$4,679</td>
<td>07/08 &amp; 08/09</td>
<td>7/10</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org">mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Tomas Bicycle Shoulder Delineation - Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070042</td>
<td>Stripe bicycle delineation along San Tomas Expressway and Camden Avenue in Campbell.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$11</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Dan Collen</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-573-2492</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$349</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>11/09</td>
<td>7/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dan.collen@rda.sccgov.org">dan.collen@rda.sccgov.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project Title: Diridon Station Track/Signal/Terminal Upgrade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPB991001</td>
<td>Rebuild track, platforms, terminal facilities and pedestrian subways at the San Jose Diridon Station to improve operations for all users (Caltrain, Amtrak, Capitol Corridor, ICE and UP RR).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Joel Slavit</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(650) 508-6476</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$10,056</td>
<td>01/02 &amp; 02/03</td>
<td>12/08 12/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slavitj@samtrans.com">slavitj@samtrans.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sponsor: JPB

**Fund Source:**
- CMAQ $6,593
- Local $857
- STIP $2,626

**Last Updated:** 9/22/2009

---

### Project Title: Caltrain/ACE Santa Clara Train Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL991060</td>
<td>Rebuild the track and passenger platforms and construct track connections to enable ACE trains to stop at the Santa Clara Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Joel Slavit</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$701</td>
<td>00/01</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(650) 508-5476</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>12/09 12/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:slavitj@samtrans.com">slavitj@samtrans.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Sponsor: JPB

**Fund Source:**
- CMAQ $3,098 (2000)
- Local $403

**Last Updated:** 9/30/2009
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**Sponsor:**

**Project Title:** Planning, Programming and Monitoring - Santa Clara County Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTC990005</td>
<td>Planning, programming &amp; monitoring activities in the San Francisco Bay Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Source**

- AB3090 $346 (06/07)
- RTP $133 (07/08)
- RTP $229 (08/09)
- RTP $29 (06/07)
- RTP $44 (04/05)

**Manager Name:** Kenneth Kao

**Phone/Fax:** (510) 817-5768

**E-Mail:** kkao@mtc.ca.gov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year Start</th>
<th>Programmed Year End</th>
<th>Current Start</th>
<th>Current End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$662</td>
<td>03/04-05 &amp; 06/07-09</td>
<td>07/03</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- AB3090 (06/07) - $346 allocated
- RTP (05/06 & 06/07) - $58 allocated
- RTP (07/08) - $30
- RTP (08/09) - $120

**Funds Expire:** 2/1/09

**Last Updated:** 10/10/2007

---

**Sponsor:**

**Project Title:** STP 3% Set-aside for Planning Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL978008</td>
<td>STP 3% set-aside for planning purposes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Source**

- Local $271
- STP-G $3,943

**Manager Name:** Kenneth Kao

**Phone/Fax:** (510) 464-7842

**E-Mail:** kkao@mtc.ca.gov

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year Start</th>
<th>Programmed Year End</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$4,214</td>
<td>99/00 to 04/05</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- Ongoing program managed by MTC.
- FY 99/00-01/02: STP $2,141,000
- FY 02/03: STP $452,000 - oblig.
- FY 03/04: STP $671,000 - oblig. 9/3/03
- FY 04/05: STP $679,000 - oblig. 8/12/04
- FY 05/06: STP $690,000 - oblig.
- FY 06/07: STP $700,000 - oblig.

**Funds Expire:** obligated

**Last Updated:** 3/14/2007
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

#### July-September 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>STIP Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description:**
- **SCL010004:** STIP Planning, Programming and Monitoring - Santa Clara County.
- **SCL050033:** US-101/Tully Road Interchange Modifications

**Project Phase:**
- Planning
- Design
- Right of Way
- Construction

**Fund Source:**
- **RTIP $547 (08/09)**
- **RTIP $547 (09/10)**

**Manager Name:**
- Amin Surani
- Ven Prasad

**Phone/Fax:**
- (408) 546-7989
- 408-321-5647

**E-Mail:**
- amin.surani@vta.org
- ven.prasad@vta.org

**Sponsor:**
- VTA

**Project No:**
- SCL010004
- SCL050033

**Project Title:**
- RTIP $547 (08/09)
- RTIP $547 (09/10)

**Fund Source (RTIP $547):**
- Earmark $7,000
- Local $25,020
- Other: I-BOND-CMIA $30,000
- Other: ST-CASH-T2 ($955)

**Fund Source (US-101/Tully Road Interchange Modifications):**
- Earmark $7,000
- Local $25,020
- Other: I-BOND-CMIA $30,000
- Other: ST-CASH-T2 ($955)

**Manager Name (RTIP $547):**
- Amin Surani

**Manager Name (US-101/Tully Road Interchange Modifications):**
- Ven Prasad

**Phone/Fax (RTIP $547):**
- (408) 546-7989

**Phone/Fax (US-101/Tully Road Interchange Modifications):**
- 408-321-5647

**E-Mail (RTIP $547):**
- amin.surani@vta.org

**E-Mail (US-101/Tully Road Interchange Modifications):**
- ven.prasad@vta.org

**Comments:**
- Funds Expire 2010

**Total Costs:**
- **SCL010004:** Total $1,094
- **SCL050033:** Total $62,975

**Last Updated:**
- 4/15/2009
- 7/8/2009
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### I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Interchange Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>VTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong></td>
<td>SCL070002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
<td>Interchange improvements at the I-280/I-880/Stevens Creek Blvd interchange.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fund Source</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of SJ $1,500</td>
<td>Earmark $19,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA LPR $500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Phase</strong></th>
<th><strong>Programmed Year</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E-76 for PE received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>3/06 8/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>2/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Manager Name** | Sajeeni DeAlwis-Mima |
| **Design**       | $1,700               | 06/07       | 2/09 4/12    |

| **Construction** | 08/09 | 3/11 | 12/13 |

| **Funds ($000)** | $17,130 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funds Source</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$17,130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Last Updated** | 7/10/2009 |

---

### I-880 Widening - SR237 to US101

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>VTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong></td>
<td>SCL070016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
<td>San Jose/ Milpitas: On I-880 btw SR 237 &amp; US 101; Operational and safety improvements including widening to accommodate HOV lanes in both directions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fund Source</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local ($23,400)</td>
<td>Other I-Bond/CMIA ($71,600)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project Phase</strong></th>
<th><strong>Programmed Year</strong></th>
<th><strong>Current</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>06/09 02/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Manager Name** | Lam Trinh |
| **Design**       | $6,200       | 2009        | 11/07 02/11  |

| **Construction** | 08/09 | 06/11 | 07/13 |

| **Funds ($000)** | $75,200 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Funds Source</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Last Updated** | 9/22/2009 |

---

Wednesday, October 21, 2009 3:19:18 PM

VTA
### US101 Auxiliary Lanes - SR85 to Embarcadero Road

**Sponsor:** VTA  
**Project No:** SCL070024  
**Project Description:** Santa Clara County: US 101 between Route 85 and Embarcadero Road; Construct auxiliary lanes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$3,534</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$6,612</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>07/09</td>
<td>11/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Lam Trinh  
**Phone/Fax:** 408-952-4217  
**E-Mail:** lam.trinh@vta.org  
**Funds ($000):** $102,258  
**Last Updated:** 9/22/2009  
**Funds Expire:** 2010

### Route 152 new alignment

**Sponsor:** VTA  
**Project No:** SCL090016  
**Project Description:** Route 152 new alignment from Rte 101 to Rte 156. Realign highway and evaluate route management strategies, including potential roadway pricing. Also includes SR152 "trade corridor" study from 101 to SR99.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>6/09</td>
<td>3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Darrell Vice  
**Phone/Fax:** 408-952-4214  
**E-Mail:** darrell.vice@vta.org  
**Funds ($000):** $10  
**Last Updated:** 7/6/2009  
**Funds Expire:**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: VTA</th>
<th>Project Title: SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong>: SCL090029</td>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong>: Implement roadway pricing on the carpool lane-to-carpool lane direct connectors between SR 237 and I-880.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong>: ARRA $2,700, Local $1,300, VPPP $3,960</td>
<td><strong>Manager Name</strong>: Leo Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone/Fax</strong>: 408-321-5972</td>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong>: <a href="mailto:leo.scott@vta.org">leo.scott@vta.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmed Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start</strong></td>
<td><strong>End</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$3,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$7,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: VTA</th>
<th>Project Title: Santa Clara Caltrain Station Pedestrian Grade Separated Crossing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong>: SCL090031</td>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong>: Provide a safe crossing for pedestrians to cross the UPRR tracks between the Caltrain Station on the west side to the commercial and industrial complexes on the east side of the tracks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Source</strong>: CMAQ $1,468</td>
<td><strong>Manager Name</strong>: Ken Ronsse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone/Fax</strong>: (408) 952-4129</td>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong>: <a href="mailto:ken.ronsse@vta.org">ken.ronsse@vta.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schedule</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmed Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start</strong></td>
<td><strong>End</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## I-880 Smart Park Project

**Project Title:** I-880 Smart Park Project  
**Sponsor:** VTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: VTA</th>
<th>Project Title: I-880 Smart Park Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL991013</td>
<td>Develop Smart Park at Tasman Drive and other I-880 Smart Corridor locations which incorporates various ITS features.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Roan</td>
<td>(408) 321-7109</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>8/2010</td>
<td>10/2010</td>
<td>9/24/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $945

**Comment:** Funds Expire 6/10/2010

---

## Integrated ITS Program

**Project Title:** Integrated ITS Program  
**Sponsor:** VTA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: VTA</th>
<th>Project Title: Integrated ITS Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL991057</td>
<td>Develop an integrated Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) for VTA services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total:** $2,202

**Comment:** Funds Expire 6/20/2010

---
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Community Design & Transportation Program - FY10/11 Capital Grant Award

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the project list to program Community Design & Transportation Program Capital Grants as shown in Attachment A.

BACKGROUND:

The VTA Board of Directors approved the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program to provide guidance, information and best practice manual as tools to assist Member Agencies in proactive planning and development processes. In addition, the CDT Program provides two forms of financial grant incentives to encourage good multi-modal design of City/County projects; Planning Grant and Capital Grants. This memorandum regarding award of CDT Capital Program grant funding.

The CDT Capital Grants program is intended to help Member Agencies design and build transit and pedestrian-friendly projects and to include transit and pedestrian-friendly elements in capital projects related to transit facilities, streets, and core areas such as downtowns and neighborhood commercial areas. The funding for the CDT Capital Grant Program is identified in the 25-year long-range countywide transportation plan, Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035, adopted by the VTA Board on January 8, 2009. Funding for the FY 2010-2011 CDT Capital Grant Program came through the County’s share of the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds.

The VTA Board of Directors adopted its’ current policies and criteria for the CDT Capital Grants Program at its February 1, 2007 meeting.
DISCUSSION:
On August 20, 2009, VTA issued a call for CDT Capital Grant projects and in response received four project applications. A Scoring Committee reviewed and evaluated the projects on October 29, 2009 using VTA's Board-approved policies and criteria. The Scoring Committee was composed of VTA staff, the Chair of the VTA Capital Improvement Program Working Group from the City of Campbell, and staff from the Cities of San Jose and Sunnyvale and the County of Santa Clara.

The CDT scoring criteria limits funding to projects that score 70 points or more on a 100-point scale. Each application was allowed to request a maximum of $1.5 million. The four applications requested approximately $4.78 million in total funding and the Scoring Committee’s recommended projects are shown in Attachment A and summarized as follows:

The City of Campbell proposed a capital project that would implement the City’s newly adopted Winchester Boulevard Master Plan. The proposal includes enhancements along the Campbell Ave/Winchester Boulevard corridor such as pedestrian-friendly street lighting, linking the Community Center to downtown, and constructing a landscaped median island.

The City of San Jose submitted two proposals:

(1) the San Carlos Multimodal Streetscape Improvements and
(2) the Tasman Drive Under-Crossing along the lower Guadalupe River Trail.

The San Carlos Multimodal Streetscape Improvements project encompasses pedestrian-oriented improvements along the south side of San Carlos Street between Second and Fourth Streets. The Tasman Drive Under-Crossing project proposes to elevate that portion of the surface three feet to eliminate flooding of the trail and provide continuous off-street trail access year round.

The City of Sunnyvale submitted the Sunnyvale Downtown Streetscape Improvements project which is consistent with the City’s Downtown Specific Plan. The project is located in the downtown transit core of the Town Center. Streetscape amenities include ADA compliant sidewalks and curbs, furniture, lighting, signing and marking.

ALTERNATIVES:
The VTA Board may select other projects for programming.

FISCAL IMPACT:
There is no fiscal impact to VTA as a result of this action. A total of $4.78 million will be made available to the cities of Campbell, San Jose and Sunnyvale for multi-modal transportation capital projects.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
On November 12, 2009, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and unanimously approved the CDT Capital Grant project list for programming. This item will be considered by the CMPP Committee on November 19, 2009.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
On November 19, 2009 the Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP) met as a Committee of the Whole and considered this item. The Committee asked several questions about project eligibility and future grant availability.

Prepared by: Celeste Fiore
Memo No. 1356
## Attachment A

### Community Design & Transportation Capital Grant Program
#### 2009 Final Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Grant Request</th>
<th>Grant Recommended</th>
<th>Cumulative Grant Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>San Carlos Multimodal Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Downtown Streetscape</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Winchester Boulevard Improvement Project</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>$4,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Tasman Drive Undercrossing</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$660,000</td>
<td>$4,780,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: 2010 STIP Program

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the 2010 STIP Program as presented by VTA staff in this memorandum.

BACKGROUND:

VTA, as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Santa Clara County, has the responsibility for prioritizing and programming discretionary Federal, State, regional and certain local funds for transportation projects in Santa Clara County.

One of the major funding programs is the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) which is updated every two years. The STIP is divided into two sub-programs; the Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) and Regional Improvement Program (RIP) which includes Santa Clara County's proportional share of the state funding.

STIP funding consists of a series of 5-year projections in which three years of each STIP period overlap with the prior STIP period. In the late summer of odd numbered years, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) releases a new 5-year STIP Fund Estimate for the upcoming STIP period that adjusts the prior estimates and adds two new years of fund programming capacity.

The 2008 STIP program was approved by the VTA Board of Directors on December 7, 2007. This memorandum covers the upcoming 2010 STIP which covers State fiscal years 2011 through 2015. The process includes approval of the Santa Clara County priorities by the VTA Board in December, approval of the Bay Area priorities by MTC in April and approval of the State-wide STIP in June by CTC.
DISCUSSION:

The California Transportation Commission has adopted the 2010 STIP Fund Estimate, which establishes the amount of new programming capacity available between 2010 and 2015. Funds come primarily from the State Highway Account (SHA), which itself has two primary sources:

(1) State excise taxes on gasoline ($0.184/gal) and diesel ($0.244/gal) and truck weight fees.
(2) Prop. 42 transfers of State sales taxes on gasoline and diesel.

California state law makes the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) the top priority for SHA funds and all Federal funds designated for Caltrans. The SHOPP has unmet needs in the billions, and much like local streets and roads, the amount of State Highway lane mileage estimated to be in substandard condition is increasing.

Per-gallon State fuel tax rates have not been raised since 1994. While fuel prices have been relatively high in the recent past, which increases the sales tax collected per gallon, this effect has been countered by reduced consumption due to those higher prices, high unemployment and general consumer uncertainty. The total amount of fuel sold dropped significantly in 2008 and 2009 compared to previous years.

As a result, the State’s STIP revenue projections for 2011 through 2015 are barely enough to cover the SHOPP and STIP commitments that are already programmed for 2009 through 2013. The only new funds available are Federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds. Santa Clara County's share of this new TE funding is approximately $6 million.

### STIP Fund Estimates: New Programming Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP Cycle</th>
<th>2006 STIP</th>
<th>2008 STIP</th>
<th>2010 STIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide New Programming</td>
<td>$1.791 Billion</td>
<td>$1.164 Billion</td>
<td>$89 Million (All TE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County Share</td>
<td>General: $0* TE:</td>
<td>General: $0* TE:</td>
<td>General: $0 TE:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>$3.7M</td>
<td>$4.6M</td>
<td>$6.2M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Santa Clara County was over-programmed in the 2006 and 2008 cycles due to GARVEE bond payments and allocations in the 2002 and 2004 STIP cycles.

Previous VTA Board actions direct all TE funding to the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) program. VTA staff has conducted a CDT call-for-projects, and the Board will be asked to approve a program of projects in a separate agenda item.

Although there is no new general capacity for Santa Clara County, staff recommends submitting a request to the CTC to advance program $1.8 million in new Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) funds for VTA. The VTA Congestion Management Program uses these funds for ongoing planning, programming, and project monitoring support for VTA and member...
Agencies, as well as, to develop roadway projects (highway, local road, bike and pedestrian) for future implementation.

**Proposed 2010 Santa Clara Non-TE STIP Program Priorities**

($Millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project/Program</th>
<th>Current Programming</th>
<th>Proposed New Programming</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Expressway Light Rail Extension</td>
<td>$57.54</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$57.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport People Mover</td>
<td>$50.44</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$50.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Programming &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>$3.38</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
<td>$5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-87 Riparian Habitat (Julian to US 101)</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Landscaping</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$112.21</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>$113.99</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board may consider other alternatives.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action would provide an additional $1.78 million in Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) funds to the Congestion Management Program budget in fiscal years 2011 through 2015 if approved by the California Transportation Commission.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

On November 12, 2009, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and unanimously recommended this item to the Board for approval. This item was considered by the CMPP Committee on November 19, 2009.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

On November 19, 2009, the Congestion Management Planning & Programming Committee (CMPP) reviewed and discussed this item. Committee members asked for and received verbal clarification on the status of the programming for the Capitol Expressway Light Rail Extension and the Airport People Mover Projects. Committee Members also asked that additional history, background and context of the previous STIP programming decisions of the Board be included in the future 2012 STIP Board of Directors memorandum in order to provide additional background on past decisions. There being no quorum, the Committee members were supportive of staff’s recommendations, but unable to take action on the item.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: TFCA 40% Project Selection Criteria Revisions

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Modify the criteria used to evaluate and select projects for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager fund and review the status of ongoing Santa Clara County TFCA projects.

BACKGROUND:

The Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) is generated by a $4.00 surcharge on vehicle registrations. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) administers these funds in the nine-county Bay Area. Funds are available for allocation to alternative fuels, arterial management, bicycle, and trip-reduction projects that reduce vehicle emissions.

BAAQMD returns 40% of these funds to the county in which they are collected for allocation by a “program manager.” This fund is called the TFCA Program Manager Fund (TFCA 40%). VTA is the program manager for Santa Clara County. Project sponsors apply directly to VTA for funding. The VTA Board of Directors allocates these funds to projects in Santa Clara County, subject to approval by BAAQMD.

New BAAQMD policies require VTA to conduct a periodic review of criteria for expenditure of TFCA funds. The revised policy states that VTA should “Hold a public meeting each year at least once a year, for the purpose of adopting criteria for expenditure of the funds and to review the expenditure of revenues received.”

The VTA Board of Directors last amended the criteria for reviewing TFCA project applications on February 1, 2007. The current Board-adopted scoring criteria are listed in Attachment A.

In accordance with the BAAQMD directive that the board should “review the expenditure of
revenues received,” Attachment B details the status of Santa Clara County's TFCA 40%-funded projects.

**DISCUSSION:**

Staff requested feedback on the criteria for expenditure of the funds from the CIP Working Group at its June 23 and August 25 meetings and the Systems Operations & Management working group at its August 26, 2009 meeting. The CIP Working Group believed that there was value to maintaining the community benefits component of the existing scoring criteria. Therefore, staff proposes no changes to the scoring criteria in Attachment A.

Regarding the impacts of signal timing activities, the CIP working group discussed the impacts of signal timing projects on transit operations or bicycle and pedestrian traffic.

Staff recommends enhancement of the TFCA application form to include screening criteria that allow a project sponsor to highlight consideration of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities. The enhancements include asking whether there are existing (or planned) bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities (e.g., bicycle detection, designated bicycle lanes, designated bicycle trails, pedestrian cross walks, and pedestrian signals) at the project location. If such facilities are present, or planned by the jurisdiction for construction within the next five (5) years, the project sponsor is asked to verify that applicable bicycle and pedestrian guidelines, such as the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), or VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines and/or Pedestrian Technical Guidelines, or guidelines adopted by local jurisdictions will be followed.

Additionally, staff recommends a screening criterion that if the project is in a Light Rail Transit, Bus Rapid Transit or Core Service Corridor (see Attachment C), the project sponsor will coordinate with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority with the goal of maintaining or improving the current level of transit signal priority within the transit corridor.

Based on the above discussion, the following screening criteria questions will be added to the project application:

- Are existing or planned bicycle or pedestrian facilities (e.g., bicycle detection, designated bicycle lanes, designated bicycle trails, pedestrian cross walks and pedestrian signals) present at the project location? Yes___  No___

- If Yes to above, will the project sponsor follow applicable bicycle and pedestrian guidelines, such as VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines and Pedestrian Technical Guidelines, MUTCD or guidelines adopted by local jurisdictions? Yes___  No___

- If the project is in a Light Rail Transit, Bus Rapid Transit or Core Service Corridor (see attached map), will the project sponsor coordinate with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority with the goal of maintaining or improving the current level of transit signal priority within the transit corridor? Please provide evidence of such coordination in the form of letters or emails. Yes___  No___

The CIP Working Group met on October 1, 2009 and accepted the staff recommendation...
regarding the impacts of signal timing projects on bicycle and pedestrian traffic. However, the Working Group did not accept the recommendation regarding impacts to transit operation. The TAC subcommittee discussed this item on September 10 and October 8 without coming to a final conclusion.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could decide to keep the existing criteria, or it could adopt a different set of criteria.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

On November 12, 2009, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) reviewed and discussed this item. The discussion in both committees focused on the two new proposed screening criteria.

The TAC recommended wording changes to the screening criterion dealing with bicycle and pedestrian facilities, specifying the planning horizon and naming the California MUTCD as an applicable set of standards. These recommendations have been incorporated into the language in this memorandum.

The TAC did not support the second screening criterion, specifically objecting to the requirement that transit signal priority be maintained at its current level in the corridors where it now exists. The TAC recommended that the item be sent to a TAC working group for further discussion and deferred until next year.

The PAC accepted the TAC's amendments to language regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and then unanimously recommended immediate adoption of both scoring criteria, without further amendment, to the VTA Board of Directors. Several Committee members expressed surprise that the criterion regarding consideration of bicycle and pedestrian facilities was not already included in the program.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

On November 19, 2009, the Congestion Management Planning & Programming (CMPP) Committee reviewed and discussed this item. While there was no quorum, the members present supported the staff recommendations with regards to the scoring criteria and the new screening criterion regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities, inclusive of the TAC's recommendations. The committee members discussed the second screening criterion at length, recommending that the wording and intent be changed to make maintenance and improvement of transit signal priority a goal rather than a requirement. This change has been incorporated into the recommendation currently before the VTA Board.

Prepared by: Bill Hough
Memo No. 2063
### Current TFCA Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness, Relative Scale</strong> - See CE values below:</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Benefits:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Congestion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Significance</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve &quot;Communities of Concern&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people served</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Shift</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Matching Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 point for each percentage of local match, up to 30.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total = 100</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cost Effectiveness Values [TFCA funds per ton of total ROG, NOx and weighted PM10 emissions reduced ($/ton)]:**

- $0 - $19,999 = 30 points
- $20,000 - $27,999 = 28 points
- $28,000 - $35,999 = 26 points
- $36,000 - $43,999 = 24 points
- $44,000 - $51,999 = 22 points
- $52,000 - $59,999 = 20 points
- $60,000 - $67,999 = 18 points
- $68,000 - $75,999 = 16 points
- $76,000 - $83,999 = 14 points
- $84,000 - $89,999 = 12 points
- $90,000 and above disqualified
## Attachment B-TFCA project status

**Program Manager:** Santa Clara VTA  
**Date:** 10/28/2009

**Report Period:** □ May 31st  
**X** Oct. 31st

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BAAQMD Project #</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Initial TFCA Funds Awarded</th>
<th>Current TFCA Funds Awarded</th>
<th>YTD TFCA$ Paid Out</th>
<th>Funds from CP/UB</th>
<th>TFCAS Reprgm To Project# or FY</th>
<th>% Cmpl</th>
<th>% Cmpl per CMA Update</th>
<th>Project Completion Date</th>
<th>Project Cmpl Date Per CMA Update</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98SC01</td>
<td>Arterial Management - Smart Corridor Phase IV</td>
<td>$1,120,000.00</td>
<td>$1,120,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1/1/2010</td>
<td>5/1/2011</td>
<td>TIP ID SCL976002; *TFCA portion complete; overall project 60% complete; Regarding deadline see D. Wiley email of 9/20/2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02SC05</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Traffic Management Center</td>
<td>$280,000.00</td>
<td>$280,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>9/1/2009</td>
<td>11/1/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>TIP ID SCL100041; *TFCA portion complete; overall project 80% complete. Regarding deadline see D. Wiley email of 9/20/2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04SC05</td>
<td>San Jose ITS West - Stevens Creek</td>
<td>$346,000.00</td>
<td>$346,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12/30/2008</td>
<td>8/1/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project complete; regarding deadline see D. Wiley email of 9/20/2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05SC02</td>
<td>Sunnyvale-Saratoga/Mathida Adaptive Traffic Signal Project</td>
<td>$315,000.00</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9/1/2007</td>
<td>9/1/2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project completed in September 2007. 2-year “after study” update attached, see report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07SC02</td>
<td>Upgrade to airport’s CNG fueling station</td>
<td>$526,684.00</td>
<td>$526,684</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10/31/2009</td>
<td>10/5/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07SC03</td>
<td>Provide pedestrian and bus-stop improvements as part of Tasmans/Fair Oaks Streetscape Project</td>
<td>$296,260.00</td>
<td>$296,260</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10/31/2009</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion date extended per letter of 9/21/2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07SC04</td>
<td>Permanent Creek/US 101 Overpass</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10/31/2009</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completion date extended per letter of 9/23/2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08SC02</td>
<td>San Jose Bicycle Racks</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08SC03</td>
<td>Almaden &amp; San Tomas Expressways Signal Timing</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$49,256.69</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08SC04</td>
<td>LRT Controller Upgrade Project Phase 2</td>
<td>$545,450.00</td>
<td>$545,450</td>
<td>$349,604.00</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08SC05</td>
<td>Moplas - Traffic Signal Managmnt System</td>
<td>$775,000.00</td>
<td>$775,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08SC07</td>
<td>Grant Road Adaptive Signal Project</td>
<td>$330,058.00</td>
<td>$330,058</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>In progress, estimated completion 8/2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08SC08</td>
<td>West Little Llagas Creek Bike Trail, Phase 4 (Edes court to Spring Ave)</td>
<td>$134,000.00</td>
<td>$134,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td>10/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funding difficulties, additional CON funding TBD—see report item #3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment C: Core Service Corridor

VTA Key Corridors
- Light Rail
- BRT
- Core Bus

Map showing core service corridors in the San Jose area with light rail, BRT, and core bus routes highlighted.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: 2009 Congestion Management Program

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the 2009 Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP).

BACKGROUND:

State law requires that urbanized counties biennially adopt a Congestion Management Program (CMP) containing specified elements. The intent of the CMP is the development of a comprehensive program that will monitor and mitigate traffic congestion, improve air quality, better integrate land use and transportation decision-making, and coordinate transportation systems planning and development activities.

VTA, as the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Santa Clara County, is responsible for updating the CMP Document every two years. The CMP is submitted to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for an evaluation of its consistency with MTC’s Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Following MTC’s evaluation, the responsibility to implement the CMP rests with VTA and local jurisdictions.

DISCUSSION:

The 2009 Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program is defined in terms of nine elements that logically structure the program: 1) transportation system definition; 2) traffic level of service standards; 3) multimodal transportation performance measures; 4) transportation demand management; 5) countywide transportation model; 6) community form and land use impact analysis; 7) capital improvement program; 8) annual monitoring and conformance...
requirements; and 9) deficiency plan requirements.

The CMP provides practical options for managing our region’s traffic congestion today and provides a framework for developing preventative and innovative planning options for the future. The CMP also serves as a short-term element of Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035 by focusing on congestion management strategies that can be implemented within the short to mid-term.

The 2009 update signifies an evolving and more active role for the CMP in our region’s future. The 2009 CMP revisions include:

- An updated Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Element reflecting the most current information available regarding VTA’s programs, operating revenues, and information resulting from the latest updates to the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP 2035) and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The CIP identifies programmed projects as well as future transportation projects and programs identified in VTP 2035 and the 2008 Short-range Transit Plan (SRTP).


- An updated Countywide Transportation Model and Database Element to reflect the new countywide transportation model and enhanced Geographic Information Systems (GIS)/Land Use Analysis capabilities and applications.

- A discussion of the development and implementation of Community Design and Transportation (CDT) Program Planning and Capital Grant Fund Programs. These programs help support the continued implementation of VTA’s land use program to better integrate transportation and land use.

- The inclusion of VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy (TSP) and transit Service Design Guidelines (SDG) to assist in the planning, designing, implementing and monitoring of VTA-operated transit services.

Areas that the CMP will address over the next two years include:

- A comprehensive update to the 2008 CMP Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines, starting in 2010. The update will focus on updating the level-of-service analysis methodology, addressing the impacts on the alternative transportation modes, and improved methodology in the evaluation of impacts from transit-oriented and in-fill developments.

- Revision of the CMP Guidelines for Preparing Deficiency Plans that will provide Member Agencies direction in the documentation of deficiencies caused by new development on the regional transportation system.
• Development of a new Transportation Energy and Air Quality (TEAQ) Program that will provide a framework to develop initiatives, projects and programs, conduct research and work with partner agencies to address climate change and energy issues in the coming years.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board may request staff to make changes to the 2009 Congestion Management Program.

FISCAL IMPACT:

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

ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

The Technical Advisory Committee received a brief presentation and unanimously recommended adoption of the 2009 Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP).

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

The Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee received a brief presentation on the 2009 Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP). Member Kishimoto requested that there be an inclusion of information regarding land use data near transit in the 2009 Document. Staff will include her request in the final draft of the 2009 CMP Document.

Prepared by: John Sighamony
Memo No. 2204
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Memorandum of Understanding Between Council of San Benito County Governments and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority for SR 152 Corridor

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council of San Benito County Governments to formalize the Mobility Partnership committee to provide direction on the development of a SR 152 Trade Corridor and a new alignment of SR 152 between SR 156 and US 101.

BACKGROUND:

An ad-hoc committee, referred to as the Mobility Partnership, comprised of elected officials and staff from the counties of Santa Clara and San Benito, has been meeting over the last three years to discuss safety issues and concerns associated with State Route 152 (SR 152). This ad-hoc committee is separate from the South County Policy Advisory Board formed by the VTA Board of Directors in 2002 to discuss transportation issues in the southern part of Santa Clara County, generally south of the SR 85/US 101 interchange in the City of San Jose. The South County Policy Advisory Board includes one member appointed from each of the cities of Gilroy, Morgan Hill, and San Jose, the county supervisor representing the southern part of Santa Clara County, and one VTA Board Member appointed by the VTA Board of Directors.

One outcome of the work of the ad-hoc committee is the ongoing SR 152 Trade Corridor project that includes project development work for a new alignment of SR 152 between SR 156 and US 101. This ongoing work is being led by VTA through up to $5 million in Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds assigned to VTA by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and up to $5 million in matching Local Program Reserve
funds approved by VTA Board of Directors.

The Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) that is the subject of this memorandum formalizes the Mobility Partnership and the roles for the Council of San Benito County Governments (SBCOG) and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) related to the development of a SR 152 Trade Corridor and a new alignment for SR 152.

SBCOG approved the MOU at their October 15, 2009 Board of Directors meeting.

DISCUSSION:

The Mobility Partnership was formed in 2006 in response to safety issues and traffic congestion along SR 152 in Santa Clara and San Benito counties. The Mobility Partnership ad-hoc committee is informally attended by two elected officials from San Benito County and two elected officials from Santa Clara County, currently Supervisor Don Gage and Mayor Al Pinero of the City of Gilroy. The MOU proposes to formalize the Mobility Partnership with appointment of four members, two appointed by the VTA Board of Directors, one appointed by the SBCOG Board of Directors, and one appointed by the San Benito County Board of Supervisors. It is proposed that Santa Clara County's two positions on the Mobility Partnership be assigned from the already existing South County Policy Advisory Board membership. The Mobility Partnership would generally cover an area in southern Santa Clara County and northern San Benito County along SR 152 and would be responsible for providing guidance to the development of a SR 152 Trade Corridor on behalf of Santa Clara and San Benito counties and a new alignment for SR 152 in the two counties.

The work to determine a new alignment for SR 152 in the two counties between SR 156 and US 101 includes an investigation of private and public funding sources for such a new alignment. The second part to the current work is an evaluation of the SR 152 corridor between US 101 and SR 99 to assess the ability for corridor to operate as a trade corridor linking the Central Valley and Silicon Valley that also includes an investigation of funding options for identified improvements.

This second wider effort covers SR 152 in Merced and Madera counties in addition to the segments in the two counties already discussed in this memorandum. For the State, Caltrans District 4 (Oakland) is the lead agency, with segments of the corridor also located in Caltrans Districts 5, 10 and 6.

ALTERNATIVES:

The VTA Board of Directors could choose to not approve the MOU to formalize the relationship between the two counties to address matter along the SR 152 corridor. In this case, the Mobility Partnership ad-hoc committee would cease and the project would continue as a staff only effort providing formal reporting to appropriate policy Boards of both counties.
**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The execution of this MOU would have no financial impact to VTA.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, considered this item at its November 19, 2009 meeting. No action was taken and the Committee recommended this item be placed on the Consent Agenda for the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors’ meeting.

Prepared by: Casey Emoto
Memo No. 2251
Memorandum of Understanding
between the
Council of San Benito County Governments
and the
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
to create the
and to conduct
State Route 152 Realignment and Trade Corridor Studies

The Council of San Benito County Governments (SBCOG) and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) jointly propose to establish a new alignment for State Route 152 (SR 152) from US 101 to the interchange of SR 152 and State Route 156 (SR 156). The SBCOG and VTA will study the feasibility of a public-private partnership for the SR 152 Trade Corridor from SR 99 to US 101.

The SBCOG, San Benito County Board of Supervisors, City Councils of Hollister and San Juan Bautista, through adopted resolution, all support a SR 152 realignment that begins at a point near the San Felipe Road/SR 152 intersection and continues west to a point near the Pajaro River or Bloomfield Road at Highway 25 where it enters San Benito County.

The SBCOG and VTA understand that the SR 152 Realignment Studies will accommodate traffic demands forecasted at least 25 years into the future and evaluate including one (1) lane in each direction designated as the preferred regional truck route.

The SBCOG and VTA understand that the California Transportation Commission has committed $5 million of Interregional Funds on the condition that VTA provides $5 million matching funds to conduct the appropriate studies to determine the new alignment for SR 152 between US 101 and SR 156 and analyze financing options for the project including the feasibility of a public private partnership or toll road within the stretch between US 101 to SR 99.

VTA understands that the SBCOG is under no obligation to provide any funding for the studies or the proposed project.

The SR 152 Realignment and Trade Corridor Studies will receive policy oversight/direction by the four member SR 152 Mobility Partnership. Two members shall be from San Benito County, one member shall be appointed by the SBCOG and one member shall be appointed by the San Benito County Board of Supervisors, and two members shall be appointed by the VTA.
VTA shall provide the appropriate professional staff and consultant services to conduct and manage the studies in consultation with the SBCOG staff.

The California Department of Transportation may provide one ex-officio member to the SR 152 Mobility Partnership from District 4 and provide appropriate staff representatives from Districts 4, 5, 6 and 10 to assist with the studies.

The SR 152 Mobility Partnership members and staffs of VTA and SBCOG will conduct outreach to the Merced Council of Governments, the City Los Banos, the Madera County Transportation Commission and the City of Chowchilla to include those organizations in the study efforts.

Should the Trade Corridor study support the viability of a public private partnership or toll road, the SR 152 Mobility Partnership will explore creating a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) or other appropriate governance/oversight entity for the corridor.

The SBCOG and VTA agree that goal is to complete the Studies within the 3-year term of this MOU.

Either party may terminate this Memorandum of Understanding, with or without cause, at any time. In order to terminate this Memorandum of Understanding, the terminating party shall give advance written notice to the other party. The termination shall be effective no earlier than 30 days from the date of the written termination notice. This Memorandum of Understanding shall commence on October 15, 2009, and end on October 15, 2012 unless sooner terminated as specified herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties have executed this MOU as follows:

COUNCIL OF SAN BENITO COUNTY
GOVERNMENTS

By: ________________________________
Anthony Botelho, Chair

SANTA CLARA VALLEY
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: ________________________________
Michael T. Burns, General Manager

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM
San Benito County Counsel’s Office

By: ________________________________
Shirley L. Murphy, Deputy County Counsel

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL FORM
VTA General Counsel

By: ________________________________
FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Rapid population growth, congested highways and constrained airports prompted California leaders to consider building a high-speed train system in the state along the lines of those that have been in operation for decades in Europe and Asia. In 2000, the California High-Speed Rail Authority, the agency currently responsible for planning, building and operating the state’s high-speed train system, unveiled a plan for an 800-mile system that would link all of the state’s major population centers, including the Bay Area, Los Angeles, Sacramento, the Inland Empire, Orange County, and San Diego.

The High-Speed Rail Authority projects that trains operating at speeds of up to 220 miles per hour would be able to transport riders from downtown San Francisco to Los Angeles in just under two and a half hours. The steel-wheel-on-steel-rail, electrically powered high-speed trains would rely on proven technology employed by systems in use in Europe and Asia. Supporters of the state’s proposed high-speed train system contend that it would relieve highway and air traffic congestion between Northern and Southern California, and significantly reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions.

To fund the core segment of the state’s proposed high-speed train system, SB 1856 (Costa) was enacted in 2002 to provide for the submission of the Safe, Reliable, High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century to the voters of California for their approval. The bond act calls for the issuance of a total of $9.95 billion in general obligation bonds, $9 billion of which would be used in conjunction with federal and private funds for the planning and construction of the first phase of the system -- from Anaheim through Los Angeles to the Bay Area. The remaining $950 million would be available for capital projects on other passenger rail lines in California to provide connectivity to the high-speed train system, and for capacity enhancements and safety improvements to those lines. Under the provisions of SB 1856, the bond act was initially scheduled for the 2004 general election. However, two subsequent bills postponed its
consideration until November 2008, at which time it was approved by the voters as Proposition 1A.

Following the passage of the bond measure, lawmakers in Sacramento came to believe that the High-Speed Rail Authority needed to be reorganized and restructured in order to prepare for the state’s spending in excess of $40 billion of federal, state, local, and private money to build the proposed high-speed train system. Four oversight hearings on this subject were held by the Senate Transportation and Housing Committee. During these hearings, it was noted that the High-Speed Rail Authority has historically operated as a promotional and planning entity, focusing its efforts on developing a vision of high-speed rail that the voters of California could endorse. Now, with the passage of Proposition 1A, the authority is on the cusp of becoming a project development and construction agency, thereby necessitating a change in its management and governance structure to provide further oversight and ensure transparency regarding the development of the high-speed train project.

The Senate hearings prompted the introduction of various pieces of legislation in 2009 that would impact the High-Speed Rail Authority's operational and administrative capabilities. Director Yoriko Kishimoto has requested that these measures be brought to the Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee as an informational item.

**DISCUSSION:**

Perhaps the most ambitious high-speed rail bill is SB 409 (Ducheny). It calls for creating a Department of Railroads within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency that would be overseen by a director to be appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. Under the provisions of this legislation, all state programs and responsibilities related to intercity passenger rail, high-speed rail, rail goods movement, and rail-highway grade crossings and separations would be consolidated under the new Department of Railroads. Specifically, SB 409:

1. Establishes the High-Speed Rail Authority as a division within the Department of Railroads. The director of the Department of Railroads would nominate a chief for this division to be approved by the High-Speed Rail Authority Board of Directors. In addition, the bill requires the director of the Department of Railroads to serve as the chair of the High-Speed Rail Authority Board.

2. Transfers from Caltrans to the Department of Railroads all powers, duties and responsibilities related to the state’s intercity passenger rail program.

3. Transfers from the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to the Department of Railroads all regulatory responsibilities related to roadway-railroad grade crossings, as well as the establishment of a priority list for grade separation projects.

4. Requires the Department of Railroads to coordinate regional planning efforts throughout the state relative to rail transportation.

5. Specifies that the Department of Railroads would be the only state agency eligible to
apply for and receive grant and loan funds from the federal government or other sources for intercity rail, high-speed rail and freight rail purposes.

According to its supporters, SB 409 is intended to elevate to California’s growing rail program to departmental status in order to ensure that it receives the same level of attention as the state’s highway program. The legislation is currently pending on the Senate floor. Negotiations regarding various aspects of SB 409 are still going on, and the bill is expected to change.

Other key bills relating to high-speed rail are as follows:

- **AB 153 (Ma):** Specifies that the High-Speed Rail Authority constitutes a “governing body” for the purpose of adopting a resolution of necessity pursuant to an eminent domain proceeding. Status: Senate Transportation and Housing Committee.

- **AB 289 (Galgiani):** Requires the High-Speed Rail Authority, to the extent possible, to use proceeds from Proposition 1A to match federal economic stimulus funds made available under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). Status: Senate Rules Committee.

- **AB 733 (Galgiani):** Allows the High-Speed Rail Authority to consider, to the extent permitted by federal and state law, the creation of jobs in California when awarding major contracts or purchasing high-speed trains. Status: Vetoed by the Governor. In his veto message, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger wrote: “While I recognize the merits of this measure, it could result in unnecessary additional costs and delays, and may jeopardize the success of the project in securing the billions of dollars that are needed to construct this project.”

- **AB 1375 (Galgiani):** Creates a Department of High-Speed Rail, which would be overseen by the High-Speed Rail Authority Board, to manage and implement the state’s high-speed rail program. Status: Assembly Appropriations Committee.

- **SB 455 (Lowenthal):** Requires the Governor’s appointees to the High-Speed Rail Authority Board to be subject to Senate confirmation, establishes criteria for selecting high-speed rail projects, and provides the High-Speed Rail Authority with eminent domain authority similar to that currently assigned to Caltrans and the Department of Water Resources. Status: Assembly Floor.

- **SB 783 (Ashburn):** Requires the High-Speed Rail Authority to prepare and submit to the Legislature a business plan by January 1, 2012, and requires this plan to be updated every two years thereafter. Status: Signed into law, Chapter #618.

So far, VTA has not taken positions on any of these bills.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

In response to a question from Director Kishimoto with regard to SB 409, staff noted that while
there is general agreement in Sacramento that changes need to be made to the High-Speed Rail Authority in order to ensure that it has the appropriate structure in place to be able to manage the delivery of a multi-billion-dollar project, there is not a consensus among key senators and Assembly members on the approach. Therefore, lawmakers are viewing SB 409 as being more of a “placeholder” bill rather than a finished product, and the legislation is likely to be significantly amended. Staff further commented that unlike AB 1375 and SB 455, the two other major bills dealing with the High-Speed Rail Authority, SB 409 in its current form goes beyond simply restructuring the authority; it would also impact Caltrans and the CPUC.

Director Kishimoto expressed preference for an approach that moves in the direction of consolidating the state’s passenger and freight rail responsibilities under one department, to enhance coordination and ensure the use of “context sensitive solutions” for major rail projects such as California’s proposed high-speed train system.

Director Rose Herrera mentioned that the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (JPA) had an extensive discussion about SB 409 and decided to take a “watch” position, primarily because it is unclear where the JPA and its state operating and capital funds would reside if the state’s passenger and freight rail functions were to be reorganized as proposed by this legislation.

Prepared By: Kurt Evans
Memo No. 2241
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: Committee for Transit Accessibility Appointments

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the reappointments of Emma Eljas (2010-2011), Sandra Gouveia (2010-2011), Troy Hernandez (2009-2010), Martin Lasich (2010-2011), Aaron Morrow (2009-2010), Thomas Slack (2009-2010), and Barbara Stahl (2010-2011) to the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) for specified two-year terms. Each of these incumbents represents persons with disabilities.

Approve the appointments of Donald Hunter (2010-completing the second year of a two-year term recently vacated) and Walter Schinke (2010-completing the second year of a two-year term) to the CTA for specified terms, representing persons with disabilities.

Approve the reappointments of the Independence Network (2009-2010), Los Gatos Senior Center (2010-2011), Silicon Valley Independent Living Center (2009-2010), and Vista Center for the Blind & Visually Impaired (2010-2011) and the appointment of the Barbara Lee Senior Center in Milpitas (2010-2011) to the CTA for specified two-year terms.

BACKGROUND:

The CTA is tasked with advising the Board of Directors on matters pertaining to paratransit services and accessibility in Santa Clara County. The committee has 21 voting members; 12 are individuals with disabilities, and nine represent agencies or businesses that serve older adults or persons with disabilities. Two ex-officio members also serve on the committee. The CTA bylaws require each Board Member to nominate individual committee members and the Board Chairperson to nominate agency or business members. Members serve two-year terms and must reside within the County.
DISCUSSION:

Emma Eljas has been nominated by Board Member Herrera; Sandra Gouveia has been nominated by Board Member Pyle; Troy Hernandez has been nominated by Board Member Kalra; Martin Lasich has been nominated by Board Chairperson Sandoval; Donald Hunter has been nominated by Board Chairperson Sandoval; Aaron Morrow has been nominated by Board Member Gage; Thomas Slack has been nominated by Board Member Caserta; Barbara Stahl has been nominated by Board Member Kishimoto; and Walter Schinke has been nominated by Board Member Kniss.

The Independence Network, Los Gatos Senior Center, Silicon Valley Independent Living Center, Vista Center for the Blind & Visually Impaired and the Barbara Lee Senior Center in Milpitas have been nominated by Chairperson Sandoval.

All applicants and incumbents satisfy the membership criteria specified in the CTA Bylaws.

ALTERNATIVES:

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

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

The item was on the Administration and Finance Committee Consent Agenda. The Committee of the Whole recommended placement on the Consent Agenda for the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors’ Meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Not applicable.

Prepared by: Sandra Weymouth
Memo No. 2246
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 Member Appointments

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Ratify the following new appointments and reappointments to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee to a two-year terms starting December 2009:

New Appointment

- Erik Wilhelmsen, Town of Los Gatos
- Jim Bell, City of San Jose

Reappointment

- Corinne Winter, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
- Carl Hagenmaier, City of Los Altos

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 from the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC).

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 or work in Santa Clara County during their term. Voting members of the Committee must also be a representative of the Member Agency’s local bicycle
advisory committee or, for Member Agencies without a local bicycle advisory committee, their representative must be an individual who lives or works in the local jurisdiction and is interested in bicycle or pedestrian issues. BPAC members are precluded from representing a Member Agency that is their employer.

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:**

Staff notified Member Agencies of their current representatives' term expiration, advised them of their current standing, provided information on the appointment process and requested that they appoint their BPAC representative for a new term. In response, the Town of Los Gatos and City of San Jose has appointed a new member and the City of Los Altos and Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition reappointed their current members to a new term. The appointment letters from the cities of San Jose and Los Altos, Town of Los Gatos and SVBC are included in the attachments.

At the City Council meeting on October 19th, 2009, the Town of Los Gatos appointed Erik Wilhelmsen to replace Bruce Entin as their new BPAC representative. Mr. Wilhelmsen, who has lived in Santa Clara County for 38 years, is a catering chef who owns Village Caterers in San Jose. He enjoys recreational bike rides, walking the trails and strolling through the neighborhoods of Los Gatos. As a member of the Town's Transportation and Parking Commission, Mr. Wilhelmsen is experienced in many bicycle and pedestrian-related projects.

The City of San Jose has appointed Jim Bell as its new representative on VTA's BPAC. Mr. Bell's background is in chemistry, environmental toxicology and business, and has worked for IBM for the past twenty years providing real estate and site operations support. As an avid bicyclist who has been biking to work for five years, rain or shine, he enjoys local rides with friends for exercise and running errands. Additionally, he has done rides up to Mt. Hamilton, over the coast to Pescadero and Half Moon Bay. Mr. Bell is a supporter of the Tour of California and has served on San Jose's BPAC for over two years.

The Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition wishes to reappoint Corinne Winter to renew her term as an ex-officio member on VTA's BPAC. Similarly, the City of Los Altos has reappointed Carl Hagenmaier to an additional two-year term. These individuals are current BPAC members in good standing and have served the Committee well.

Staff recommends the Board of Directors ratify these appointments based on the individuals' good standing as current BPAC members and the newly appointed members based on their experience and dedication to bicycling and pedestrian issues.
**ALTERNATIVES:**

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

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item as part of its November 19, 2009 Consent Agenda and approved it unanimously without comment.

Prepared by: Aiko Cuenco
Memo No. 2248
October 28, 2009

Mr. Eric Wilhelmsen
112 Elmwood Court
Los Gatos, CA  95032

RE:  Appointment to the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority County-wide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

Dear Mr. Wilhelmsen:

We are pleased to confirm that the Town Council, at its regular meeting held Monday, October 19, has appointed you as the Town representative to the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) County-wide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC).

By copy of this letter the Town of Los Gatos is informing the VTA BPAC of your appointment, as well as your status as a member of good standing of the Town’s Transportation and Parking Commission and related bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Should you have any questions, please contact me at the Department of Parks and Public Works at 399-5770. I may also be contacted by e-mail at tcapurso@losgatosca.gov. Once again, congratulations on your appointment and we thank you for your service to the Town of Los Gatos.

Sincerely,

Todd Capurso
Director, Parks and Public Works

cc:  Greg Larson, Town Manager
     Jackie D. Rose, Town Clerk Administrator

encl:  Town Resolution passed and adopted October 19th, 2009
October 2, 2009

John H. Ristow  
Valley Transportation Authority  
Chief Congestion Management Agency Officer  
3331 North First Street  
Building B  
San Jose, CA.  95134-1906  

RE:  REAPPOINTMENT OF MR. CARL HAGENMAIER AS THE CITY OF LOS ALTOS REPRESENTATIVE TO THE VTA BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Dear Mr. Ristow:

The Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) has requested that the City of Los Altos appoint its representative to VTA’s Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) to a two-year term.

Mr. Hagenmaier is the current City of Los Altos representative to the VTA Bicycle Advisory Committee, is an outstanding member of the City of Los Altos Bicycle Advisory Committee and is a resident of Los Altos.

This letter is to inform the Board of Directors that Mr. Hagenmaier has accepted this appointment and will continue his service, effective immediately.

Please call Mr. Larry Lind, Senior Engineer, at (650) 947-2624 if there are any questions regarding this appointment.

Sincerely,

Douglas J. Schmitz  
City Manager

Copy:  Mr. Carl Hagenmaier  
Larry Lind, Senior Engineer
October 6, 2008

Ying Smith  
Valley Transportation Authority  
3331 N. First Street  
San Jose, CA 95134-1906

Re: Appointment to VTA Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

This letter serves as the City of San José’s official request to appoint Jim Bell as our representative on VTA BPAC, effective as soon as possible. Mr. Bell is the chair and a member in good standing of the City of San José BPAC. He has confirmed his willingness to represent San José BPAC on the VTA BPAC.

Name: Jim Bell  
Title: City of San José BPAC  
City of Residence: San José  
Residence Address: 5893 Killarney Circle  
San Jose, CA 95138  
Email: jbell@us.ibm.com  
Cell Phone: 408-515-6847

If you have any questions, please contact me at 408-975-3206 or john.brazil@sanjoseca.gov. Please share this information with the VTA Board Secretary and have Mr. Bell added to the distribution list for VTA BPAC agenda and materials.

Regards,

John Brazil  
Department of Transportation

Cc: Jim Bell, San Jose BPAC
Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee
Valley Transportation Authority
3331 No. First St.
San Jose, CA 95134

The Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition wishes to reappoint Corinne Winter as our representative on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee, with Paul Goldstein as her alternate.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Corinne Winter
Executive Director
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Joseph T. Smith

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2010 Quarterly Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the Period Ending September 30, 2009

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Review and accept the Fiscal Year 2010 Quarterly Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the period ending September 30, 2009.

DISCUSSION:

This memorandum provides a brief discussion of significant items and trends on the attached Statement of Revenues and Expenses through September 30, 2009. The schedule has been designed to follow the same company-wide line item rollup as included in the adopted budget. The columns have been designed to provide easy comparison of actual to budget activities for the current fiscal year, along with a column reflecting the percentage of the budget exhausted (actual revenue received or funds expended) to date. The current staff projections of Revenues and Expenses for Fiscal Year 2010 are also included.

The following are highlights of the current Statement of Revenues and Expenses:

Revenues

Fiscal year-to-date Total Revenues (line 11) are below budget estimates by $10.9M, primarily due to unfavorable variances in Fares (line 1) and Sales Tax-based accounts, including 1976 Half-Cent Sales Tax (line 2), TDA (line 3), and Measure A Sales Tax Operating Assistance (line 4). This shortfall was partially offset by a positive variance in Federal Operating Grants (line 6).

Fares (line 1) shows an unfavorable variance of $0.7M through the first three months of the year, the result of decreased ridership attributable to a weak economy and high local unemployment.
Sales Tax-based revenues, including 1976 Half-Cent Sales Tax (line 2), TDA (line 3), and Measure A Sales Tax Operating Assistance (line 4), accounted for a collective shortfall of $11.4M below budget estimates. This is a reflection of the impact of a slowing economy upon locally generated taxable sales. Current projections for these three revenue sources for FY 2010 reflect a 13.1% decrease from FY 2009.

Federal Operating Grants (line 6) shows an increase of $1.2M over budget, the result of utilizing 10% of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) funds for operating rather than capital.

**Expenses**

Overall, Fiscal year-to-date Total Expenses (line 44) were $5.5M below budget driven primarily by favorable variances in Materials and Supplies (line 13), Professional & Special Services (line 15), Other Services (line 16), and Reimbursements (line 28).

Materials and Supplies (line 13) reflects a positive variance of $0.7M, primarily related to savings in costs in support of maintaining the bus and light rail fleet.

Professional & Special Services (line 15) and Other Services (line 16) have positive variances of $0.5M and $0.6M respectively, generally due to timing of contracted activities.

Reimbursements (line 28) are derived primarily from activities within the capital program. The year-to-date positive variance of $0.8M is primarily due to timing of reimbursable project activities.

Paratransit (line 31) shows a positive variance of $0.8M through the first quarter, the product of continued efficiency strategies to contain costs and a decrease in passenger rides.

**SUMMARY:**

Through the first three months of the year, revenues fell short of budgeted projections by $10.9M while expenses were $5.5M below budget estimates, for an overall negative variance of revenues over expenses (line 45) of $5.4M.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration & Finance Committee, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, considered this item at its November 19, 2009 meeting. No action was taken and the Committee recommended this item be placed on the Consent Agenda for the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors’ meeting.

Prepared by: Carol Lawson, Fiscal Resources Manager
Memo No. 1872
### SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
### STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES
### Fiscal Year 2010
### through September 30, 2009

(Dollars in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fiscal Year-to-Date Actual</th>
<th>Fiscal Year-to-Date Budget</th>
<th>Year-to-Date Variance</th>
<th>FY 2010 Current Budget</th>
<th>% of Budget Received/Expended</th>
<th>FY 2010 Projection2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fares</td>
<td>8,545</td>
<td>9,239</td>
<td>(694)</td>
<td>38,533</td>
<td>22.18%</td>
<td>34,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1976 Half-Cent Sales Tax</td>
<td>30,024</td>
<td>35,657</td>
<td>(5,633)</td>
<td>144,420</td>
<td>20.79%</td>
<td>119,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TDA</td>
<td>12,155</td>
<td>16,969</td>
<td>(4,814)</td>
<td>67,877</td>
<td>17.91%</td>
<td>47,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Measure A Sales Tax-Oper Asst</td>
<td>5,576</td>
<td>6,513</td>
<td>(937)</td>
<td>26,380</td>
<td>21.14%</td>
<td>22,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Federal Operating Grants</td>
<td>13,863</td>
<td>12,693</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>50,946</td>
<td>27.21%</td>
<td>55,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>State Operating Grants</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>26.74%</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Investment Earnings</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2,196</td>
<td>30.87%</td>
<td>2,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Advertising Income</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>24.57%</td>
<td>2,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other Income</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>2,283</td>
<td>(185)</td>
<td>15,202</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
<td>15,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,977</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,915</strong></td>
<td><strong>(10,938)</strong></td>
<td><strong>349,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.16%</strong></td>
<td><strong>301,138</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Labor Costs</td>
<td>62,865</td>
<td>64,105</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>253,360</td>
<td>24.81%</td>
<td>249,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Materials &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>3,218</td>
<td>3,865</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>15,432</td>
<td>20.85%</td>
<td>15,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Security</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>1,895</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7,584</td>
<td>23.63%</td>
<td>7,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Professional &amp; Special Services</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>3,685</td>
<td>15.98%</td>
<td>3,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>8,016</td>
<td>17.28%</td>
<td>8,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Fuel</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>2,735</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>10,829</td>
<td>24.27%</td>
<td>10,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Traction Power</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3,351</td>
<td>27.42%</td>
<td>3,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tires</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,597</td>
<td>24.05%</td>
<td>1,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2,461</td>
<td>23.28%</td>
<td>2,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>1,191</td>
<td>1,211</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4,847</td>
<td>24.57%</td>
<td>4,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Data Processing</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2,694</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>2,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Office Expense</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>19.31%</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>26.37%</td>
<td>1,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Employee Related Expense</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>17.39%</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Leases &amp; Rents</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>21.09%</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>12.58%</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Reimbursements</td>
<td>(11,479)</td>
<td>(10,655)</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>(41,966)</td>
<td>27.35%</td>
<td>(41,966)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Operating Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>65,415</strong></td>
<td><strong>69,888</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,473</strong></td>
<td><strong>275,563</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.74%</strong></td>
<td><strong>271,231</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Paratransit3</td>
<td>7,166</td>
<td>7,921</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>32,132</td>
<td>22.30%</td>
<td>30,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Caltrain3</td>
<td>4,708</td>
<td>4,542</td>
<td>(166)</td>
<td>18,179</td>
<td>25.90%</td>
<td>18,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Light Rail Shuttles3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Altamont Commuter Express3</td>
<td>1,115</td>
<td>1,127</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,509</td>
<td>24.73%</td>
<td>4,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Highway 17 Express3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>24.57%</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dumbarton Express3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>19.69%</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Monterey-San Jose Express Service3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Contribution to Other Agencies</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>2,471</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>20,893</td>
<td>11.83%</td>
<td>20,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Other Expense</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Other Expense</strong></td>
<td><strong>15,825</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,847</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,022</strong></td>
<td><strong>77,332</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.46%</strong></td>
<td><strong>75,726</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td><strong>Operating &amp; Other Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>352,895</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.02%</strong></td>
<td><strong>346,957</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Contingency Utilization</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,240</strong></td>
<td><strong>86,735</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>353,395</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.99%</strong></td>
<td><strong>347,457</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><strong>Surplus/(Deficit) to Reserves</strong></td>
<td>(7,263)</td>
<td>(1,820)</td>
<td>(5,443)</td>
<td>(3,795)</td>
<td><em>(46,319)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Reflects Adopted Budget approved by the Board on June 4, 2009
2 Reflects current staff projection as of 10/29/09
3 Includes allocation of indirect costs
**SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**  
**SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS SUMMARY**  
**Fiscal Year 2010**  
**through September 30, 2009**  
**(Dollar in Thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 2010 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2010 Projection</th>
<th>FY 2011 Adopted Budget</th>
<th>FY 2011 Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>349,600</td>
<td>301,138</td>
<td>336,255</td>
<td>301,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>353,395</td>
<td>347,457</td>
<td>359,529</td>
<td>349,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Operating Revenues Over (Under) Expenses</td>
<td>(3,795)</td>
<td>(46,319)</td>
<td>(23,274)</td>
<td>(47,766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total VTA Transit Capital</td>
<td>102,481</td>
<td>102,481</td>
<td>17,228</td>
<td>17,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Less: Funding from Grants &amp; Other Sources</td>
<td>(96,040)</td>
<td>(91,290)</td>
<td>(13,403)</td>
<td>(13,403)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>VTA Transit Share, drawn from Reserves</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>11,191</td>
<td>3,825</td>
<td>3,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Beginning Reserves</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>(274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Operating Revenues Over (Under) Expenses</td>
<td>(3,795)</td>
<td>(46,319)</td>
<td>(23,274)</td>
<td>(47,766)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>From (To) Debt Reduction Fund for Capital</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>11,191</td>
<td>3,825</td>
<td>3,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VTA Transit Funds, drawn from Reserves for Capital</td>
<td>(6,441)</td>
<td>(11,191)</td>
<td>(3,825)</td>
<td>(3,825)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Projected Ending Operating Reserves</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>(274)</td>
<td>18,976</td>
<td>(48,040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Projected Operating Reserve %</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Adopted Budget approved by the Board on June 4, 2009  
2. Reflects current staff projection as of 10/29/09  
3. Line 11 divided by Budgeted Line 2
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Joseph T. Smith

SUBJECT: Contract Award – Money Manager Services

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute an agreement with UBS Global Asset Management for the management of the US Core Real Estate portfolio portion of SCVTA - ATU Pension Plan assets.

BACKGROUND:

To enhance the SCVTA - ATU Pension Plan’s asset allocation and align its assets closer to the Plan’s liabilities, the SCVTA - ATU Pension Board (Pension Board) approved an Asset-Liability Study which was completed in January 2008, followed by a Portfolio Structuring Analysis, which was completed in August 2008. Both studies were completed by Mercer Investment Consulting Incorporated (Mercer), as the investment consultant to the Pension Board. Based on the results of the studies Mercer recommended, and the ATU Pension Board approved, that two new asset classes be added to the VTA/ATU Pension Plan Investment Portfolio.

The new asset classes include real estate and emerging markets. By including these two asset classes, the expected annual return for the pension portfolio increases from 7.93% to 8.32%. Furthermore, the overall risk of the portfolio, as measured by its standard deviation, declines from 11.46% to 11.03%. Standard deviation provides a quantified estimate of the uncertainty of future returns, or how far the value of an investment moves above or below its average value. The wider the range, which means the greater the standard deviation, the riskier an investment is considered to be. The reason for the reduction in risk is the increase in diversification.
**DISCUSSION:**

On October 14, 2008, VTA engaged Mercer to search for US Core Real Estate managers. Mercer uses a proprietary database called its Global Investment Manager Database (GIMD), which stores information for over 3,300 investment managers including firm-wide demographics, investment product details, performance, independent research including meeting notes, news items and managers ratings. All investment managers who participated in the selection process were asked to access the GIMD and ensure that all details about their firms were correct and up to date. Due to the high volatility and market stress of the real estate market condition at that time, the ATU Pension Board deferred the search for Real Estate managers until March 2009.

Using the GIMD, Mercer narrowed the search and on March 10, 2009 Mercer presented the credentials of five Investment Management Firms for real estate manager (JPMorgan, MREA, Prudential, RREEF, and UBS Realty). The Pension Board selected the top three candidates (JPMorgan, Prudential, and UBS Realty) for interviews based on the following criteria:

**Organization**

1. Firms that have been managing assets for at least five years, preferably longer,
2. Firms with sufficient assets under management, such that our assets would not represent a significant percentage of total assets, and,
3. Firms that produce superior investment returns overtime, with stock and asset selection methods that can increase the probability of investment success.

**Performance**

1. Verifiable track record that demonstrates consistent adherence to stated investment approach,
2. Risk and return characteristics of historical data that are consistent with the prescribed benchmark, and,
3. Performance that is generally competitive over time when compared to other managers with the same index.

Interviews with the selected finalists were conducted on September 1, 2009. The interviews were evaluated by a panel consisting of the Investment Committee members (three VTA management representatives and two ATU representatives) and consultants from Mercer utilizing the following factors and criteria:

1. Impression of the Project Manager
2. Quality of the Team’s Oral Presentation
3. Content of the Team’s Oral Presentation
4. Answers to Questions
5. Project Manager’s ability to work with VTA
6. Overall Impression of the Team (both in written submittal and oral interview)
The ranking of the firms interviewed were: UBS Realty (UBS), followed by JPMorgan and Prudential. The panel selected UBS as the preferred Real Estate Investment Managing firm. The primary reason for selecting UBS was the manager’s conservative investment approach that consistently benefited the strategy.

On September 1, 2009, the Pension Board approved UBS Global Asset Management as the fund manager to manage the US Core Real Estate portfolio.

The selection of a fund manager for Emerging Markets will be brought to the Board to consider at a future date.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could opt not to approve the contract and request that the Pension Board reevaluate the asset allocation strategy or the selection of the real estate fund manager.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration & Finance Committee, sitting as a Committee of the Whole, considered this item at its November 19, 2009 meeting and approved it unanimously without comment.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Annual management fees, which are paid with Pension Plan assets, are estimated to be $321,000 for the $30 million real estate portfolio.

Prepared by: Manny Bagnas, Investment Services Manager

Memo No. 2234
REAL ESTATE

UBS REALTY INVESTORS LLC
UBS FUND SERVICES (USA) LLC
242 Trumbull Street
Hartford, CT 06103-1212

Contact Information:

Maria C. Bascetta
Director – Client & Portfolio Services
(860) 616-9021
Maria.bascaetta@ubs.com

Deborah Ulian
Director – Client & Portfolio Services – San Francisco
455 Market Street – Suite 1540
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 538-4850
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: Transit Advertising - Contract Award to Lamar Corporation

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Lamar Corporation to sell, display and manage the advertising program on VTA Bus and Light Rail Vehicles for a three-year term beginning on January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2012, with an option for VTA to extend the contract for two additional one-year periods for 2013 and 2014.

BACKGROUND:

VTA, like many public transportation agencies in the United States, contracts with one firm to manage, sell and post advertisements on the interiors and exteriors of its transit vehicles. The firm under contract has the exclusive right to sell the advertising space on behalf of VTA. VTA has contracted with CBS Outdoor (formerly known as Viacom Outdoor Group, Inc.) since January 1, 2005. VTA’s contract with CBS Outdoor will expire on December 31, 2009.

DISCUSSION:

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued on August 10, 2009. Responses were received from four firms and reviewed by a panel consisting of the Chief of External Affairs; the Public Information Officer; the Deputy Director of Operations - Operations Planning; the Senior Mechanical Engineer - Bus Systems; the Sales & Promotions Supervisor; and the Contracts Administrator II.

The evaluation criteria for the RFP were:

- Experience & Qualifications
- Revenue
- Responsiveness of Proposal
Local Firm Preference

The revenue proposals were to cover the following different potential groups of advertising:

1. Bus
   a. Exterior/Interior Advertising
   b. Wraps
2. Light Rail
   a. Exterior/Interior Advertising
   b. Wraps
3. Optional Advertising
   a. Bus Fronts
   b. Non-VTA Operated Service
   c. Television Monitors
   d. Tunnels
   e. Light Rail Stations
   f. Any Additional Options Submitted by Proposer

Proposals were received from CBS Outdoor, Titan Outdoor, Lamar Corporation and Transit Treasure, Inc. Transit Treasure’s proposal did not fulfill the requirements of the RFP and was deemed non-responsive.

The results of the financial evaluation of the three qualified proposers are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposer</th>
<th>Guaranteed Income For Five Years</th>
<th>Revenue Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Corporation</td>
<td>$7,400,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titan Outdoor</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS Outdoor</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lamar’s proposal was the best all around in terms of offering the best income, the expertise and integrity of their team members, their unique strengths (family run business through 3 generations), and commitment to support a sustainable, accessible and community focused transportation program. Founded in 1902 and based in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, Lamar is a publicly owned out-of-home advertising company that has seen steady growth in the transit business in the last decade. Currently, it has contracts with 70 transit districts in the United States and Canada and includes TriMet (Portland), TransLink (Vancouver), Lane Transit Authority (Eugene) and Utah Transit Authority (Salt Lake City). In addition, they have contracts with several Bay Area transit properties namely Tri-Delta Transit, Livermore/Amador Valley Transit Authority and Union City Transit.

Lamar has a well-documented history of success in transit advertising and has a strong and established national, regional and local sales team. Its approach to local sales is a key success factor. Lamar staff will focus on increasing local market advertisements sales which can provide additional revenue stream. Together with its strong regional and national network, Lamar can ensure that the Santa Clara County market is well represented in forthcoming media buys.

Upon award of the contract, Lamar has committed to establishing a local San Jose office.
Lamar’s key management and leadership team will dedicate a majority of their time during the initial 90-day period to facilitate a seamless transition.

Lamar is responsible for donating more than $4 million annually to worthwhile non-profit groups in its various transit markets. This illustrates Lamar’s dedication to its focus of community and sustainability and is closely aligned with VTA’s operating principles.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board could decide not to approve the transit advertising contract at this time. Deciding not to approve the transit advertising contract would result in a significant revenue loss and VTA would incur additional expense to place and maintain onboard bus and light rail carcards (currently used to convey vital customer information such as service impacts). The Board could also decide to reject the proposal and re-advertise the RFP.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

On November 19, 2009, the Administration and Finance Committee met as a committee of the whole, and reviewed the above recommendation. Following discussion, and hearing no objections to the staff recommendation, the committee chair requested that this item be placed on the consent agenda for the December 10, 2009 Board meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Lamar’s financial proposal was the most advantageous to VTA. Under the terms of the recommended action, Lamar would remit to VTA either: 1) a minimum guarantee of $1.2 million in 2010, $1.4 million in 2011 and $1.5 million in 2012 or 2) 60% of net sales, whichever is greater. If VTA were to extend the contract for two additional one-year periods for 2013 and 2014, VTA would receive from Lamar either: 1) a minimum guarantee of $1.6 million in 2013 and $1.7 million in 2014 or 2) 60% of net sales, whichever is greater. By having the option to receive the greater of either a minimum annual guarantee or percentage of net sales, VTA will have the opportunity to collect additional revenues at such time the economy improves and the advertising demand grows.

If the advertising contract is not renewed, it could result in a revenue loss to VTA in the amount of $7.4 million in 5 years.

SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:

Because this is a revenue agreement, VTA did not establish a specific goal for this program but contractors are encouraged to afford maximum opportunity to SBEs.

Prepared by: Dino Guevarra, Sales & Promotions Supervisor
Memo No. 2303
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Firm</th>
<th>Contractor Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Corporation</td>
<td>Senior VP &amp; Regional Manager</td>
<td>Sandy Trahan</td>
<td>1600 Valley River Drive, Suite 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eugene, OR 97401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Corporation</td>
<td>General Manager &amp; Vice President</td>
<td>Casey Sexton</td>
<td>754 South 200 West Salt Lake City, UT 84101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Corporation</td>
<td>Director of National Sales</td>
<td>John M. Miller</td>
<td>5551 Corporate Boulevard Baton Rouge, LA 70808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Corporation</td>
<td>Director of Transit Business Affairs</td>
<td>Cindy Blood</td>
<td>1600 Valley River Drive, Suite 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Corporation</td>
<td>Market Manager</td>
<td>Shelby Stilwell</td>
<td>6252 Preston Avenue Livermore, CA 94551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: Caltrain Safety Improvements - JPB Crossings Contract Award

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Shimmick Transit, the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of $5,833,770 for the construction of the Caltrain Safety Improvements - JPB Crossings. This contract is 100% Measure A funded.

BACKGROUND:

VTA is implementing the Caltrain Safety Improvements Program to enhance safety at various at-grade crossings along the Caltrain Corridor in Santa Clara County similar to a program initiated by PCJPB in San Mateo County. The first phase of this program was completed in March 2009 and included signing and striping at 36 at-grade crossings from Palo Alto to Gilroy. The second phase of the program will include modifications to railroad crossing gates, installation of guardrail, fencing, pedestrian gates, emergency swing gates, sidewalk, crossing panels, and tactile warning panels as well as grading modifications to crossings within the JPB owned segment (between Lick in San Jose and Palo Alto) and crossings in the UPRR owned segment (between Lick and Gilroy).

This contract, Caltrain Safety Improvements - JPB Crossings, is the first contract under the second phase, and will construct safety improvements at eight JPB crossings from Sunnyvale to Palo Alto. Construction under this contract is scheduled to begin in late December 2009, with completion in December 2010.

The Caltrain Safety Improvements - UPRR Crossings contract will be the final contract of this program and will be advertised in April 2010.
DISCUSSION:
The Caltrain Safety Improvements - JPB Crossings contract was advertised on August 19, 2009 to begin the contractor pre-qualification and bidding process. Bids were opened on November 3, 2009, with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shimmick Transit</td>
<td>$5,833,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavex Construction</td>
<td>$6,003,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon N. Ball</td>
<td>$6,641,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Construction</td>
<td>$6,697,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuire &amp; Hester</td>
<td>$7,824,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Estimate</td>
<td>$6,042,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Budget</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shimmick Transit is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid is 3.5% below the Engineer’s Estimate. VTA staff has completed a bid analysis and recommends award of this contract to the low bidder Shimmick Transit.

ALTERNATIVES:
The project could be delayed, but it is not recommended because this will delay safety improvements at the crossings and reduce the opportunity to minimize incidents.

FISCAL IMPACT:
This action will authorize $5,833,770 for safety improvements construction. Appropriation for these expenditures is included in the FY 2010 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. This contract is 100% 2000 Measure A funded.

SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:
In keeping with VTA’s SBE Policy, a 12.6% SBE subcontracting participation goal has been established. Shimmick Transit has complied with the goal and committed to a goal of 35.0% participation.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
The Transit Planning & Operations Committee considered this item as part of its November 19, 2009 Regular Agenda and unanimously recommended the Board of Directors approve the staff recommendation and place the item on the Consent Agenda for the December Board meeting.

Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director
Memo No. 2134
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: September 2009 Facilities Projects Semi-Annual Report

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Please find attached the Semi-Annual Report for the Facilities Program for the period ending September 30, 2009.

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

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning & Operations Committee received this item on November 19, 2009 and moved to place the item on the Consent Agenda for the Board of Directors’ meeting.

Prepared By: John Rowe
Memo No. 1901
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Senior Policy Advisor, Jim Lawson

SUBJECT: Governance Amendment to JPA

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the attached resolution to amend the Joint Powers Agreement for the Administration of the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program dated December 1, 1994 (JPA), and direct staff to forward the amendment to each member agency and the County of Santa Clara for their approval.

BACKGROUND:

At the November 5, 2009 Board of Directors meeting, the Board voted to reconfigure the small city groupings to include a new city group comprised of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and Milpitas. In order to make this change to VTA’s governance structure, an amendment must be made to the Joint Powers Agreement for the Administration of the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program dated December 1, 1994 (JPA).

Attached is the resolution with the proposed amendment which reflects the direction agreed upon by the Board at its November 5 meeting.

DISCUSSION:

All amendments to the JPA require the approval of the VTA Board of Directors, the County Board of Supervisors and a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population.

Once approved by the VTA Board, the amendment will be forwarded to every city and the County Board of Supervisors for their consideration.
**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no alternatives to implementing the governance change approved by the Board of Directors without amending the JPA.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There are no fiscal impacts.

Prepared by: Scott Haywood
Memo No. 2395
Resolution No.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
APPROVING AMENDMENT TO JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT
FOR ADMINISTRATION OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), the fifteen (15) Cities in the County of Santa Clara, and the County of Santa Clara, entered into a JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (hereinafter “Agreement”) dated December 1, 1994;

WHEREAS, Section 6 of the Agreement, pursuant to California Public Utilities Section 100060, established the groupings of the Cities within the County of Santa Clara, other than the City of San Jose, for the appointment of members to the Santa Clara County Transit District (now the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority) Board of Directors;

WHEREAS, on November 5, 2009, the VTA Board of Directors approved the reconfiguration of the groupings of the Cities within the County of Santa Clara, other than the City of San Jose, to include a new city group comprised of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and Milpitas, that would appoint two Board members and one alternate;

WHEREAS, to implement such reconfiguration, the Agreement must be amended through the adoption of resolutions by VTA, the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, and a majority of the Member Agency parties to the Agreement (other than Santa Clara County) representing a majority of the population in Santa Clara County, pursuant to Section 15 thereof;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, that the attached Amendment to the Agreement, which Amendment would reconfigure the groupings of the Cities within the County of Santa Clara, other than the City of San Jose, to include a new city group comprised of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and Milpitas, that would appoint two Board members and one alternate, is hereby approved.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on December 10, 2009, by the following vote:

AYES: Directors:

NOES: Directors:

ABSENT: Directors:
Sam Liccardo, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  

Kevin D. Allmand, General Counsel
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

ATTEST:

Sandra Weymouth, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
AMENDMENT TO
JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT
FOR THE ADMINISTRATION
OF THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

THIS AMENDMENT TO JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT (hereinafter “Amendment”) dated as of December 10, 2009 is made and entered into between Cities within the County of Santa Clara, the County of Santa Clara and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (formerly known as the Santa Clara County Transit District).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the parties hereto entered into a JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SANTA CLARA COUNTY CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (hereinafter “Agreement”) dated December 1, 1994;

WHEREAS, Section 6 of the Agreement, pursuant to California Public Utilities Section 100060, established the groupings of the Cities within the County of Santa Clara, other than the City of San Jose, for the appointment of members to the Santa Clara County Transit District (now the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority) Board of Directors;

WHEREAS, the parties now desire to amend Section 6 to reconfigure the groupings of the Cities within the County of Santa Clara, other than the City of San Jose, to include a new city group comprised of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and Milpitas, that would appoint two Board members and one alternate;

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

(1) Section 6.A.1 of the Agreement is hereby amended to read as follows:

The five (5) city council members and three (3) alternates to be appointed as Directors by all the cities in Santa Clara County except the City of San Jose shall be selected according to the following groupings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City Grouping</th>
<th>Representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Los Altos</td>
<td>1 representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>1 alternate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b. Campbell
   Cupertino
   Los Gatos
   Monte Sereno
   Saratoga

   1 representative
   1 alternate

c. Milpitas
   Santa Clara
   Sunnyvale

   2 representatives
   1 alternate

d. Gilroy
   Morgan Hill

   1 representative
   1 alternate

(2) This Amendment shall become effective on January 1, 2012, if approved by resolutions adopted by the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, a majority of the Member Agencies (other than Santa Clara County) representing a majority of the population in Santa Clara County and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, as provided in Section 15 of the Agreement.

(3) As hereby amended, the terms and conditions of the Agreement shall remain in full force and effect.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the parties have executed this Agreement on the date shown below.

CITY OF CAMPBELL

By:_________________________ Date

CITY OF CUPERTINO

By:_________________________ Date

CITY OF GILROY

By:_________________________ Date

CITY OF LOS ALTOS

By:_________________________ Date

TOWN OF LOS ALTOS HILLS

By:_________________________ Date

TOWN OF LOS GATOS

By:_________________________ Date
SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

By: __________________________

Date
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Joseph T. Smith

SUBJECT: Budget and Structural Deficit Strategies

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Reduce appropriation for the VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Operating budget in the amount of $7.5 million in FY 2010 and $7.5 million FY2011; and,

2. Reduce appropriation in the Measure A Transit Improvement Program budget for the procurement of 40 articulated hybrid diesel electric buses by $25.0 million from $43.25 million to $18.25 million and increase appropriation to direct such funds to support VTA operations; and,

3. Waive the provisions of the VTA Transit Enterprise Debt Reduction Policy restricting the uses of the Debt Reduction Fund and authorize use of the Debt Reduction Funds for operating requirements for a period not to exceed June 30, 2011; and,

4. Direct staff to return to the Board with additional recommendations in April 2010 if anticipated STA funding and updated Sales Tax Revenue projections are insufficient to provide FY 2011 ending Operating Reserves of $20.0 million; and,

5. Appoint an Ad-hoc Committee of the Board of Directors consisting of 3-5 members, supported by a representative group of business, labor, Advisory Committee and other stakeholders, to develop recommendations for consideration at a future board meeting that address VTA’s structural deficit beyond FY 2011 to insure the continued sustainability of transit services in Santa Clara County.
BACKGROUND:

The Board approved the FY 2010 and FY 2011 Biennial Budget at its meeting on June 4, 2009 amid a backdrop of economic distress, declining Sales Tax Revenues and evaporating State funding for transit operations.

The approved budget included realigned Paratransit service coverage consistent with fixed route service, and a fare increase effective January 2010. However in response to lower sales tax projections and receipts, the fare increase was moved forward to October 1, 2009 and 8% service reductions were authorized effective January 2010.

The adopted biennial budget also included concessions from labor in the form of furloughs and wage freezes and the use of operating reserves to fund a deficit of $27.1 million.

At the October Administration & Finance Committee (A&F) meeting, staff provided an update regarding projected deficits in FY 2010 and FY 2011 based on actual FY 2009 sales tax revenues received in September. Attachment A is a copy of the Sources and Uses Funds Comparison that was provided at the meeting. It illustrates projected operating reserve levels assuming different levels of sales tax revenue growth in FY 2010 and FY 2011. Scenario C, which is staff’s recommended planning scenario, shows an operating deficit of $98 million for FY 2010 and FY 2011 combined. A summary of the assumptions and operating reserve balances for each of the scenarios is included in Attachment B.

During the discussion at the Administration & Finance Committee, Director Kniss requested that staff submit an action item for consideration at the November board meeting that would establish a short-term Ad Hoc Committee of the Board responsible for developing strategies to address the immediate funding shortfalls as well as the continued sustainability of transit services in the County.

An Executive Summary of recommendations, dated April 17, 2003 from a previously established Ad-hoc Financial Stability Committee is included in attachment C. The recommendations were presented to the Board of Directors at the April 25, 2003 Board Workshop.

DISCUSSION:

The adopted FY 2010 and FY 2011 budget assumed an operating deficit of $27 million over the two-year period. Operating reserves were projected to be drawn down to cover the deficit, leaving an operating reserve of approximately $20 million at the end of FY 2011. Actual FY 2009 sales tax receipts are $22 Million lower than assumed in the budget and revised projections for sales tax revenues in the next two years indicate an additional projected deficit of $70.0 million exacerbating VTA’s fundamental problem: VTA’s recurring operating expenses exceed recurring revenues available to support operations. While one-time revenues and cost-savings may help address a part of the near-term budget shortfall, VTA must address the underlying structural problem by identifying recurring revenues and aligning expenditure reductions to eliminate the operating deficit and restore a prudent level of operating reserves.
In the near term, a combination of efficiencies from cost containment measures, and deferral of capital projects, is expected to generate savings of approximately $40.0 Million as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount ($ in Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Containment</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferral of BRT buses</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, based on the results of the law suit filed by the California Transit Association (CTA) against the State of California relating to the diversion of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds, staff anticipates that some level of funding will be restored during the next two years, which will result in a reduction in VTA’s projected deficit. In the absence of this restoration, and to the extent that STA funding will not cover the entire remaining deficit, staff recommends that the policy that restricts the use of VTA’s Transit Enterprise Debt Reduction Fund for capital be waived and create the potential for use of the funds to support operations.

In order to address the long term structural imbalance beyond the current two year horizon, staff proposes the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee of the Board of Directors that utilizes stakeholders in the community such as labor, business, riders, and others as appropriate as advisors to identify and recommend long term strategies including but not limited to the following:

1. Health care and pension benefit modifications
2. Regional partnership options
3. Additional/new revenue sources
4. Alternative service delivery models

The Committee recommendations would be used to develop future budgets beginning with FY 2012.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could choose to direct staff to develop alternative recommendations for their consideration.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The nominal amount of funding required to support the Ad Hoc committee is included in the FY 2010 and FY 2011 Adopted VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Operating Budget.

Prepared by: Ali Hudda, Deputy Director of Accounting
Memo No. 2398
## VTA TRANSIT
### SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS COMPARISON

(Dollars in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Total Revenues</td>
<td>349,600</td>
<td>336,255</td>
<td>321,807</td>
<td>311,479</td>
<td>303,338</td>
<td>306,582</td>
<td>333,194</td>
<td>329,356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>353,395</td>
<td>359,529</td>
<td>351,495</td>
<td>354,129</td>
<td>351,495</td>
<td>354,129</td>
<td>351,495</td>
<td>354,129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Beginning Reserves</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>(2,112)</td>
<td>4,971</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>27,745</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Operating Revenues Over (Under) Expenses</td>
<td>(3,795)</td>
<td>(23,274)</td>
<td>(29,688)</td>
<td>(42,650)</td>
<td>(48,157)</td>
<td>(49,973)</td>
<td>(47,546)</td>
<td>(24,772)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Projected Ending Operating Reserves</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>18,977</td>
<td>16,358</td>
<td>(26,291)</td>
<td>(2,112)</td>
<td>(52,091)</td>
<td>4,971</td>
<td>(42,575)</td>
<td>27,745</td>
<td>2,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Projected Operating Reserve %</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>-14.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-12.1%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sales Tax Change Assumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Adopted June 2009</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Budget Projections</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Beacon October 2009</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
<td>+2.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D First Quarter SBOE FY10, flat FY11</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Flat from FY09 Actual</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projections include adjustments for:
- Base Sales Tax adjusted for FY09 actual receipts
- Fare Revenue trend
- Fare increase accelerated to October 2009
- January service reduction
- May '09 ATU increase
- ARRA 10% to PM
FY 2010 & FY 2011 Operating Budget Scenarios

**Scenario A**
Scenario A represents the adopted biennial operating budget. Sales tax revenues (which include VTA’s 1976 half-cent sales tax, TDA, and 2000 Measure A Operating Assistance) were assumed to decline 5% and 3% in FY 2010 and FY 2011, respectively, from projected FY2009 sales tax revenues. The projected two-year operating deficit was $27 million and projected operating reserve was $19 million at the end of FY 2011.

**Scenarios B-E**
Subsequent to adoption of the budget, VTA received the final disbursement of FY 2009 sales tax revenues from the state, concluded labor negotiations, accelerated the fare increase to October 2009, and instituted a service reduction for January 2010. Revenues and expenditures for Scenarios B through E have all been adjusted to reflect the following changes from the adopted budget:

- Revised sales tax base corresponding to actual FY2009 sales tax receipts;
- Declining trend in fare revenue (due to declining in ridership);
- Accelerated fare increase effective October 2009;
- January 2010 service reductions approved by the Board in October 2009;
- May 2009 ATU wage increase;
- Additional $4.7 million operating revenues provided by a 10% allocation of ARRA funds to be received by VTA.

The only differences in Scenarios B through E are the assumptions used to project sales tax related revenues.

**Scenario B**
Scenario B represents the adopted biennial operating budget updated to reflect only the changes listed above. This scenario uses the same assumptions for sales tax related revenues as the adopted budget (declines of 5% and 3% in FY 2010 and FY 2011, respectively). The projected two-year deficit has increased from $27 million to $72 million and operating reserves are completely exhausted prior to the end of FY 2011.

**Scenario C**
Scenario C adjusts sales tax revenues, based on taxable sales projections from VTA’s economist, Dr. Chris Thornberg of Beacon Economics. Dr. Thornberg’s projections of taxable sales indicate that VTA will suffer a further decline of 13.11% in FY 2010 sales tax revenues, followed by an increase of 2.35% in FY 2011. The operating deficit in this scenario is $98 million and operating reserves are exhausted prior to FY 2010 year end.

**Scenario D**
Scenario D assumes sales tax growth projections of a 10% decline in FY 2010 (consistent with the first advance from the State Board of Equalization for first quarter of FY 2010) and 0% growth in FY 2011. The two-year operating deficit in this scenario is $89 million and operating reserves are exhausted prior to FY 2011 year end.

**Scenario E**
Scenario E assumes no growth (or decline) in sales tax revenues in either FY 2010 or FY 2011. The two-year operating deficit in this scenario is $43 million with a projected ending operating reserve of $3 million at FY 2011 year end.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
CONSULTANT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
VTA AD-HOC FINANCIAL STABILITY COMMITTEE
4-17-03

FINDINGS

1. In response to a dramatic and unprecedented decline in sales tax revenue to VTA, the Board and staff have made substantial in-roads toward the reduction of the near-term operating deficit by reducing expenses and improving productivity and efficiency.

2. However, in spite of these efforts, VTA is still facing annual operating deficits averaging between $60-$65 million beginning in FY 2006.

3. As a consequence, VTA must urgently address the need to enhance revenues and reduce expenses in the very near term. Additional delay in addressing this structural problem simply exacerbates the problem.

The consultants have developed the following recommendations. Since their priority has not yet been determined, any of these recommendations could be considered as short or long-term actions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Consultants Estimated Annual Financial Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. VTA should consider actively pursuing new local revenue sources that effectively diversify the revenue stream dedicated to VTA. ¹ (See page 9 of Recommendations)</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. VTA should support statewide legislative efforts to broaden the sales tax base, as well as to reduce the threshold for passing broad-based local transportation measures. (See page 10 of Recommendations)</td>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. VTA should seek to partner with other entities when seeking new revenue sources. (See Page 10 of Recommendations)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. VTA should implement management’s recommended fare changes for Fiscal Year 2004. (See page 12 of Recommendations)</td>
<td>$3.5 million (net)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Committee has yet to recommend particular revenue sources.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
CONSULTANT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
VTA AD-HOC FINANCIAL STABILITY COMMITTEE
4-17-03

Recommendations (con't)

5. VTA should adopt and annually examine a formal policy guiding fares for the future, which includes setting a farebox recovery target of 20% to 25%, to be pursued over the coming two to three years. (See page 14 of Recommendations)

6. VTA should streamline the procedure for considering a fare change. (See page 14 of Recommendations)

7. VTA should work with labor representatives and health care providers to develop a strategy to contain health insurance costs. (See page 17 of Recommendations)

8. VTA should develop a strategy for negotiating with all four labor organizations in order of agreement expiration (Local 715, CEMA and TAEA in 2003 and ATU in 2005) and address non-represented staff benefits in a timely manner. (See page 20 of Recommendations)

9. Implement staffing changes consistent with productivity improvements and service reductions. (See page 23 of Recommendations)

10. Re-examine and revise inventory levels required for reduced fleet levels. (See page 23 of Recommendations)

11. Address excess fleet issue by halting rehabilitation of 92 Series buses, mothballing excess fleet and evaluating partial sale of excess fleet. (See page 23 of Recommendations)

12. VTA should examine work rules and resulting productive work hours per employee as part of both the current service restructuring and labor negotiations. (See page 24 of Recommendations)

Consultants Estimated Annual Financial Impact

Estimated to average $3.5 million net increase for subsequent fare increases

- None
- Will be determined through negotiations
- Included in #7
- Included in #14 below
- Negligible
- TBD
- Included in #14 below
Recommendations (con't)

13. VTA should carefully examine reductions in administrative costs both as part of potential productivity improvements and as part of the service restructuring effort. (See page 25 of Recommendations)

14. VTA should implement service reductions (restructuring) totalling 30% by October 2003. Such reductions should be made in line with the Board of Directors' adopted service standards. The net effect of this reduction is to save between 22 and 27 percent of total operating expense. (See page 26 of Recommendations)

15. The VTA Board should receive an annual presentation on the nature and magnitude of VTA services and periodic reports on route productivity, comparisons to service standards and efforts to restore services previously reduced. (See page 26 of Recommendations)

16. VTA should review and revise its service standards in light of its financial condition. These standards should address target and minimum acceptable measures of route productivity by route, service type, and overall system. (See page 26 of Recommendations)

17. VTA should revise and enforce staff time keeping policies and procedures to ensure maximum allocation of appropriate direct and indirect costs to capital projects. (See page 27 of Recommendations)

18. The Board of Directors should not adopt capital programs unless operations and maintenance costs have been identified and revenue sources are determined. Capital programs and service changes should be considered by the Board in the context of the budget process and revenue and cost projections. (See page 28 of Recommendations)

19. VTA should re-assess overhead cost composition to ensure all appropriate projects are defined as capital. (See page 28 of Recommendations)
Budget and Structural Deficit Strategies

Board of Directors Meeting/Workshop

December 10, 2009
FY10 and FY11 Adopted Budget Appropriation Levels by Funding Source
(Dollars in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY09 Projected</th>
<th>FY10 Adopted</th>
<th>FY11 Adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>351,195</td>
<td>349,600</td>
<td>336,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit</td>
<td>3,118</td>
<td>3,795</td>
<td>23,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>354,313</td>
<td>353,395</td>
<td>359,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sales Tax Related Revenue Update

- Third and fourth quarter year-over-year growth for FY09 less than projected:
  - 3rd Qtr: -8%
  - 4th Qtr: -5%
  - Actual: -21% -27%
  - Total FY09 Impact $22M

- Updated year-over-year projections for FY10 and FY11:
  - Lower FY09 base sales tax related revenues and updated growth projections for FY10 and FY11 result in a projected loss of revenue in each fiscal year:
    - FY10--$49M
    - FY11--$29M
Current Updated Picture
Appropriation Levels by Funding Source
(Dollars in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Deficit Funded from Reserves</th>
<th>Unfunded Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY09 Actual</td>
<td>332,881</td>
<td>332,881</td>
<td>8,585</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10 Current Projection</td>
<td>303,338</td>
<td>303,338</td>
<td>46,045</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11 Current Projection</td>
<td>304,150</td>
<td>304,150</td>
<td>49,978</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

December 10, 2009 Workshop
Measures Taken
FY10 and FY11 Adopted Budget

- Fare Increase
- Service Reductions (January 2010--8%)
- Furloughs
- Wage Freeze
- Non-Labor Reductions
- Paratransit-aligned service consistent with fixed-route
- Caltrain—no increase from FY09 contribution
- ACE—no increase from FY09 contribution
- Use of Operating Reserves
Proposed Process to Address Budget and Structural Deficit

- Discuss and approve near-term solutions for FY10 and FY11 today

- Form Ad Hoc Committee to focus on solutions beyond the current two-year horizon
Guiding Principles for Process

• Minimize service reductions and fare increases
• Preserve jobs to greatest extent possible
• Limit reliability on one-time revenues as a long-term solution to the structural deficit
• Include both expense reduction and revenue generation strategies
• Maintain capital infrastructure
Near-Term Strategy

Timeframe: Current 2-year budget horizon

Goal:  
- Address projected additional FY10 and FY11 deficit ($70M total)  
- End FY11 with ~$20M in Operating Reserves
Proposed Near-Term Strategy

• Identify internal operational efficiencies/savings
  – Hard hiring freeze
  – Additional decrease to non-labor budget
    • Advertising
    • Travel
    • Professional Services
    • Others
  – Contracted services efficiencies
• Defer Measure A BRT Hybrid Bus purchase and increase VTA Operating Assistance
• Identify additional decision points
Proposed Near-Term Strategy (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Projected 2-year Deficit</td>
<td>$70M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings from Internal Efficiencies</td>
<td>(10M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services Efficiencies</td>
<td>(5M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure A Operating Assistance</td>
<td>(25M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Deficit Remaining</td>
<td>$30M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Near-Term Strategy (cont.)
March 2010 Decision Point

- Anticipated additional information received:
  - Confirmation of STA amount
  - First and second quarter Sales Tax receipts
  - Updated projections for Taxable Sales growth

- Trigger
  - Combined STA funding and updated Sales Tax Revenue projections insufficient to provide FY 2011 ending Operating Reserves at $20M level

- Action
  - Implement service modifications
  - Implement reduction in workforce
  - Debt Reduction Fund transfer
Long-Term Strategy

Timeframe: Beyond current 2-year budget horizon

Goal: Address structural deficit
Ad Hoc Committee
Proposed Charge

• Identify and recommend long-term strategies to address structural deficit
  – Benefit modifications
  – Regional transit partnership options
  – Revenue stability measures
  – Alternative service delivery models
  – Others
Ad Hoc Committee (cont.)

Proposed Structure

- Subcommittee of Board of Directors
  (3-5 members)

- Utilize stakeholders as advisors
  - Labor
  - Business
  - Transit Users
  - Advisory Committee members
  - City and County representatives
  - Others as appropriate
Ad Hoc Committee (cont.)
Proposed Timeline

• Committee meets January to September 2010
• Committee recommendations discussed at September 2010 Board Workshop
• Substantive strategies to address structural deficit adopted at October 2010 Board Meeting
• Adopted strategies used to develop future budgets beginning with FY 2012
Workshop Action Items

- Reduce FY10 and FY11 budget appropriation
- De-obligate funds for BRT buses and reprogram to VTA Operating Assistance
- Approve waiver of Debt Reduction Fund Policy
- Approve formation of Ad Hoc Committee
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 the key transportation-related bills that are being considered by the California State Legislature during the 2009-10 session. It indicates the status of these measures and any adopted VTA positions with regard to them.

DISCUSSION:

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger has acted on all of the bills that were sent to him by lawmakers as part of the regular legislative session for 2009. Of the 10 measures approved by the Legislature that were supported by the VTA Board of Directors, the Governor signed eight and vetoed two. The following is a summary of those 10 bills:

**AB 112 (Beall):** This bill makes 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. Status: Signed into law, Chapter #81. VTA Position: Sponsor.

**AB 116 (Beall):** VTA partnered 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. The intent of AB 116 is to improve our cost efficiencies with regard to materials, supplies and equipment contracts.
Status: **Signed into law, Chapter #408.** VTA Position: Co-Sponsor.

**AB 338 (Ma):** Sponsored by the California Transit Association and BART, this legislation was intended to encourage transit-oriented development by allowing local officials to use property tax increment revenues to pay for infrastructure within transit village development districts. Status: **Vetoed** by the Governor. VTA Position: Support. Governor Schwarzenegger vetoed AB 338 because it would have eliminated the voter approval requirement for the creation of infrastructure financing districts.

**AB 672 (Bass):** This legislation authorizes a regional or local agency to expend its own money for a project funded through Proposition 1B transportation infrastructure bonds with the expectation of eventual reimbursement with bond proceeds. The intent of AB 672 is to provide regional and local agencies with a tool that would help them ensure the timely delivery of their Proposition 1B bond projects. Status: **Signed into law, Chapter #463.** VTA Position: Support.

**AB 729 (Evans):** Sponsored by the California Transit Association, this bill extends the existing statutory authority for public transit agencies to use design-build contracting for transit capital improvement projects for another four years -- until January 1, 2015. If AB 729 had not been enacted, this statutory authority would have expired on January 1, 2011. Status: **Signed into law, Chapter #466.** VTA Position: Support.

**AB 798 (Nava):** Sponsored by the Treasurer’s Office, this bill creates the California Transportation Financing Authority to assist regional and local agencies in obtaining financing through the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of improvements to the state’s transportation infrastructure. The measure also allows the authority to permit regional and local agencies, as part of the financing plan for their projects, to impose tolls for the use of the facilities constructed. Status: **Signed into law, Chapter #474.** VTA Position: Support.

**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 transit capital projects. AB 1072 makes several important changes to this program. For example, it fixes the formula factors that would be used to allocate the remaining amount of PTMISEA funding to public transit operators. This provides certainty to public transit operators as to the total amount of their individual formula shares and, thus, allows them to more effectively plan for how they would use their PTMISEA money. AB 1072 also calls upon each public transit operator to submit to the state an expenditure plan for its remaining formula share so that a statewide program of projects for PTMISEA can be established. This statewide program of projects would provide the Governor and the Legislature with important guidance in terms of how much money should be appropriated for PTMISEA in any given fiscal year. VTA co-sponsored AB 1072 with the California Transit Association. Status: **Signed into law, Chapter #271.** VTA Position: Co-Sponsor.

**AB 1158 (Hayashi):** This legislation would have added educational facilities and other land uses that link people traveling to and from K-12 schools, community colleges and universities to the...
list of specified characteristics that a transit village plan may address. Status: Vetoed by the Governor. VTA Position: Support. In his veto message, Gov. Schwarzenegger wrote: “This bill is unnecessary because local governments are already free to address any form of development as part of a transit village plan, including educational facilities.”

**SB 83 (Hancock):** Mirroring bills that have been introduced in the past, SB 83 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. Status: Signed into law, Chapter #554. VTA Position: Support.

**SB 626 (Kehoe):** This legislation requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to develop and implement policies designed to overcome the barriers associated with the widespread deployment of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. Status: Signed into law, Chapter #355. VTA Position: Support.

Prepared By: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
Memo No. 1873
# LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
## 2009 – 2010 State Legislative Session
### October 23, 2009
### 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> (Beall)</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>3/25/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #81</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority: Local Streets/Roads Funding</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. Allows VTA to award a contract for materials, supplies or equipment exceeding $100,000 either to the lowest responsible bidder or according to best value. For materials, supplies and equipment contracts between $2,500 and $100,000, requires VTA, to the extent practicable, to obtain a minimum of three written or oral quotes that permit prices and terms to be compared, and to award the contract to the lowest responsible bidder. 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>4/21/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #408</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 118</strong> (Logue)</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>Global Warming Solutions Act: Repeal</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>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 153</strong> (Ma)</td>
<td>By March 30, 2010, 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. Requires revenues collected pursuant to compliance mechanisms related to the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act, as well as any federal climate change funds received by the state, 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>6/26/09</td>
<td>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California High-Speed Rail Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 231</strong> (Huffman)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Protection Trust Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 254</strong> (Jeffries) Emergency Vehicles: Payment of Tolls</td>
<td>Exempts emergency vehicles from any requirement to pay tolls under the following circumstances: (1) the vehicle is properly identified or marked as an emergency vehicle; (2) the vehicle is being driven while responding to an urgent or emergency call, is engaged in an urgent or emergency response, or is engaged in a fire station coverage assignment directly related to an emergency response; and (3) the driver of the vehicle determines that the use of the toll facility will likely improve the availability or response and arrival time of the emergency vehicle and its delivery of essential public safety services. Specifies that the provisions of the bill apply to a toll road, high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane, toll bridge, toll highway, a vehicular crossing for which payment of a toll or charge is required, or any other toll facility.</td>
<td>6/26/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 266</strong> (Carter) Transportation Needs Assessment</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>4/20/09</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 277</strong> (Ammiano) Bay Area County Traffic and Transportation Funding Act</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>5/11/09</td>
<td>Vetoed by the Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 286</strong> (Salas) Vehicle Theft Crimes</td>
<td>Extends until January 1, 2018, existing provisions that allow counties to impose a $1 vehicle registration surcharge to fund local programs related to vehicle theft crimes.</td>
<td>6/23/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 289</strong> (Galgiani) High-Speed Rail Bonds</td>
<td>Requires the California High-Speed Rail Authority, to the extent possible, to use bond proceeds from the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century to match federal economic stimulus funds made available under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.</td>
<td>8/17/09</td>
<td>Senate Rules 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 338</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Ma)&lt;br&gt;Transit Village Developments: Infrastructure Financing</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, if the district is being proposed to implement a transit village development plan.</td>
<td>6/25/09</td>
<td>Vetoed by the Governor</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 497</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Block)&lt;br&gt;HOV Lanes: Physicians</td>
<td>Allows Caltrans and local transportation authorities to permit a vehicle driven by a physician who is traveling in response to an emergency call to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes regardless of the number of passengers in the vehicle, provided the vehicle displays an insignia approved by the California Highway Patrol (CHP) indicating that the vehicle is owned by a licensed physician. Specifies that the provisions of the bill would only apply if Caltrans determines that its application would not subject the state to a loss of federal aid for highways.</td>
<td>5/14/09</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 522</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Blumenfield)&lt;br&gt;Federal Economic Stimulus Money: Proposition 1B Bond Projects</td>
<td>Requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to ensure that bond funds previously committed to Proposition 1B transportation projects remain available to the sponsoring agency for another qualifying project if money from any federal economic stimulus legislation enacted in 2009 is used to fund the project.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 569</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Emmerson)&lt;br&gt;Meal Periods: Construction and Transportation Industries</td>
<td>Specifies that provisions in the Industrial Welfare Commission’s wage order pertaining to meal periods do not apply to an employee in a construction occupation, a commercial driver in the transportation industry or an employee in the security services industry if all of the following conditions are satisfied: (1) the employee is covered by a valid collective bargaining agreement; (2) the valid collective bargaining agreement expressly provides for the wages, hours of work, and working conditions of employees; and (c) the valid collective bargaining agreement expressly provides for meal periods, final and binding arbitration of disputes concerning the application of its meal period provisions, premium wage rates for all overtime hours worked, and a regular hourly rate of pay of not less than 30 percent more than the state minimum wage rate.</td>
<td>9/11/09</td>
<td>Senate Rules 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>&lt;br&gt;(Caballero)&lt;br&gt;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>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 619</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Blumenfield)&lt;br&gt;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>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 628</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Block)&lt;br&gt;Pay-By-Plate Toll Collection</td>
<td>Authorizes a tolling authority to charge and collect tolls using digital images of license plates.</td>
<td>8/26/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #459</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 652</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Skinner)&lt;br&gt;Bike Racks on Buses</td>
<td>Authorizes the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) to install three-position bicycle racks on its buses provided that: (a) the rack does not extend more than 40 inches from the front of the bus when fully deployed; and (b) the handlebars of the bicycle being transported do not extend more than 46 inches from the front of the bus.</td>
<td>8/24/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 670</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Berryhill)&lt;br&gt;HOV Lanes: Veterans</td>
<td>Allows Caltrans and local transportation authorities to permit a vehicle driven by a veteran or active duty member of the U.S. Armed Forces to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes regardless of the number of passengers in the vehicle, provided the vehicle displays an insignie approved by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Specifies that the provisions of the bill would only apply if Caltrans determines that its application would not subject the state to a loss of federal aid for highways.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 672</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Bass)&lt;br&gt;Proposition 1B Bond Projects: LONPs</td>
<td>Authorizes the lead agency for a project funded through Proposition 1B transportation infrastructure bonds to apply for a letter of no prejudice (LONP) that would allow the agency to expend its own funds for any bond-funded component of the project, subject to later reimbursement from bond proceeds under certain conditions. In the case of the State-Local Partnership Program, requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC), prior to the commencement of each funding cycle, to calculate the amount of bond funds designated for the program that have not been appropriated, and requires the CTC to establish projected targets for the distribution of those funds for purposes of planning projects for which LONPs may be issued.</td>
<td>6/2/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #463</td>
<td>Support</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 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>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</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>6/30/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #466</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 nine transportation projects from January 1, 2010, to July 1, 2010.</td>
<td>6/16/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 733</strong> (Galgiani) California High-Speed Rail Authority: Contracts</td>
<td>Allows the California High-Speed Rail Authority to consider, to the extent permitted by federal and state law, the creation of jobs in California when awarding major contracts or purchasing high-speed trains.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Vetoed by the Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 744</td>
<td>Bay Area Express Lane Network</td>
<td>Authorizes the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) to develop, acquire, administer, operate, and maintain a regional express lane network on state highways within the geographic jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in a collaborative manner with the congestion management agencies (CMAs) in the Bay Area, Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). Creates the Bay Area Express Lane Network Project Oversight Committee to recommend policies related to the network to BATA, including an express lane development plan. Specifies that the plan would consist of the following two elements: (1) a phasing plan for the development of the express lane network, which would include a definition of the geographic boundaries of each of the express lane corridors in the network; and (2) an operational plan, which would include consistency standards for the network related to geometric design, signage, safe and simple operations, technology, pricing policies and goals, carpool occupancy requirements, hours of operation, maintenance, enforcement, marketing, tort liability, and performance standards. Requires the committee to establish corridor working groups for each express lane corridor. Requires each corridor working group to prepare a project initiation document to assess the feasibility and desirability of express lanes in the corridor, as well as to develop a corridor investment plan. Requires the corridor investment plan to consist of the following: (a) phased development of the segment of the regional express lane network within the corridor of the group; (b) carpool occupancy and fee policies; (c) local funding for the development of part or all of the segment of the network within the corridor of the group; (d) proposed reimbursement of local agencies for prior expenditures on elements of the network; (e) proposals as to which agencies would perform the work described in the corridor investment plan; (f) an examination of equity considerations; (g) a proposal for improving public transit services in the corridor; (h) an examination of safety and operations, including express lane ingress and egress; and (i) projects and programs to be funded with any net revenues generated by the corridor, giving the highest priority to projects and programs that would provide cost-effective transit. Authorizes BATA to issue revenue bonds to finance the development of the regional express lane network, and to pledge toll revenues from the Bay Area’s state-owned toll bridges as a “backstop” for those bonds. Allows BATA to increase the tolls collected on those bridges if that action is necessary to meet the obligations of the revenue bonds. Allows BATA to expend toll bridge revenues on the regional express lane network provided that: (a) funding from other sources is not available; and (b) BATA projects that funding the network will not necessitate an increase in bridge toll rates or preclude BATA from upholding its contractual and statutory obligations. Requires all revenues generated by the network to be deposited in the Bay Area Express Lane Network Account, which BATA would create. Requires BATA to return 95 percent of any revenues net of operating, maintenance, financing, and administration costs to the corridors where the net revenues are generated for the purpose of funding projects and programs identified in the relevant corridor investment plan. Requires the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency and the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority to enter into agreements with BATA by January 1, 2011, to provide for the transfer of their rights and obligations relative to express lane projects to BATA. Requires BATA to provide vehicle owners with the option of obtaining a FasTrak account using cash or a check, and without having to provide a name or address. Prohibits BATA from converting existing non-tolled general purpose lanes to express lanes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 744 (Torrico)</td>
<td>Authorizes the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) to develop, acquire, administer, operate, and maintain a regional express lane network on state highways within the geographic jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in a collaborative manner with the congestion management agencies (CMAs) in the Bay Area, Caltrans and the California Highway Patrol (CHP). Creates the Bay Area Express Lane Network Project Oversight Committee to recommend policies related to the network to BATA, including an express lane development plan. Specifies that the plan would consist of the following two elements: (1) a phasing plan for the development of the express lane network, which would include a definition of the geographic boundaries of each of the express lane corridors in the network; and (2) an operational plan, which would include consistency standards for the network related to geometric design, signage, safe and simple operations, technology, pricing policies and goals, carpool occupancy requirements, hours of operation, maintenance, enforcement, marketing, tort liability, and performance standards. Requires the committee to establish corridor working groups for each express lane corridor. Requires each corridor working group to prepare a project initiation document to assess the feasibility and desirability of express lanes in the corridor, as well as to develop a corridor investment plan. Requires the corridor investment plan to consist of the following: (a) phased development of the segment of the regional express lane network within the corridor of the group; (b) carpool occupancy and fee policies; (c) local funding for the development of part or all of the segment of the network within the corridor of the group; (d) proposed reimbursement of local agencies for prior expenditures on elements of the network; (e) proposals as to which agencies would perform the work described in the corridor investment plan; (f) an examination of equity considerations; (g) a proposal for improving public transit services in the corridor; (h) an examination of safety and operations, including express lane ingress and egress; and (i) projects and programs to be funded with any net revenues generated by the corridor, giving the highest priority to projects and programs that would provide cost-effective transit. Authorizes BATA to issue revenue bonds to finance the development of the regional express lane network, and to pledge toll revenues from the Bay Area’s state-owned toll bridges as a “backstop” for those bonds. Allows BATA to increase the tolls collected on those bridges if that action is necessary to meet the obligations of the revenue bonds. Allows BATA to expend toll bridge revenues on the regional express lane network provided that: (a) funding from other sources is not available; and (b) BATA projects that funding the network will not necessitate an increase in bridge toll rates or preclude BATA from upholding its contractual and statutory obligations. Requires all revenues generated by the network to be deposited in the Bay Area Express Lane Network Account, which BATA would create. Requires BATA to return 95 percent of any revenues net of operating, maintenance, financing, and administration costs to the corridors where the net revenues are generated for the purpose of funding projects and programs identified in the relevant corridor investment plan. Requires the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency and the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority to enter into agreements with BATA by January 1, 2011, to provide for the transfer of their rights and obligations relative to express lane projects to BATA. Requires BATA to provide vehicle owners with the option of obtaining a FasTrak account using cash or a check, and without having to provide a name or address. Prohibits BATA from converting existing non-tolled general purpose lanes to express lanes.</td>
<td>7/15/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td>Support</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 782</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Jeffries) 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 Natural Resources Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 798</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>6/24/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #474</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 810</td>
<td>Renames the circulation element of local general plans the “circulation and transportation element.”</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate 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 878</strong> (Caballero) Infrastructure Financing</td>
<td>Authorizes a local governmental agency to enter into an agreement with a private entity for financing for specified types of revenue-generating infrastructure projects.</td>
<td>4/20/09</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 922</strong> (Miller) Biodiesel Fuel Tax Exemption</td>
<td>Until June 30, 2014, exempts biomass-based diesel fuel produced in the state with California feedstock from the diesel fuel excise tax.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 949</strong> (Logue) State-Local Partnership Program</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1030</strong> (Blumenfield) Caltrans: Renewable Energy Projects</td>
<td>In consultation with Caltrans, authorizes the Institute of the Environment at the University of California-Los Angeles (UCLA) to undertake a project for mapping the renewable energy development potential of state-owned real property under the direction and control of Caltrans. Requires Caltrans to respond within 90 days to any proposal to develop a renewable energy project as to whether: (a) the property is available for sale, lease or encroachment permit; and (b) the project would be compatible with the current and projected use of that property.</td>
<td>7/13/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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. Under terms and conditions approved by Caltrans, allows a project sponsor, in a particular fiscal year, to loan its allocation of Proposition 1B transit capital funds to another project sponsor in order to ensure that all allocations in that fiscal year are put to use. Allows a project sponsor to use a Proposition 1B transit capital funding allocation in a subsequent fiscal year to complete a project that was approved by Caltrans in a previous fiscal year.</td>
<td>6/18/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #271</td>
<td>Co-Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1091</strong> (Ruskin) Climate Change Adaptation Strategy</td>
<td>Authorizes the Natural Resources Agency to develop a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy to assess California’s vulnerability to the impacts of climate change, including the impacts of projected sea-level rise, on the state’s physical and natural infrastructure. Requires the strategy to be subject to a multidisciplinary review process prior to adoption to ensure that ecosystems, sensitive species, or other environmentally sensitive resources or habitats are not inadvertently put at risk or adversely impacted.</td>
<td>5/6/09</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1104</strong> (Monning) Off-Highway Motor Vehicles</td>
<td>Expands the period of time during which a review of a parking violation may be requested.</td>
<td>4/14/09</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| AB 1135  
(Skinner)  
Odometer Readings | Requires California vehicle owners to report the current odometer reading of their vehicles at the time of vehicle registration. | 4/13/09 | Assembly Appropriations Committee |
|------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|
| AB 1158  
(Hayashi)  
Transit Village Plans:  
Educational Facilities | Adds educational facilities and other land uses that provide direct linkages for people traveling to and from primary and secondary schools, community colleges and universities to the list of specified characteristics that a transit village plan may address. | 6/25/09 | Vetoed by the Governor Support |
| AB 1175  
(Torlakson)  
Bay Area Toll Authority | Requires the Controller’s Office to collect unpaid bridge tolls and express lane fees, as well as any relevant interest, penalties, fines, or other charges from money owed to a person or entity from state income or sales tax refunds, or winnings in the state lottery. Adds seismic safety improvement projects on the Antioch and Dumbarton Bridges to the Toll Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program. Redirects surplus cost overrun revenues to be shared between the state and the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) to BATA for the seismic safety improvement projects on the Antioch and Dumbarton Bridges. Requires BATA to provide all remaining necessary funds to complete those projects. Allows BATA to increase tolls on all Bay Area state-owned toll bridges for the following purposes: (a) funding the seismic safety improvement projects on the Antioch and Dumbarton Bridges; (b) meeting its obligations and covenants under any bond resolution or indenture of the authority for any outstanding toll bridge revenue bonds issued by the authority; and (c) funding the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, and seismic retrofit of the Bay Area state-owned toll bridges. Allows BATA to vary its toll structure from bridge to bridge, and to provide discounts for high-occupancy vehicles. Requires maintenance expenditures funded from toll revenues to be paid for by those toll revenues remaining after payment of all obligations of BATA that are secured by toll revenues. Requires BATA to provide vehicle owners with the option of obtaining a FasTrak account using cash or a check, and without having to provide a name or address. Requires BATA to contract with a nationally recognized independent entity with expertise in privacy issues associated with the electronic transmission and storage of data to conduct a review and an analysis of the privacy issues pertaining to FasTrak, and to report to the Legislature by January 31, 2011. | 8/19/09 | Signed into Law: Chapter #515 |
| AB 1186  
(Blumenfield)  
Employee Parking | Requires that lease agreements for non-residential buildings occupied by 50 or more persons that offer parking to tenants list separately the costs for parking from other costs included in the lease. | 8/18/09 | Vetoed by the Governor |
| AB 1192  
(Strickland)  
SILO/LILO Transactions | Prohibits a legislative body of a city from selling or leasing any existing public improvement to a private or public entity for the purposes of renting or leasing back, or repurchasing through installment payments that existing public improvement. | 4/20/09 | Assembly Local Government Committee |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1203</strong></td>
<td>Requires the California Emergency Management Agency (Cal EMA) to administer the Proposition 1B bond funds appropriated for the Transit System Safety, Security, and Disaster Response Account, rather than the Office of Emergency Services. No later than February 1 of each year, requires Cal EMA to provide the Controller’s Office with a list of the projects and sponsoring agencies eligible to receive an allocation from the account. Upon receipt of this information, requires the Controller’s Office to commence any necessary actions to allocate the funds to the sponsoring agencies, including seeking the issuance of bonds for that purpose.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1321</strong></td>
<td>Establishes the Advance Infrastructure Mitigation Program to be administered and implemented by the California Natural Resources Agency. In this regard, authorizes the agency to: (a) prepare, approve and implement regional advance mitigation plans for planned infrastructure projects; (b) acquire, restore, manage, monitor, and preserve lands, waterways, aquatic resources, or fisheries in accordance with a regional advance mitigation plan; (c) establish mitigation or conservation banks; (d) purchase credits at mitigation or conservation banks if it determines that they would provide biologically appropriate mitigation for planned infrastructure projects; and (e) use, or allow infrastructure planning agencies to use, mitigation credits or values created or acquired under the Advance Infrastructure Mitigation Program to fulfill the mitigation requirements of planned infrastructure projects. Specifies that the purposes of a regional advance mitigation plan are to: (1) provide effective mitigation and conservation of natural resources and natural processes on a landscape, regional or statewide scale to expedite the environmental review of planned infrastructure projects; and (2) facilitate the implementation of measures to mitigate the impacts of those projects in advance of project approval. Allows an infrastructure planning agency to identify planned infrastructure projects for the purposes of including them in a regional advance mitigation plan or for other advance mitigation under the Advance Infrastructure Mitigation Program. Specifies that the Advance Infrastructure Mitigation Program is intended to improve the efficiency and efficacy of mitigation only and is not intended to supplant the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or any other environmental law.</td>
<td>5/6/09</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1364</strong></td>
<td>Allows any state agency that has entered into a grant agreement for the expenditure of state bond funds where the state agency or grant recipient may not be able to comply with the terms of that agreement because of the suspension of interim funding for projects and contracts by the Pooled Money Investment Board on or after December 18, 2008, to do either of the following: (a) renegotiate, modify or eliminate the deadlines and timetables for deliverables within the grant agreement in order to address the suspension; or (b) terminate the grant agreement if no grant funds have yet been delivered.</td>
<td>8/17/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #526</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 1375 (Galgiani) California High-Speed Rail Authority</td>
<td>Creates the Department of High-Speed Trains within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. Requires the California High-Speed Rail Authority to establish policies directing the development and implementation of high-speed train service that is fully integrated with the state’s existing intercity rail and bus network, consisting of interlinked conventional and high-speed train lines and associated feeder buses. Further specifies that the intercity network in turn shall be fully coordinated and connected with commuter train lines and urban transit systems developed by local agencies, through the use of common station facilities whenever possible. Requires the Department of High-Speed Trains to implement these policies. Requires the authority to do all of the following: (1) select the routes of the high-speed train system; (2) determine the priority of construction of the various segments of the high-speed train system; (3) serve as the governing body of the Department of High-Speed Trains; (4) adopt criteria for the awarding of franchises; and (5) set fares or establish guidelines for the setting of fares. By October 1 of each year, requires the authority to adopt and submit to the Governor and the Legislature a high-speed train program that would cover a period of six fiscal years. Requires the program to include a listing of all capital improvement projects that are expected to require an appropriation in the annual Budget Act, including federal, state, local, and private funds, during the following six fiscal years. Requires the director of the Department of High-Speed Trains to be appointed by the authority. Requires the department to do all of the following: (1) conduct engineering and other studies related to the selection and acquisition of rights-of-way, and the selection of a franchisee; (2) evaluate alternative high-speed train technologies, systems and operators, and select an appropriate high-speed train system; (3) award franchises consistent with criteria adopted by the authority; (4) select a proposed franchisee, a proposed route and proposed terminal sites; (5) prepare a detailed financing plan, including any necessary taxes, fees or bonds to pay for the construction of the high-speed train system; (6) enter into contracts for the design, construction and operation of the high-speed train system; (7) acquire rights-of-way through purchase or eminent domain; (8) enter into cooperative or joint development agreements with local governments or private entities; (9) subject to the approval of the authority, issue debt secured by pledges of state funds, federal grants or project revenues; (10) relocate highways and utilities; (11) plan, construct and operate the high-speed train system; (12) acquire, sell and lease passenger rail rolling stock, power units and associated equipment; and (13) acquire, lease, design, construct, and improve track lines and related facilities.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1404 (De Leon) Global Warming Solutions Act: Compliance Offsets</td>
<td>If the California Air Resources Board (CARB) allows the use of market-based compliance mechanisms pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires the board to limit the use of compliance offsets to no more than 10 percent of the greenhouse gas emission reductions expected from market mechanisms during the compliance period.</td>
<td>9/4/09</td>
<td>Vetoed by the Governor</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 1405</strong> (De Leon) Global Warming Solutions Act: Community Benefits Fund</td>
<td>Requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to deposit a minimum of 30 percent of the fee revenues generated under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, other than revenues collected for administrative purposes, in the Community Benefits Fund. Requires the revenues in the fund to be used solely in the most impacted and disadvantaged communities in the state to accelerate greenhouse gas emission reductions or mitigate direct health impacts of climate change in those communities. Requires the revenues in the fund to be used to provide competitive grants for projects that do any of the following: (a) reduce greenhouse gas emissions while achieving co-benefits, such as reductions in air pollution; (b) increase water and energy efficiency and conservation through retrofitting, replacing or weatherizing activities; (c) install clean distributed generation systems that utilize locally available renewable energy sources, such as solar, wind and geothermal energy; (d) initiate or enhance public mass transit, including fare subsidies to commuters; (e) incentive low-income, public mass transit-oriented housing development; (f) minimize the direct health impacts of climate change and prepare for emergencies from extreme weather events by taking actions such as the operation of air-conditioned cooling centers that are open to the public; or (g) provide community based greening, forestry or water-related projects, such as stormwater capture, tree planting, and water conservation and efficiency measures that have been recognized to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and produce co-benefits. Requires CARB to adopt a methodology to identify the most impacted and disadvantaged communities by June 30, 2010.</td>
<td>9/1/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1431</strong> (Hill) Port of Oakland: Emission Reduction Strategies</td>
<td>Requires the Port of Oakland and entities involved in goods movement at that port to establish emission reduction strategies that are no less stringent than those employed at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.</td>
<td>4/14/09</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1464</strong> (Smyth) Bicycle Routes of National, State or Regional Significance</td>
<td>Authorizes Caltrans to establish a process for identifying and promoting bicycle routes of national, state or regional significance. Allows Caltrans to establish a process whereby local bicycle organizations, private entities, or state or local government entities may nominate a route for inclusion in the system of bicycle routes of national, state or regional significance. Authorizes Caltrans to develop criteria for the design, placement and installation of signs relative to bicycle routes of national, state or regional significance. Allows the applicants or nominating entities to pay the costs for purchasing, erecting and maintaining the signs, as determined by Caltrans. Allows these costs to be reimbursed by Caltrans.</td>
<td>6/30/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter # 396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1500</strong> (Lieu) HOV Lanes: Low-Emission Vehicles</td>
<td>Unless pre-empted by federal law, extends the authorization for low-emission vehicles to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes regardless of the number of vehicle occupants from January 1, 2011, to January 1, 2014.</td>
<td>7/14/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1502 (Eng) HOV Lanes: Low-Emission and Hybrid Vehicles</td>
<td>Unless pre-empted by federal law, extends the authorization for certain low-emission vehicles to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes regardless of the number of vehicle occupants from January 1, 2011, to January 1, 2017. However, retains the January 1, 2011, sunset date for hybrid vehicles.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Transportation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 3 (Blakeslee) State General Obligation Bonds</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to require an initiative measure authorizing the issuance of state general obligation bonds in a total amount exceeding $1 billion to either provide additional tax or fee revenues, eliminate existing programs or both as necessary to fully fund the bonds in order to be placed on the ballot.</td>
<td>6/16/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 5 (Calderon) State General Obligation Bonds</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to require an initiative measure authorizing the issuance of state general obligation bonds to be approved by a 55 percent majority of the electorate.</td>
<td>7/14/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 9 (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 any of the following: (a) the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure improvements, and facilities or buildings used primarily to provide sheriff, police or fire protection services to the public; (b) affordable housing; and (c) the acquisition or lease of real estate for public infrastructure improvements, public safety facilities or buildings, and affordable housing, if the bond issuance is approved by its electorate by a 55 percent majority. Creates an exception to the 1 percent limit for property tax assessments if the revenues are being used to pay bonded indebtedness, approved by a 55 percent majority vote, to fund any of the following: (a) the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure improvements, and facilities or buildings used primarily to provide sheriff, police or fire protection services to the public; (b) affordable housing; and (c) the acquisition or lease of real estate for public infrastructure improvements, public safety facilities or buildings, and affordable housing.</td>
<td>6/26/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 13 (Hernandez) Initiatives</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 an initiative measure to the Legislature prior to certification of the voter signatures that were collected to qualify the measure for the ballot. Allows the Legislature to amend an initiative measure that proposes to change the Constitution by concurrent resolution. If the proponents of the initiative measure accept the amendments of the Legislature, the Legislature may return the measure to the Secretary of State’s Office for possible placement on the ballot. Allows an initiative measure transmitted to the Legislature that only proposes a statute to be introduced in the Legislature as a bill. Provides that if such a bill is enacted and the proponents of the initiative measure accept any amendments of the Legislature, then the Secretary of State’s Office shall not submit the initiative measure to the voters. If the Legislature returns an initiative measure to the Secretary of State’s Office within 30 legislative session days after it has been transmitted to the Legislature and the measure is certified to have been signed by the requisite number of voters, requires the Secretary of State’s Office to place the measure, including any accepted amendments, on the ballot. If the Legislature does not return an initiative measure to the Secretary of State’s Office within 30 legislative session days after it has been transmitted to the Legislature, requires the Secretary of State’s Office to place the measure on the ballot if it is certified to have been signed by the requisite number of voters.</td>
<td>9/4/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 15 (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 Floor</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 16 (Nestande) State General Obligation Bonds</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to allow the Legislature to approve general obligation bond measures only for the purpose of funding long-term infrastructure. Defines “long-term infrastructure” to mean any of the following: (a) the acquisition of land, including easements, rights-of-way and other interests in land; (b) the construction or acquisition of improvements to land, including structures and equipment integral to the operation of those structures; and (c) the construction or acquisition of roadways and water conveyances.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR 14 (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>3/27/09</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources 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>ACR 77 (Swanson)</td>
<td>Urges the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to meet the statutory requirements of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 by ensuring that its analysis of the emission reduction measures as proposed in its scoping plan and related rulemaking includes the following: (1) an analysis of the projected employment impacts of the proposed measures by sector in each of the years leading up to 2020 and beyond that specifies the potential for green collar jobs to be located in California or outside the state; (2) identification of the types of jobs that will be created in California, the industry sectors where the jobs will be created, and the wage and benefit levels expected for those workers; (3) identification of the types of jobs that may be lost in California and the industry sectors where the jobs may be lost; and (4) a plan for providing California workers with training programs for new green technology jobs that are different from the traditional jobs in energy, transportation and construction.</td>
<td>9/1/09</td>
<td>Enacted by the Legislature</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 10 (Leno) 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. Specifies that the bill is not to be construed to supplant any funds that the state apportions to counties and San Francisco, including those apportioned under the Vehicle License Fee Law.</td>
<td>7/8/09</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 31 (Pavley) Global Warming Solutions Act: Compliance Revenues</td>
<td>Requires any revenues collected pursuant 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>5/5/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 43 (Alquist) Santa Clara Stadium Authority</td>
<td>Authorizes the Santa Clara Stadium Authority to award a design-build contract without utilizing a competitive bidding process for the construction of a stadium, provided that all of the following has occurred: (1) a ballot measure endorsing the development of a stadium suitable for use by a professional football team is approved by the voters in a citywide election; (2) the governing body of the Santa Clara Stadium Authority determines that the cost of the contract is reasonable and the award of the contract is in its best interest; (3) the design-build contract does not require expenditures from the general fund of the city of Santa Clara; and (4) the design build contract is not funded by contributions from the city’s Redevelopment Agency.</td>
<td>8/27/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 83</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Hancock)&lt;br&gt;Vehicle Registration Surcharge</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 are consistent with the applicable Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); 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 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>9/4/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #554</td>
<td>Support</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>Subjects nitrogen trifluoride to the regulatory framework established in the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.</td>
<td>9/4/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 124</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Oropeza)&lt;br&gt;Air Pollution: Vehicle Idling at Schools</td>
<td>Increases the minimum civil penalty for violating administrative regulations adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) limiting the idling of school buses, transit buses and other commercial vehicles near schools.</td>
<td>8/27/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 128</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Padilla)&lt;br&gt;California Climate Change Institute</td>
<td>Creates 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. Specifies that the provisions of the bill would be implemented only to the extent that sufficient funds are appropriated by the Legislature for its purposes.</td>
<td>4/2/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 295 (Dutton) Global Warming Solutions Act: Peer-Reviewed Study</td>
<td>Requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to complete a peer-reviewed study to re-evaluate the costs and benefits included in its scoping plan prepared pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. Requires this additional study to include all of the following: (1) estimates of the actual costs in every year and for every sector of the economy of the recommendations identified in the scoping plan; (2) estimates of overall costs and savings, as well as the cost-effectiveness of the reductions identified in the scoping plan; (3) estimates of the timing of capital investments, annual expenditures to repay those investments, and the resulting cost savings; (4) sensitivity of the results to changes in key inputs, including energy price forecasts, and estimates of measure costs and savings; (5) impacts on small businesses; (6) the current state of California’s economy; (7) the impact of increased federal funding for green technology as a result of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; (8) estimates of the greenhouse gas emission reductions, and annualized costs and savings that would result if the emission targets were raised and lowered for at least five measures in the scoping plan. Requires CARB to provide this study to the Legislature by October 1, 2009. Requires CARB to report to the Legislature by November 1, 2009, on whether the study will lead to changes to the scoping plan.</td>
<td>5/13/09</td>
<td>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 391 (Liu) California Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans to update the California Transportation Plan by December 31, 2015, and every five years thereafter. 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 as required by the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, 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. Requires Caltrans to complete an interim report by December 31, 2012. Requires this interim report to include: (a) a list and overview of all sustainable communities strategies and alternative planning strategies that have been prepared; and (b) an assessment of how the implementation of these sustainable communities strategies and alternative planning strategies would influence the configuration of the statewide integrated multimodal transportation system.</td>
<td>5/4/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #558</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SB 406**  
(DeSaulnier)  
Regional Blueprint Plans | Requires the Planning Advisory and Assistance Council to: (a) work with regional agencies, such as metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) and councils of governments (COGs), as well as with cities and counties to facilitate the implementation of regional blueprint plans; and (b) develop and propose recommendations to facilitate the coordination between regional blueprint plans, state growth and infrastructure funding plans, and programs that facilitate the implementation of regional blueprint plans. Authorizes an MPO, COG, or county transportation commission and subregional COG jointly preparing a subregional sustainable communities strategy to impose a vehicle registration surcharge of $1 or $2 solely to: (a) develop a regional blueprint plan or sustainable communities strategy to identify land-use strategies to reduce the use of motor vehicles in its jurisdiction and thereby achieve the greenhouse gas emission reduction target specified in the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006; and (b) implement a sustainable communities strategy or regional blueprint plan that achieves the greenhouse gas emission reduction target specified in the act. In the Bay Area, requires the surcharge to be jointly imposed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), and the revenues from the surcharge to be divided in accordance with an agreement between those two entities. If the surcharge exceeds $1, requires all amounts above $1 in a jurisdiction with a population greater than 300,000 to be used to provide grants to cities, counties and congestion management agencies (CMAs) for planning and projects related to the implementation of a regional blueprint plan. Requires 5 percent of the surcharge revenues to be transmitted to the Planning Advisory and Assistance Council. Allows an MPO, COG, or county transportation commission and subregional COG jointly preparing a subregional sustainable communities strategy to divide the revenues from the surcharge with the local air quality management district. Requires any surcharge revenues received by a local air quality management district to be used to assist local and regional governments in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. | 9/4/09 | Vetoed by the Governor |
| **SB 409**  
(Ducheny)  
Department of Railroads | Creates the Department of Railroads within the California Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. Specifies that the department would be overseen by a director to be appointed by the governor and confirmed by the Senate. Transfers to the department all state programs and responsibilities related to the following: (1) intercity passenger rail; (2) high-speed rail; (3) rail goods movement; and (4) rail-highway grade crossings and separations. Creates the Division of Railroad-Highway Grade Separation and Grade Crossing Protection within the department. Requires the department to conduct an analysis of the state’s freight rail transportation system every two years. Requires the department to coordinate regional planning efforts throughout the state relative to rail transportation. Specifies that the department shall be the only state agency eligible to apply for and receive grant and loan funds from the federal government or other sources for intercity rail, high-speed rail and freight rail purposes. Establishes the California High-Speed Rail Authority as a division of the department. Requires the chief of this division to be nominated by the director of the Department of Railroads and approved by the High-Speed Rail Authority. Requires one of the appointments to the High-Speed Rail Authority to be the director of the Department of Railroads. Requires the director of the Department of Railroads to serve as the chair of the High-Speed Rail Authority. | 5/21/09 | Senate Floor |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senate Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 425 (Simitian)</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management Strategies</td>
<td>Authorizes the Franchise Tax Board to deny a deduction for parking as a business expense if the employer is not in compliance with state parking cash-out requirements. Requires any revenues generated by disallowed deductions to be allocated as a tax credit to small business to help them implement and maintain qualified commute trip reduction measures.</td>
<td>7/23/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 455 (Lowenthal)</td>
<td>California High-Speed Rail Authority</td>
<td>Requires the five gubernatorial appointments to the California High-Speed Rail Authority to be confirmed by the Senate. Exempts the High-Speed Rail Authority from the following: (a) various statutory provisions related to the acquisition and disposal of property requiring the approval of the Department of Finance; (b) securing the approval of the Department of Finance or the State Public Works Board when expending funds appropriated for capital outlay purposes; and (c) securing the approval of the Department of General Services when acquiring an easement or right-of-way. Prohibits the Department of General Services from: (a) granting easements across the property of the High-Speed Rail Authority; and (b) maintaining an inventory of the property owned by the authority. Authorizes the High-Speed Rail Authority to negotiate, in the name of the state, access to rights-of-way that it owns. Requires any capital investment made by the High-Speed Rail Authority for Phase 1 of the high-speed train project to be consistent with one or more of the following criteria: (a) enhances railroad access to stations and terminals, with priority being given to those stations and terminals that serve the largest employment centers; (b) improves travel times, service reliability, safety, and service frequency for existing commuter and intercity passenger train services; or (c) improves connections from the San Joaquin Valley to Southern California, or from the San Joaquin Valley to the Bay Area. Requires changes in contracts entered into by the High-Speed Rail Authority to be approved by its governing board. Requires the High-Speed Rail Authority to create an overall schedule with delivery milestones for all aspects of the high-speed train project.</td>
<td>4/16/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 474 (Ducheny)</td>
<td>Innovative Contracting and Financing Pilot Programs</td>
<td>Requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to provide an annual consolidated report to the Legislature on the progress of the following pilot programs authorized under current law: (1) public-private partnerships; (2) design-build; and (3) design-sequencing. Within 90 days after the award of a contract or after entering into any agreement for a pilot program involving public-private partnerships, design-build or design-sequencing under current law, requires the lead agency for the project to make a finding that the use of the alternative contracting or financing method will provide any of the following benefits to the public when compared to a traditional contracting or financing method: (a) accelerates the project completion date; (b) produces savings in personnel or financial resources; (c) results in lower costs to the users of the facility developed under the method; or (d) brings financial resources to the project that would not otherwise be available. If the lead agency on a project is not the owner of the facility, requires the owner of the facility to concur with the finding.</td>
<td>8/24/09</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 476 (Correa)</td>
<td>CEQA: Non-Compliance Allegations</td>
<td>Clarifies provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that prescribe when and how a person may bring an action or a proceeding against a project before a public entity.</td>
<td>4/30/09</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 485 (Wright)</td>
<td>SHOPP Funding</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 518 (Lowenthal)</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>5/28/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 526 (Ashburn)</td>
<td>Intercity Rail: Altamont Pass Extension</td>
<td>4/2/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 527 (Kehoe)</td>
<td>Bicycles</td>
<td>5/6/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #594</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 528 (Negrete McLeod) Public-Private Partnerships: Lessee Compensation</td>
<td>Prohibits a lease agreement related to a public-private partnership for a transportation facility that is entered into on or after January 1, 2010, from providing for compensation to the private entity for the adverse effects on toll revenues resulting from the development, operation or lease of competing transportation projects.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 535 (Yee) HOV Lanes: Low-Emission and Fuel-Efficient Vehicles</td>
<td>Unless preempted by federal law, indefinitely extends the authorization for vehicles that meet California’s super ultra-low exhaust emission standard and the federal inherently low-emission evaporative emission standard to use high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes regardless of the number of vehicle occupants. In addition, allows certain highly fuel-efficient vehicles to travel in HOV lanes without the required number of passengers, beginning in 2011. However, retains the January 1, 2011, sunset date for hybrid vehicles.</td>
<td>9/4/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 555 (Kehoe) Eminent Domain: Conservation Easements</td>
<td>Revises eminent domain law to establish requirements for the acquisition of property subject to a conservation easement. Requires the person seeking to acquire the property through eminent domain to give the holder of the conservation easement a notice containing specified information and an opportunity to comment on the acquisition. Requires the holder of the conservation easement to provide notice of the proposed acquisition to each public entity that helped fund the purchase of the easement or that imposed conditions on the approval or permitting of a project that were satisfied, in whole or in part, by the easement. Requires the person seeking to acquire the property subject to a conservation easement to respond to any comments in writing. Specifies that the holder of a conservation easement is entitled to compensation under eminent domain law.</td>
<td>9/3/09</td>
<td>Vetoed by the Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 560 (Ashburn) Sustainable Communities Strategies</td>
<td>Provides that greenhouse gas emission credits for cities and counties that site and permit commercial wind, solar and biomass projects may be used as credit in the formation of a sustainable communities strategy or an alternative planning strategy. Provides that transportation trips outside of federal lands that are directly related to activities of a federal or state military installation shall not be included in the emissions inventory otherwise required to be considered to achieve any reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 575 (Steinberg) Sustainable Communities Strategies</td>
<td>Makes technical changes to several provisions under the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008, including: (a) the rezoning requirements under housing element law; and (b) housing element due dates. In addition, requires Caltrans to maintain and publish a current schedule of the estimated regional transportation plan (RTP) adoption dates, and a current schedule of the estimated and actual housing element due dates on its Internet Web site.</td>
<td>8/17/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Senate Bills</strong></td>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td><strong>Last Amended</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>VTA Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 626</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Kehoe)</strong> Plug-In Hybrids and Electric Vehicles</td>
<td>Requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to evaluate policies to develop infrastructure sufficient to overcome any barriers to the widespread deployment and use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. By July 1, 2011, requires the CPUC to adopt rules to address all of the following: (1) the impacts on the state’s electrical infrastructure of the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles, and the role and development of public charging infrastructure; (2) the impact of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles on grid stability and the integration of renewable energy resources; (3) the technological advances that are needed to ensure the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles, and what role the state should take to support the development of this technology; (4) the existing code and permit requirements that will impact the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles; (5) any recommended changes to existing legal impediments to the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles; (6) the role the state should take to ensure that technologies employed in plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles work in a harmonious manner and across service territories; and (7) the impact of the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles on achieving the state’s greenhouse gas emission reduction goals pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, and what steps should be taken to address possibly shifting emission reduction responsibilities from the transportation sector to the electrical industry.</td>
<td>7/1/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 632</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Lowenthal)</strong> Ports: Infrastructure Needs</td>
<td>Beginning January 1, 2010, requires the ports of Long Beach, Los Angeles and Oakland to assess their infrastructure and air quality improvement needs, including projects that improve the efficiency of the movement of cargo, and that reduce the congestion impacts and pollution associated with the movement of cargo. Requires these assessments to include the total costs of the infrastructure and air quality improvements, possible funding options for these projects, and estimated timelines for their implementation. Requires each port to provide this assessment to the Legislature by July 1, 2010.</td>
<td>4/30/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 716</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Wolk)</strong> TDA: Farmworker Vanpool Services</td>
<td>For counties that had a population of less than 500,000 as of the 1970 census, but that have a population of 500,000 or more as of the 2000 census or at a subsequent census, requires Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds apportioned to the urbanized areas of those counties to be used solely for public transit and paratransit purposes, as well as for bicycle projects. However, exempts cities with a population of 100,000 or less within those counties from this requirement. In addition, for TDA money apportioned to the non-urbanized areas of those counties, allows these funds to remain available for local street/road purposes and to be used for the acquisition or lease of vans and related equipment for a farmworker vanpool program, if there is a finding by the relevant transportation planning agency that there are no unmet transits needs that are reasonable to meet. Furthermore, for counties with a population of less than 500,000, allows TDA funds to be used for the acquisition or lease of vans and related equipment for a farmworker vanpool program, if there is a finding by the relevant transportation planning agency that there are no unmet transits needs that are reasonable to meet.</td>
<td>9/3/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SB 721**  
(Steinberg)  
Climate Action Team | Creates the Climate Action Team consisting of the following representation: (a) secretary of the California Environmental Protection Agency; (b) secretary of the Natural Resources Agency; (c) chairperson of the California Air Resources Board (CARB); (d) chairperson of the Energy Resources Conservation and Development Commission; (e) president of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC); (f) secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency; (g) secretary of the Department of Food and Agriculture; (h) secretary of the Department of Consumer Affairs; and (i) secretary of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency. Consistent with the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires the Climate Action Team to coordinate the state’s overall climate change policy. Requires the Climate Action Team to prepare and adopt a strategic research, development, demonstration, and deployment plan that identifies funds to be expended to: (1) assist in bringing California clean technologies into the marketplace that provide quantifiable reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; (2) encourage behavior changes or changes in consumer preferences that assist California in meeting its climate change targets and requirements; and (3) identify and forecast the impacts of climate change, and identify and research methods to mitigate and adapt to those impacts. Requires the Climate Action Team to coordinate with the Natural Resources Agency to prepare and adopt a climate change impact mitigation and adaptation plan that includes all of the following: (1) an assessment of the current state of climate change impact analysis, and an identification of potential climate change impacts that should be included in decision-making related to the management of natural resources or investment in infrastructure; (2) a process for integrating climate change impact information into the planning and decision-making of state agencies as appropriate; (3) the identification of additional research and research priorities that could assist and improve state decision-making in future years; (4) an evaluation of each sector’s contribution toward meeting the greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006; and (5) a review of the best available scientific information regarding projected climate change impacts, risk analysis and best management practices developed to date. | 4/23/09 | Senate Appropriations Committee |
| **SB 728**  
(Lowenthal)  
Parking Cash-Out Program | Allows cities, counties and air districts to establish, by ordinance or resolution, a penalty or other mechanism to ensure compliance with the state’s parking cash-out law. | 8/20/09 | Signed into Law: Chapter #359 |
<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 783</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Asburn)&lt;br&gt;High-Speed Rail: Business Plan</td>
<td>No later than January 1, 2012, and every two years thereafter, requires the California High-Speed Rail Authority to prepare, publish, adopt, and submit to the Legislature a business plan. Requires the business plan to identify all of the following: (1) the type of service that the authority anticipates it will develop, such as local, express, commuter, regional, or interregional; (2) a description of the primary benefits that high-speed rail will provide; (3) a forecast of the anticipated patronage, operating and maintenance costs, and capital costs for the high-speed train system; (4) an estimate and description of the total anticipated federal, state, local, and other funds that the authority intends to access to fund the construction and operation of the high-speed train system; and (5) the proposed chronology for the construction of the eligible corridors of the high-speed train system. In addition, requires the plan to include the following elements: (a) using the most recent patronage forecast for the high-speed rail system, develop a forecast of the expected patronage and service levels for the Phase 1 corridor (San Francisco/San Jose to Los Angeles/Anaheim), and by each segment or combination of segments for which a project-level environmental analysis is being prepared for Phase 1; (b) based on the patronage forecast, develop alternative financial pro formas for the different levels of service, and identify the operating break-even points for each alternative; (c) identify the expected schedule for completing environmental review, and initiating and completing construction for each segment of Phase 1; (d) identify the source of federal, state and local funds available for the project that will augment funds from the high-speed rail bond measure, and the level of confidence for obtaining each type of funding; (e) identify written agreements with public or private entities to fund components of the high-speed rail system and any impediments to the completion of the system, such as the inability to gain access to existing railroad rights-of-way; and (f) identify alternative public-private development strategies for the implementation of Phase 1.</td>
<td>7/2/09</td>
<td>Signed into Law: Chapter #618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCA 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Wyland)&lt;br&gt;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><strong>SCA 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Hancock)&lt;br&gt;State Budget</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>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCA 10</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Ducheny)&lt;br&gt;Constitutional Amendments</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 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>8/17/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 14 (Duceny)</td>
<td>Ballot Initiative Costs</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution regarding the costs associated with statewide initiative measures. Specifically, prohibits an initiative measure that would result in a net increase in state or local government costs other than costs attributable to the issuance, sale or repayment of bonds from being placed on the ballot unless the Legislative Analyst’s Office and the Department of Finance jointly determine that the initiative measure provides for additional revenues in an amount that would meet or exceed the net increase in costs.</td>
<td>8/17/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</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, November 19, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Administration and Finance Committee (A&F) was called to order at 12:04 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>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gage</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Kniss</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Reed</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</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>Present</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.

Vice Chairperson Gage noted a quorum was not present; therefore no action would be taken; however, the Committee of the Whole would forward the items for consideration at the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors Meeting.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Regular Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2009

On order of Vice Chairperson Gage and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole deferred the Regular Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2009.


Joe Smith, Chief Financial Officer, noted the equity market and VTA’s Fixed Income portfolio are doing well. VTA Retiree’s Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust
composite portfolio and Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Spousal Medical Trust Fund composite portfolio are outperforming their composite benchmarks.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the Report on Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Investments for the month of September 2009.

6. **Monthly Legislative History Matrix**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the Monthly Legislative History Matrix.

7. **Quarterly Purchasing Report**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the Quarterly Purchasing Report.

8. **First Quarter FY 2010 Public Liability/Property Damage Claims Activity Report**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the First Quarter FY 2010 Public Liability/Property Damage Claims Activity Report.

9. **First Quarter FY 2010 Report of Worker's Compensation Claims and Transitional Work Program**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the First Quarter FY 2010 Report of Worker's Compensation Claims and Transitional Work Program.

10. **Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Member Appointments**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved forwarding the item without a recommendation to the Board of Directors for discussion and consideration at the December 10, 2009 VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting the item to approve the appointments to the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA).

11. **Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) Member Appointments**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Gage** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved forwarding the item without a recommendation to the Board of Directors for consideration at the December 10, 2009 VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting the item to ratify the following new appointments and reappointments to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee to a two-year terms starting December 2009:

**New Appointment**
- Erik Wilhelmsen, Town of Los Gatos
- Jim Bell, City of San Jose

**Reappointment**
- Corinne Winter, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
- Carl Hagenmaier, City of Los Altos

On order of Vice Chairperson Gage and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved forwarding the item without a recommendation to the Board of Directors for consideration at the December 10, 2009 VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting the item to review and accept the Fiscal Year 2010 Quarterly Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the period ending September 30, 2009.

REGULAR AGENDA

13. Contract Award – Money Manager Services

Kimberly Koenig, Finance Department Manager, reported in 2008 Mercer Investment Consulting Incorporated recommended and completed an Asset Liability Study and Portfolio Structuring Analysis for the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Pension Plan.

Ms. Koenig reported based on the study results, the VTA/ATU Pension Board approved Mercer’s recommendation and added two new asset classes to the VTA/ATU Pension Plan Investment Portfolio. The new two asset classes include real estate and emerging markets.

Subsequently, VTA directed Mercer Investment Consulting Incorporated to search for US Core Real Estate Managers using its Global Investment Manager Database. Mercer presented the credentials of five Investment Management firms for Real Estate Managers and VTA’s panel selected UBS Global Asset Management as the preferred Real Estate Investment Managing firm after an exhausting review of the recommended firms. On September 1, 2009, VTA/ATU Pension Board approved UBS Global Asset Management as the fund manager to manage VTA’s US Core Real Estate portfolio.

Ms. Koenig stated VTA will invest approximately $30 million in the real estate portfolio and will pay an estimated annual management fee of $321,000, which are paid with VTA/ATU Pension Plan Assets.

Ms. Koenig noted the selection of a fund manager for Emerging Markets will be presented to the Board of Directors for consideration at a future date.

Alternate Board Member Moylan stressed the importance for VTA to be diligent in its evaluation and selection of an Emerging Markets Fund Manager for foreign investments.

On order of Vice Chairperson Gage and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved forwarding the item without a recommendation to the Board of Directors for consideration at the December 10, 2009 VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting, authorizing the General Manager to execute an agreement with UBS Global Asset Management for the management of the US Core Real Estate portfolio portion of SCVTA - ATU Pension Plan Assets.

14. Transit Advertising – Contract Award to Lamar Corporation

Greta Helm, Chief External Affairs Officer, reviewed the recommendation to award VTA’s sale advertising to Lamar Corporation. Ms. Helm stated VTA currently has an existing contract with CBS Outdoors where VTA receives a minimum guarantee of
$1.5 million per year as well as 50 percent of any specialty advertising bus wraps for example.

Ms. Helm reported VTA determined Lamar Corporation’s proposal was best overall offering the best income, marketing, and operational plans. Lamar Corporation has committed to establish a local office in San Jose and to staff it with an experienced team with local, regional, and national contacts.

Vice Chairperson Gage queried about the contract amount. Ms. Helm responded the contract amount is basically similar to the existing contract. VTA will receive a minimum guarantee of $1.2 million in 2010, $1.4 million in 2011, and $1.5 million in 2012 or receive 60 percent of net sales, whichever is greater.

Alternate Board Member queried about the existing contract with CBS Outdoors. Ms. Helm responded the new contract with Lamar Corporation will provide more revenue opportunities for VTA.

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, stated CBS Outdoor has lowered its minimum guarantee, which is an indication that they are not willing to take a risk in the advertising market. Mr. Burns stated Lamar Corporation is a thriving national company and has performed well in Denver.

Ms. Helm reported Lamar Corporation has approximately 70 transit properties throughout the country with 100 years of experience, specifically in outdoor advertising.

Vice Chairperson Gage queried about VTA’s bus stops contract vendor. Dino Guevarra, Sales and Promotions Supervisor, responded Clear Channel is the vendor responsible for VTA’s bus stops, noting the current contract will be up for renewal in October 2010.

Mr. Guevarra stated staff has had discussions with Lamar Corporation regarding transit shelters, noting the possibility that Lamar will consider participating in VTA’s Request for Proposal (RFP) process next year when the transit shelter contract goes out for bid.

Vice Chairperson Gage queried whether VTA has advertising on banners or billboards, noting potential opportunities to generate revenues. Ms. Helm responded that VTA is not currently advertising using these methods; however, staff is evaluating all advertising opportunities as well as exploring what is permissible under billboard laws.

Vice Chairperson Gage stressed the importance to utilize VTA facilities and yards with advertising opportunities. Mr. Guevarra responded staff has asked VTA’s Real Estate Department to look into these types of opportunities and determine what city ordinances will allow.

Alternate Board Member Moylan queried about advertising constraints or restrictions regarding the contract. Mr. Guevarra responded VTA does not allow alcohol advertising, noting other concerns with advertising current issues, legal, or political issues.

Mr. Guevarra stated VTA will allow advertising if the advertisement specifically states it was paid for by the specific organization.

Ms. Helm noted VTA reserves the right to review in advance any advertisement that may appear to be controversial.
On order of Vice Chairperson Gage and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved forwarding the item without a recommendation to the Board of Directors for consideration at the December 10, 2009 VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting, authorizing the General Manager to execute a contract with Lamar Corporation to sell, display and manage the advertising program on VTA Bus and Light Rail Vehicles for a three-year term beginning on January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2012, with an option for VTA to extend the contract for two additional one-year periods for 2013 and 2014.

OTHER ITEMS

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 of the Whole reviewed the Committee Work Plan.

17. Committee Staff Report
There was no Committee Staff Report.

18. Chairperson’s Report
There was no Chairperson’s Report.

19. Determine Consent Agenda for the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors Meeting
CONSENT: Agenda Item #10. Approve the appointments to the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA);
Agenda Item #11. Ratify the following new appointments and reappointments to the Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee to a two-year terms starting December 2009:

New Appointment
• Erik Wilhelmsen, Town of Los Gatos
• Jim Bell, City of San Jose

Reappointment
• Corinne Winter, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition
• Carl Hagenmaier, City of Los Altos;

Agenda Item # 12. Review and accept the Fiscal Year 2010 Quarterly Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the period ending September 30, 2009;

Agenda Item #13. Authorize the General Manager to execute an agreement with UBS Global Asset Management for the management of the US Core Real Estate portfolio portion of SCVTA - ATU Pension Plan Assets; and

Agenda Item #14. Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Lamar Corporation to sell, display and manage the advertising program on VTA Bus and Light Rail Vehicles for a three-year term beginning on January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2012, with an option for VTA to extend the contract for two additional one-year periods for 2013 and 2014.

REGULAR: NONE
20. **Announcements**

There were no Announcements.

21. **ADJOURNMENT**

*On order of Vice Chairperson Gage* and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole meeting was adjourned at 12:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle M. Garza, Board Assistant  
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee

Thursday, November 19, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

1. ROLL CALL

The Regular Meeting of the Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP) was called to order at 10:04 a.m. by Vice Chairperson Kishimoto in Conference Room B-104, Valley Transportation Authority, River Oaks Campus, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

<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>Yoriko Kishimoto</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pyle</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</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>

A quorum was not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

The Agenda was taken out of order.

12. High-Speed Rail Legislation

Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager, provided an overview of the staff report. The Legislature is aware that since the passing of Proposition 1A, the focus of the High Speed Rail Authority has shifted from a planning entity to a project development and construction agency. He discussed the High Speed Rail key bills introduced in 2009: SB 409 (Ducheny); AB 153 (Ma); AB 289 (Galgiani); AB 733 (Galgiani); AB 1375 (Galgiani); SB 455 (Lowenthal); and SB 783 (Ashburn).

Currently, SB 409 has the following provisions: High Speed Rail Authority restructuring; creation of a Department of Railroads within the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency; and transfer of some Caltrans and California Public Utilities Commission
(CPUC) responsibilities. At this time, not all key players have fully supported the concept; thus, the Legislature views SB 409 (Ducheny) as a placeholder. When the session resumes in January 2010, the Legislature will work and determine the a High Speed Rail Authority structure that will effectively manage and deliver this project.

Member Herrera arrived and took her seat at 10:10 a.m.

Upon inquiry of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto, Mr. Evans commented VTA should not take a position on any bill regarding High Speed Rail until there is clarity on bill provisions and its impacts to various agencies.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto expressed preference for integration of High Speed Rail with other State rail facilities. She noted there should be coordination in planning, land use, and “context sensitive solutions” for integrating rail with communities.

Member Herrera reported the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (JPA) expressed concern about SB 409’s provision to create a Department of Railroads. She noted the JPA has not taken any support or oppose position. The JPA will send a letter requesting clarification the Capital Corridor JPA will still exist and funding will still available. With regard to Intercity Rail, there is concern about funding for the new rail cars.

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed high-speed rail bills that were introduced in the California State Legislature in 2009.

CONSENT AGENDA

4. Minutes of October 15, 2009

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole deferred approval of the Minutes of October 15, 2009.

5. Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for July-September 2009

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for July to September 2009.

6. Programmed Project Monitoring - Quarterly Report

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for July-September 2009.
REGULAR AGENDA

7. Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program - FY10/11 Capital Grant Award

Marcella Rensi, Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the staff report. About $5 million is available to fund four projects noted in Attachment A.

Upon inquiry of the Committee of the Whole, Ms. Rensi stated some recommended projects are bicycle/pedestrian projects, and the requirement is minimum of 20 percent local match. Ms. Rensi added there will be another call for projects sometime late spring or early summer next year.

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to approve the project list to program Community Design & Transportation Program Capital Grants as shown in Attachment A.

8. 2010 STIP Program

Ms. Rensi provided an overview of the staff report, noting the revenue projections for 2011-2015 is barely enough to cover the programmed commitments. Michael T. Burns, General Manager, stated the Board has already identified the projects referenced in Page 3 of 3 for this funding.

Upon inquiry of Member Herrera, John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and staff liaison, explained this funding is programmed for the CELR and will be available July 1, 2010. This process aligns the funds so that it can be used by VTA as the sponsoring agency.

Member Herrera noted the community is very appreciative of the work and excited for the Capitol Expressway Light Rail (CELR) Extension Project.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto inquired about the status of the Airport People Mover. Mr. Ristow noted the City of San Jose released a Request for Proposals (RFP) to procure services that will investigate which type of mode and how connections will be made.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto requested putting more background in the memorandum including history, and STIP programming actions in the past.

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to approve the 2010 STIP Program priorities as presented by VTA staff in this memorandum.

9. Transportation Fund for Clean Air Act (TFCA) 40% Project Selection Criteria Revisions

Ms. Rensi provided an overview of the staff report. Ms. Rensi discussed the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), CIP and Systems Operations & Management Working
Groups’ comments regarding the proposed criteria revisions. Ms. Rensi noted there was consensus regarding the cost effectiveness, local match criteria, and consideration of pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities. However, there was no consensus on the criterion regarding the impacts to transit operation.

Mr. Ristow explained staff’s position is to balance the needs of motorists, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. He noted VTA staff wants a guarantee that new TFCA projects do not degrade transit signal priority system of light rail, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Line 522, or any other future VTA projects requiring signal priority.

Upon inquiry of Member Herrera, Ms. Rensi noted some of the concerns raised were the following: 1) This is the first step towards the “Transit First Policy;” and 2) The criteria will provide veto power over signal timing projects. Mr. Ristow referred to concern #2 and clarified each city controls what signal priority they provide to a new service.

Member Herrera commented there seems to be miscommunication regarding the impacts to transit criterion. She expressed support for improving the efficiency of transit systems and noted there should be more discussion address the concerns. She stated the importance of finding balance among all transportation modes, including bicyclists and pedestrians. She also noted that there should be coordination early in the process between VTA and project sponsor.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto recommended a criterion language change to make maintenance and improvement of transit priority signal a goal rather than a requirement.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to modify the criteria used to evaluate and select projects for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager fund and review the status of ongoing Santa Clara County TFCA projects.

**10. 2009 Congestion Management Program (CMP)**

John Singhamony, Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the staff report including the major changes of the CMP since 2007.

Vice Chairperson Kishimoto requested including a map that shows development or land use data near transit facilities.

Chris Augenstein, CMA Deputy Director, reported VTA is beginning to do its long-range planning process in parallel and coordination with Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). This process includes planning how to participate in SB 375.

Member Herrera noted there is nexus between land use and transit and commented there should be more incentives for job makers to create jobs near transit facilities.
On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to adopt the 2009 Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP).

Member Herrera left the meeting at 11:20 a.m.

11. Memorandum of Understanding Between Council of San Benito County Governments and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority for SR 152 Corridor

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole approved submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to authorize the General Manager for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council of San Benito County Governments to formalize the Mobility Partnership committee to provide direction on the development of a SR 152 Trade Corridor and a new alignment of SR 152 between SR 156 and US 101.

OTHER

13. Bike Share Program Update

Aiko Cuenco, Transportation Planner, provided an overview of staff report. Ms. Cuenco reported staff applied for Safe Routes to Transit Grant for the pilot program implementation. Staff was notified their application is recommended for approval and confirmation of grant funding is expected next month. The pilot program is slated to be implemented in Spring of 2010.

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received an update on the Bicycle Sharing Pilot Program.

14. Items of Concern and Referral to Administration

There were no Items of Concern or Referral to Administration.

15. Committee Work Plan

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

16. Committee Staff Report

Mr. Ristow noted the written Committee Staff Report is available on the table. He highlighted SB 83 (Hancock) has been signed by the Governor. This will allow each Bay Area CMA to put a vehicle registration fee of up to $10 per year before the voters.

On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received the Committee Staff Report.
17. **Chairperson’s Report**

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

18. **Consent Agenda for December 10, 2009 Board of Directors Meeting**

**CONSENT:**


Agenda Item #7. Approve the project list to program Community Design & Transportation Program Capital Grants as shown in Attachment A.

Agenda Item #8. Approve the 2010 STIP Program priorities as presented by VTA staff in this memorandum.

Agenda Item #9. Modify the criteria used to evaluate and select projects for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager fund and review the status of ongoing Santa Clara County TFCA projects.

Agenda Item #10. Adopt the 2009 Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP).

Agenda Item #11. Authorize the General Manager for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council of San Benito County Governments to formalize the Mobility Partnership committee to provide direction on the development of a SR 152 Trade Corridor and a new alignment of SR 152 between SR 156 and US 101.

19. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

20. **ADJOURNMENT**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Kishimoto** and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine F. Baltao, Board Assistant
Office of the Board Secretary
Transit Planning & Operations Committee

Thursday, November 19, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee was called to order at 4:37 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>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Kalra</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Sandoval</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sellers</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Campos</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Livengood</td>
<td>Alternate Member</td>
<td>NA</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

Chairperson Sellers requested the following Agenda Item be moved to the beginning of the Agenda; Item #10, Receive Information on the Light Rail System Analysis – Cost Benefit Overview.

The Agenda was taken out of order.
10. **Light Rail Systems Analysis – Cost Benefit Overview**

Andrew Ittigson, Senior Planner, provided a PowerPoint presentation regarding Light Rail System Analysis Cost/Benefit Overview highlighting: 1) Background; 2) Project Context; 3) Public Outreach; 4) Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) forecast model projections regarding light rail growth through 2035; 5) Market Analysis and Transit Competitiveness; 6) Existing light rail networks; and 7) Proposed light rail networks.

Mr. Ittigson reviewed individual light rail components, improvements, and discussed capital costs and ridership projections. Mr. Ittigson commented that the Light Rail Analysis focuses on making the system as efficient and productive as possible given the existing and potential travel market out to the year 2035. He noted the Analysis represents the second phase of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) for the transit system.

Mr. Ittigson commented that staff has presented the key project milestones to VTA’s Advisory and Standing Committees and staff has met with the affected cities, providing general briefings. Specific concerns from those cities have been addressed.

Members Kalra and Sandoval inquired about the accuracy of forecast models for transit trends. John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer, commented ABAG projections for population and jobs growth drives the light rail growth projections. He clarified the data is combined with the affected cities projected development and general plans before the VTA travel demand model is determined.

Mr. Ittigson discussed proposed route alternatives for the existing Light Rail network, and capital cost estimates. He commented the projects would be built in phases based upon need and funding. Mr. Ittigson noted proposed next steps include comparisons of scenarios and a presentation to the full Board February 2010.

Member Kalra recommended scheduling public outreach meetings for residents in South San Jose.

Member Sandoval inquired about funding for proposed projects. Mr. Ristow replied that a Board approved plan and strategy must be proactively in place so at the time funds are made available criterion has been met. Michael T. Burns commented some of the projects could qualify for Measure A funds.

Member Sandoval recommended staff include engineering costs for the proposed projects when the Board of Directors hears this item at its February 2010 meeting.

**On Order of Chairperson Sellers** and there being no objection, the report from the Light Rail System Analysis – Cost Benefit Overview was received.
CONSENT AGENDA

4. Minutes of September 17, 2009

M/S/C (Caserta/Kalra) to approve the Minutes of September 17, 2009.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. Report from the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Activities

There was no report from the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA).

6. Caltrain Safety Improvements – JPB Crossings Contract Award

Mark Robinson, Chief Construction Officer, reviewed the Caltrain Safety Improvements – JPB Crossing Contract Award. He stated Shimmick Transit was the lowest responsible bidder at $5,833,770.

Mr. Robinson clarified the contract is 100 percent Measure A funded and the improvements will enhance safety at various at-grade crossings along the Caltrain Corridor in Santa Clara County.

M/S/C (Sellers/Sandoval) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Shimmick Transit, the lowest bidder, in an amount of $5,833,770 for the construction of the Caltrain Safety Improvements – JPB Crossings. This contract is 100% measure A funded.

OTHER ITEMS

7. Fiscal Year to Date 2010 First Quarter Transit Operations Performance Report

Joonie Tolosa, Operations Analysis, Reporting and Systems Manager, reported on the continual decline of ridership. He provided the following figures: 1) Bus average weekday ridership declined 8.3 percent; 2) Light Rail average weekday ridership declined 8.5 percent; 3) FY2010 first quarter system average weekday ridership (bus and rail) decreased by 8.1 percent; and 4) Average weekday ridership declined 8.4 percent from the first quarter of last year to the first quarter of this year.

Mr. Tolosa noted key performance indicators continue to demonstrate improvements. Service reliability performance during the first three months of FY2010 was 99.76 percent, higher than last year’s 99.69 percent. Bus miles between major mechanical schedule losses recorded an 11 percent improvement compared to the same period in FY2009, and Light Rail miles between major mechanical schedule losses increased by 36.3 percent. Although FY2010 first quarter light rail performance was 89.6 percent, lower than last year’s 90.8 percent, bus on-time performance was up primarily due to the decline in ridership.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Paratransit ridership for the first quarter FY2010 has declined by 5.8 percent from the same period last year. Mr. Tolosa noted requests to apply for paratransit eligibility has also declined by 4.4 percent.

**On Order of Chairperson Sellers** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Fiscal Year to Date 2010 First Quarter Transit Operations Performance Report

8. **October 2009 Monthly Ridership and Fare Revenue Performance**

Joonie Tolosa, Operations Analysis, Reporting and Systems Manager, reported on the continuous decline of ridership.

He provided the following highlights: 1) Bus average weekday ridership is down 13.4 percent; 2) Light Rail average weekday ridership is down 12.4 percent; 3) System average weekday ridership fiscal year to date is down 13.2 percent; 4) Fare revenues are flat; 5) Average fare per boarding is up 17.5 percent; and 6) Fare increases became effective October 1, 2009.

Mr. Tolosa stated the increasing rate of unemployment and the downturn in the economy has directly impacted ridership.

**On Order of Chairperson Sellers** and there being no objection, the October 2009 Monthly Ridership and Fare Revenue Performance report was received.

11. **Quarterly Marketing Report**

Dino Guevarra, Sales and Promotions Supervisor, reviewed the Quarterly Marketing Report and highlighted the following activities: 1) Marketing provided support for three major outreach efforts; 2) VTA participated in six partnerships; and 3) Embarked on two online promotions.

He provided a presentation highlighting the Marketing Department’s efforts to provide public outreach to riders notifying them of the October 1, 2009 fare increase implementation. The marketing materials supporting this effort included, carcards, station posters, decals on the doors of bus and rail, and information to our consignees was provided.

Mr. Guevarra commented on the successful outreach efforts provided to riders impacted by the Rock & Roll Half Marathon, as well as riders affected by the weekend light rail closures during rail repairs.

Mr. Guevarra reviewed the marketing campaign to support the Lifeline program funding received by VTA. The campaign promoted VTA services specifically in South County. Mr. Guevarra clarified the campaign focused on reaching Spanish speaking/limited English proficient individuals to increase their awareness of VTA services.

Mr. Guevarra commented that marketing partnerships have been established between VTA and the San Jose Civic Auditorium, Opera San Jose, Walk for Aids, and the American Cancer Society. Member Kalra recommended staff explore the possibilities of utilizing the online websites of Facebook and Twitter to advertise and promote VTA.
On Order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the October 2009 Monthly Ridership and Fare Revenue Performance report was received.

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

Member Sandoval expressed concern with the impact of the January 2010 service reductions to Paratransit services and the three-quarter mile preclusion requirement.

13. **Committee Work Plan**

The Committee reviewed the Committee Work Plan.

On Order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the Committee Work Plan was reviewed.

14. **Committee Staff Report**

Dan Smith, Chief Operations Officer and Staff Liaison, provided a handout highlighting the following: 1) The Rail Replacement and Rehabilitation Program. The Program assists in maintaining the light rail system at optimum levels. He stated in Downtown San Jose, at Almaden and Market Streets the rail was worn and has been replaced. The removal and replacement of the rails was done on weekends to minimize the impact to riders and traffic in the Downtown area; and 2) Distributed copies of the, “Operations Update – November/December 2009.”

On order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the Committee received the Committee Staff Report.

15. **Chairperson's Report**

Chairperson Sellers thanked staff for their diligence and hard work.

16. **Determine Consent Agenda for the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors Meeting**

Consent Agenda:

**Agenda Item #6**, Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Schimmick Transit, the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of $5,833,770 for the construction of the Caltrain Safety improvements – JPB Crossings. This contract is 100% Measure A funded.


17. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.
18. **ADJOURNMENT**

On Order of Chairperson Sellers and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline F. Golzio, Board Assistant
Office of the Board Secretary
AUDIT COMMITTEE

Thursday, December 10, 2009

NOTICE OF CANCELLATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Audit Committee Meeting scheduled for Thursday, December 10, 2009, at 12:00 p.m. or immediately following the Board of Directors Workshop/Regular Meeting has been cancelled.

The next meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Audit Committee is scheduled for Thursday, March 4, 2010, at 4:00 p.m. at County Government Center, Conference Room 157, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

Michelle M. Garza, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
Committee for Transit Accessibility

Tuesday, November 10, 2009

MINUTES

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>Emma Eljas</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Fernandez</td>
<td>Staff Aide to Ex-Officio Board Liaison Reed</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Gallo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Gouveia</td>
<td>Second Vice Chairperson</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>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Jensen</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Langford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Lasich</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Michels</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Montague</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Morrow</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Hardy</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Stahl</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Zhu</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. INTRODUCTION OF AUDIENCE MEMBERS

Andrew Ittigson, Consultant; Martha O’Connell, Interested Citizen; Sandra Weymouth, Policy and Administrations Manager; David Ledwitz, Management Analyst; Mark Romoser, Silicon Valley Independent Living Center; and Joseph Rouzmehr, Senior Information Systems Analyst.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Martha O’Connell, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding the closure of light rail stations during the elevator and escalator upgrades, passenger safety, and the lack of a bus shelter which services the building that houses the Silicon Valley Council on Aging.
Dilip Shah, Interested Citizen, shared concerns and provided a written letter from students in Milpitas regarding the lack of service in certain areas.

Larry Saltman, Interested Citizen, provided a written letter from Ron Schwartz, Emeritus Member of the City of San Jose Senior Commission, who expressed concern with the lack of real-time information on the arrival of buses at major stops.

Mr. Saltman also presented a letter thanking VTA Staff for installing a bench at the bus servicing the Berryessa Community Center, and requesting a bus shelter be added as well.

Chairperson Morrow requested staff follow-up with the individuals and address their concerns.

4. Minutes of September 9, 2009
M/S/C (Gouveia/Jensen) to approve the minutes of September 9, 2009.

5. Summary Minutes of October 7, 2009
On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received and filed the Summary Minutes of October 7, 2009.

6. Chief Operating Officer’s Report
Sandra Weymouth, Policy and Administrations Manager, provided an overview of the staff report contained in the Agenda packet.

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the Chief Operating Officer’s Report.

7. Board of Directors Report
There was no Board of Directors Report.

BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER

8. Bus Stop Improvement Program
Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director, Construction, provided an overview of the staff report contained in the Agenda packet.

Chairperson Morrow requested staff follow-up on the Committee’s request to provide pictures online of each bus stop.

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the Bus Stop Improvement Program report.

9. Light Rail Systems Analysis
Andrew Ittigson, Consultant, provided an overview of the staff report contained in the Agenda packet and the Cost/Benefit Analysis PowerPoint presentation reviewing

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
individual component improvements and their associated capital costs.

Member Eljas left her seat at 2:15 p.m. and the quorum was lost.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee received a report on the Light Rail Systems Analysis.

10. **Nominating Committee for CTA Chairperson, First Vice Chairperson, and Second Vice Chairperson**

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Appointment of a Nominating Committee for CTA Chairperson, First Vice Chairperson, and Second Vice Chairperson was deferred due to the lack of a quorum.

11. **Workplan Update**

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee Workplan was reviewed.

**REPORTS**

12. **City of San Jose Disability Advisory Commission (DAC) Report**

Chairperson Morrow provided the City of San Jose Disability Advisory Commission Report highlighting new guidelines of Street Vending Policy, and the success of Disability Awareness Day.

13. **Committee Staff Report**

Jim Unites, Operations Deputy Director and Staff Liaison, provided a report highlighting: 1) The addition of 23 new Prius vehicles for Outreach; 2) CTA reappointments and vacancy fillings; 3) Farebox Program; and 4) VTA’s financial position. He announced the retirement of Board Secretary, Deborah Harrington, and the appointment of Sandra Weymouth to the position.

14. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Morrow provided a report highlighting changes that will occur from decisions made during the Advisory Committee Enhancement process including a recommendation to have the Committee meet quarterly instead of monthly.

**OTHER**

15. **Announcements**

There were no Announcements.
16. **ADJOURNMENT**

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Menominee L. McCarter, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary
Call to Order

The Regular Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was called to order at 4:35 p.m., by Chairperson Tebo, in Conference Room B-104, VTA River Oaks Campus, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Blaylock</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jacobvitz</td>
<td>CAC Vice Chair</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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Rogers</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Schulter</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Skinner</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Tebo</td>
<td>CAC Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

4. VTA Board Chairperson’s Update

Chairperson Tebo welcomed VTA Board Chairperson Dolly Sandoval. VTA Board Chairperson Sandoval expressed her appreciation for the invitation to speak to the committee.

VTA Board Chairperson Sandoval gave a brief summary of her public service career. She began her involvement with VTA in 1999 as a member of the Citizens Advisory
Committee, followed by four years on the Policy Advisory Committee during which time she served as an alternate member to the VTA Board of Directors. VTA Board Chairperson Sandoval became a regular member of the VTA Board of Directors in January 2006.

VTA Board Chairperson Sandoval reflected upon the changes within VTA over the past ten years.

VTA Board Chairperson Sandoval addressed the economical challenges facing VTA and noted an ad hoc committee will be created at the December board meeting to determine sustainable funding solutions.

VTA Board Chairperson Sandoval was awarded a special nameplate: VTA Board Chairperson and Citizens Advisory Committee Member Emeritus.

5. Committee Staff Report

Greta Helm, Chief External Affairs Officer and Staff Liaison, reported: 1) committee members are welcome to attend the December VTA Board Workshop/Board Meeting; and 2) VTA services changes become effective January 11, and VTA is making every effort to ensure the service changes message is getting out via media, city councils, onboard VTA vehicles and through station postings.

Ms. Helm noted Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Task Force recommendations presented to the Administration and Finance Committee in December will include: 1) the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) will continue to meet on a monthly basis; 2) The CAC, TAC and PAC will work through their chair to review work plans and identify opportunities to cancel and streamline unnecessary meetings; 3) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) will meet a maximum of four meetings per year; and 4) BPAC will be available on an on-call basis to meet as a working group.

The CAC ACE Representatives noted: 1) the recommendation that a member from CTA and a member from BPAC join the CAC; 2) the ACE had a near-unanimous vote with only one no vote; and 3) the ACE will meet again in one year to study, evaluate and make any necessary adjustments.

Ms. Helm introduced Herman Wadler, former chairperson of BPAC, noting Mr. Wadler had submitted his application to join the CAC.

6. Chairperson’s Report

Chairperson Tebo noted he attended and spoke at the November VTA Board of Directors meeting.
7. Minutes of October 7, 2009
   M/S/C (Probst/Larsen) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of October 7, 2009.

8. Monthly Legislative History Matrix
   On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection the Committee reviewed the Monthly Legislative History Matrix.

2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA

9. CAC Nomination Subcommittee Report

   Member Hashimoto reported the nominees listed below have agreed to have their names put up for consideration:

   Candidates for Chairperson: Member Powers and Member Larsen.

   Candidates for Vice Chairperson: Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz, Member Larsen and Member Skinner.

   Member Skinner removed his name from the list of candidates for the Vice Chairperson’s position when it was reported Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz sought reappointment.

   Elections will be held during the December 9, 2009, CAC meeting.

10. Update on SVRT Milpitas Design Features

   Leyla Hedayat, Planning Manager, provided an overview of the staff report.

   On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection the Committee received an update on SVRT Milpitas Design Features.

11. (Deferred to the December 9, 2009, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting)

   On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection the Committee deferred receiving information on the Light Rail System Analysis.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
12. (Deferred to the December 9, 2009, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting)

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection the Committee deferred receiving information on the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for July-September 2009.

COMBINED CAC AND CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE ITEMS

13. Citizens Advisory Committee and Citizens Watchdog Committee Work Plans

Committee members requested: 1) an update on the potential 49ers Stadium; 2) information on VTA’s policy with regard to the overnight usage of buses by the homeless; and 3) to include the ACE Committee recommendation as an action item on the December 9, 2009, CAC Agenda.

OTHER

14. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

15. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 6:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Garcia, Board Assistant
Office of the Board Secretary
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 6:16 p.m. by Chairperson Walton in Conference Room B-104, 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>Bruce Entin</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Faupell</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Fernandez</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Absent</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>Richard Ruh</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</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, Vice Chairperson</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 Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Walton, Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Zavala</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Winter</td>
<td>SVBC</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Goldstein</td>
<td>Alt Ex-Officio, SVBC</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.
4. **Committee Staff Report**

Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst and Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Task Force Members Simons and Wadler reported on ACE Task Force recommendations. The recommendations will be forwarded to the Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee in December 2009 and will be considered by the Board in January 2010.

Members of the Committee expressed concern regarding how the working group will relate to Brown Act and requested a statement from Legal Counsel regarding Brown Act provisions for working groups.

Ying Smith, Transportation Planning Manager and Staff Liaison, reported the upcoming Board ratification of new BPAC appointments. Members Muniz and Wadler noted they have been reappointed by their respective cities.

Aiko Cuenco, Transportation Planner, reviewed the results of the River Oaks Bridge Counts held in September 2009.

Tamiko Percell, Student Intern, provided a presentation on VTA Bike Element Geographic Information System (GIS) layers and showed the Committee how to access the information through Google Earth.

Members of the Committee noted there should be city by city comparison of bike miles and bike plan implementation. Members of the Committee commended staff for their effort and work on putting the bike facilities, routes, and plans on GIS. They recommended staff to conduct a press release regarding this GIS project to inform the public of this positive accomplishment and solicit information that can be added to the database.

- **Capital Program Update**

  There was no Capital Program Update.

- **Conditions of Approval Update**

  There was no Conditions of Approval Update.

- **County Report**

  Dan Collen, Deputy Director, Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department reported the following: 1) VTA Board approved the funding program for the expressways at its November 5, 2009 meeting; 2) County Roads and Airports are currently using reserves and is waiting for the State of California to repay the diverted gas tax revenues.

  **On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the Committee Staff Report was received.
5. **Chairperson’s Report**

Members of the Committee suggested adding a “mail to” or “contact us” link on the BPAC roster or BPAC main page of the VTA website so that interested citizens can forward comments to BPAC Chairperson.

Members of the Committee called for more safety or accident prevention efforts at areas where there is a high number of bicycle/pedestrian accidents occur.

- **Nominating Subcommittee Report**

  The Nominating Subcommittee reported the nomination of Member Simons as BPAC Chairperson and Member Meyer as BPAC Vice Chairperson for calendar year 2010.

  Ms. Smith reported the current steps VTA is taking to address the financial crisis. She advised the Board will be discussing budget strategies at their December 2010 meeting.

6. **BPAC Subcommittee Reports**

The Special Event Ordinance Subcommittee reported they have sent their recommended revisions of the ordinance to Santa Clara County staff. The subcommittee further reported they will meet with Santa Clara County staff again to discuss results of the community meeting the County conducted.

**On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the BPAC Subcommittee Reports were received.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

7. **Minutes of October 7, 2009**

M/S/C (Stallman/Wadler) to approve the Minutes of October 7, 2009. Member Ginzton abstained.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

  **The Agenda was taken out of order.**

9. **Bike Share Program Update**

Ms. Cuenco provided an overview of staff report. Members of the Committee inquired about existing bike share program technologies. Ms. Cuenco briefly discussed the comparison of six Bike Sharing Systems including system technologies, models, and liability.

**On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the Bike Share Program Update was received.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
10. **Central Expressway Auxiliary Lane (County Item)**

Paul Pascoal, Project Engineer, provided an overview of staff report.

Members of the Committee expressed safety concerns for bicyclist, noting lack of signage informing motorists about oncoming bicyclists; suggested implementing bike lane sensors which will cause flashing signals to motorists when bicyclists are present; and expressed interest in reviewing the striping plan for this project.

**On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department’s Report on the Central Expressway Auxiliary Lane project was received.

8. **Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for July-September 2009**

Ms. Smith provided an overview of staff report.

**On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the BPAC the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for July-September 2009 was received.

**OTHER**

11. **Local Jurisdiction Project Review Report**

There was no Local Jurisdiction Project Review Report.

12. **BPAC Work Plan**

Members of the Committee suggested staff inform the Committee regarding the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Regional Bicycle Network and its implications to the bicycle/pedestrian project funding and suggested including Pedestrian Program in the work plan for discussion at a future meeting.

**On order of Chairperson Walton** and there being no objection, the BPAC Work Plan was reviewed.

Vice Chairperson Stallman left the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

13. **Elect BPAC Chair/Vice Chair for 2010**

M/S/C (Wadler/Entin) to close the nominations and elect Member Simons as Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Chairperson for calendar year 2010 to complete the election process.

M/S/C (Wadler/Simons) to close the nominations and elect Member Meyer as Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Vice Chairperson for calendar year 2010 to complete the election process.
14. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Collen reported the County successfully completed a pedestrian adaptive crossing signal demonstration project on Bascom Avenue and Renova Drive in San Jose, California. Mr. Collen explained the signal had a microwave detection system capable of extending the crosswalk time if it senses that the pedestrian has not completed crossing the intersection. The County is now reporting the results to Office of Traffic Safety and is pursuing to implement a permanent installation.

Alternate Ex-Officio Goldstein announced the City of Palo Alto is working to implement another bike boulevard.

Member Wadler reported the City of Campbell obtained funding for countdown stop lights for pedestrians. He added Campbell has a new member in its Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC).

Member Meyer reported the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC) will have a gala event on November 18, 2009. The City of Mountain View also has a new member in its Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee. The City of San Jose has a new Bike Plan.

Member Simons thanked Chairperson Walton for all his work and contribution to the BPAC.

Member Swent reported the Palo Alto City Council approved staff recommendation for the Oregon Expressway Update Plan, which will result in bicycle/pedestrian safety improvements.

Member Sullivan announced the City of Santa Clara found funding for sidewalks in San Tomas Expressway.

The Committee determined the December 2009 BPAC meeting will be cancelled.

15. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Walton and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine F. Baltao, Board Assistant
Office of the Board Secretary
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, November 12, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:33 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>Julie Caporgno</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Capurso</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cherbone</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Chiu</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Absent</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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Dey</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvia Fung, Alt. Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans)</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Goepfert</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Absent</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>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>Mo Sharma</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Tripousis</td>
<td>City of San Jose</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 not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Member Kass took his seat at 1:35 p.m.

There were no Public Presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.
The Agenda was taken out of order.

6. **Reports from TAC Working Groups**

   Members Capurso and Armendariz took their seats at 1:36 p.m. and a quorum was declared.

   - **Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

     Celeste Fiore, Transportation Planner II, provided a report on the discussions held at the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) meeting on October 27, 2009. The next meeting will be held on December 1, 2009, in the City of Campbell.

   - **Systems Operations and Management (SOM) Working Group**

     Member Dey provided a report on the discussions held at the Systems Operations and Management (SOM) Working Group meeting on October 28, 2009. He noted the SOM Working Group disagreed with VTA staff’s recommended proposed changes to the current Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program policy.

     Alternate Member Collen took his seat at 1:37 p.m.

   On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the reports from the TAC Working Groups were received.

   Member Lind took his seat at 1:38 p.m.

4. **Committee Staff Report**

   Jim Lawson, Senior Policy Advisor, reported on the VTA Governance Structure issue. He provided a report highlighting: 1) VTA Board of Directors considered alternative actions regarding the governance structure and approved the following option at the November 5, 2009 Board of Directors meeting on a vote of 9 ayes to 2 noes: 1.a. Reconfigure the small city groupings to include a new city group comprised of Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and Milpitas, that would appoint two Board Members and one alternate; 2) Cities of Palo Alto and Sunnyvale opposed option 1.a.; and 3) Additional action required to implement the governance structure.

   John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, provided a report highlighting: 1) Senate Bill 83–Vehicle Registration Surcharge; and 2) VTA staff to meet with the cities to review their project priorities and work programs.

   On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the Committee Staff Report was received.
5. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Witthaus provided a status report on the Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Task Force meetings held in October and November 2009, noting the proposed Committee structure recommendations to be presented to the Administration and Finance Committee.

7. **High Speed Rail/Caltrain Project**

Steven Fisher, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a verbal report on the High Speed Rail/Caltrain Project, highlighting: 1) Progress of the north and south segments; and 2) Report on issues VTA was facing in terms of the Caltrain/High Speed Rail Corridor.

*On order of Chairperson Witthaus* and there being no objection, a verbal report on the High Speed Rail/Caltrain Project was received.

**BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

8. **Minutes of October 8, 2009**

M/S/C (Tripousis/Collen) to approve the Minutes of October 8, 2009.

9. **Programmed Project Monitoring – Quarterly Report**


**REGULAR AGENDA**

10. **TAC Election Process for 2010**

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, provided an overview of the staff report.

Chairperson Witthaus and Member Jenkins volunteered to serve on the Nomination Subcommittee.

M/S/C (Tripousis/Dey) to appoint Chairperson Witthaus and Member Jenkins to the Nomination Subcommittee to identify Committee members interested in serving as the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson for 2010.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
11. **Community Design & Transportation Program – FY 10/11 Capital Grant Award**

Celeste Fiore, Transportation Planner II, provided an overview of the staff report.

**M/S/C (Kass/Tripousis)** to recommend the VTA Board of Directors approve the project list to program Community Design & Transportation Program Capital Grants as shown in Attachment A.

12. **2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Program**

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, provided an overview of the staff report.

**M/S/C (Tripousis/Batra)** to recommend the VTA Board of Directors approve the 2010 STIP Program priorities as presented by VTA staff in this memorandum.

13. **Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) 40% Project Selection Criteria Revisions**

Amin Surani, Principal Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the staff report.

Alternate Member Connolly took his seat at 3:03 p.m.

Members of the Committee recommended revisions to the screening criterion dealing with bicycle and pedestrian facilities, specifying the planning horizon and naming the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) as an applicable set of standards.

Members of the Committee opposed the second screening criterion, specifically objecting to the requirement that transit signal priority be maintained at its current level in the corridors where it now exists.

Public Speaker: Dawn Cameron, County of Santa Clara, expressed concern regarding the screening criterion for signal timing projects.

Members of the Committee requested to defer any changes to the TFCA Scoring Criteria to next year and that the item be sent to the TAC Systems Operations and Management (SOM) Working Group in January 2010 for further discussion.

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, reported the Committee’s recommendations would be forwarded to the Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee.

**M/S/C (Dey/Jenkins)** on a vote of 10 ayes to 1 abstention to defer until next year to recommend the VTA Board of Directors modify the criteria used to evaluate and select projects for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager fund and review the status of ongoing Santa Clara County TFCA projects. Further, TAC requested the item be forwarded to the SOM Working Group in January 2010 for further discussion. Alternate Member Rowe abstained.
Member Batra left the meeting at 3:06 p.m.

14. **2009 Congestion Management Program**

Member Jenkins left the meeting at 3:07 p.m.

John Sighamony, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the staff report.

**M/S/C (Collen/Tripousis)** to recommend the VTA Board of Directors adopt the 2009 Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP).

15. **Memorandum of Understanding Between Council of San Benito County Governments and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority for SR 152 Corridor**

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, provided an overview of the staff report.

**M/S/C (Collen/Dey)** to recommend the VTA Board of Directors authorize the General Manager for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with the Council of San Benito County Governments to formalize the Mobility Partnership committee to provide direction on the development of a SR 152 Trade Corridor and a new alignment of SR 152 between SR 156 and US 101.

Member Tripousis and Alternate Member Collen left the meeting at 3:10 p.m., the quorum was lost, and a Committee of the Whole was declared.


Member Capurso left the meeting at 3:11 p.m.

Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the staff report.

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received a presentation on the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for July through September 2009.

17. **Light Rail (LR) System Analysis – Cost Benefit Overview**

Chairperson Witthaus requested the Light Rail (LR) Systems Analysis – Cost Benefit Overview be deferred to the December 10, 2009 TAC meeting.

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole deferred the information on the Light Rail System Analysis.
18. Bike Share Program Update  

Aiko Cuenco, Transportation Planner I, provided an overview of the staff report.  

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received an update on the Bicycle Sharing Pilot Program.  

OTHER  

19. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives  

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, reported the Federal Reauthorization is currently in debate.  

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received an update on MTC Activities and Initiatives.  

20. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee Report  

Chairperson Witthaus provided a report on the discussions held at the November 12, 2009 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee, highlighting: 1) Governance structure issue; 2) Senate Bill 375 to be reviewed; 3) VTA and Caltrans staff meetings to discuss Caltrans’ development review process and impact on local agencies; and 4) Draft Transportation System Monitoring Program (TSMP) report to be presented at December 10, 2009 TAC meeting.  

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received the TAC Subcommittee Report.  

21. Committee Work Plan  

Upon query of Member Dey, John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, noted the staff support for the TAC and CIP and SOM Working Groups would remain the same.  

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the Committee Work Plan.  

22. Announcements  

Chairperson Witthaus announced the work being done in downtown City of Sunnyvale and encouraged everyone to visit downtown Sunnyvale.  

ADJOURNMENT
On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracene Y. Crenshaw, Board Assistant
Office of the Board Secretary
CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) was called to order at 4:03 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>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whittum (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>P</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>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael F. Kotowski</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>P</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>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Wong (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Woodward</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Tucker (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Satterlee</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>P</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>P</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>P</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>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis Wright (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marby Lee</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Tate (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Abe-Koga</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>P</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>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Klein (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansen Chu</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie Matthews</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie McLeod (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich Larsen</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>P</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 that VTA has completed track replacement work in Downtown San Jose at the intersection of Almaden and San Carlos Streets, and ridership has declined system-wide by 9 percent from September 2009.

   Mr. Lawson provided an overview of the Board of Director’s November 5, 2009 meeting.

   Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, provided an update regarding the ACE Task Force meeting held November 10, 2009.

5. **Chairperson’s Report**
   There was no Chairperson’s Report.

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 October 8, 2009**
   M/S/C (Page/Kotowski) to approve the Minutes of October 8, 2009.

   Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the staff report.

   Committee members asked if VTA provides comment on land use mix as it pertains to congestion management and the reduction of automobile trips. Staff provided examples of VTA’s comments.

   Member Matthews expressed his support of the proposed 49ers stadium project in the City of Santa Clara.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY
9. **TFCA 40% Project Selection Criteria Revisions**

Marcella Rensi, Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the staff report.

The committee members accepted the Technical Advisory Committee’s (TAC) amendments to the staff report to language regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

**M/S/C (Satterlee/Page)** to modify the criteria used to evaluate and select projects for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager Fund and review the status of ongoing Santa Clara County TFCA projects.

10. **Memorandum of Understanding Between Council of San Benito County Governments and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority for SR 152 Corridor**

John Ristow, Chief Congestion Management Officer, provided an overview of the staff report.

Committee members queried regarding the overall purpose for the project, the process for involvement of the PAC, long term funding options, financial responsibilities of VTA, and impacts the project could have on High Speed Rail in the corridor. Staff provided answers to all questions.

**M/S/C (McHugh/Page)** to authorize the General Manager for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to execute a Memorandum of understanding with the Council of San Benito County Governments to formalize the Mobility Partnership Committee to provide direction on the development of a SR 152 Trade Corridor and a new alignment of SR 152 and US 101.

11. **Light Rail System Analysis – Cost Benefit Overview**

Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager, provided an overview of the staff report.

Committee members asked several questions regarding capital costs and ridership estimated for future light rail alternatives. Staff provided answers to all questions and stated discussion regarding phasing alternatives of the system will be provided to the committees in January 2010.

**On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga** and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Light Rail System Analysis – Cost Benefit Overview.

**OTHER**

12. **Committee Work Plan**

The Committee reviewed the 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 Golzio, Board Assistant
Office of the Board Secretary