BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, September 3, 2009

5:30 P.M.
The Regular Session will commence immediately following the conclusion of the Closed Session.

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

AGENDA

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

- Persons wishing to address the Board of Directors on any item on the agenda or not on the agenda should complete a blue card located at the public information table and hand it to the Board Secretary staff prior to the meeting or before the item is heard. Speakers will be called to address the Board when their agenda item(s) arise during the meeting and are asked to limit their comments to 2 minutes. The amount of time allocated to speakers may vary at the Chairperson's discretion depending on the number of speakers and length of the agenda. If presenting handout materials, please provide 25 copies to the Board Secretary for distribution to the Board of Directors.

- The Consent Agenda items may be voted on in one motion at the beginning of the meeting. If you wish to discuss any of these items, please request the item be removed from the Consent Agenda by completing a blue card at the public information table and handing it to the Board Secretary staff prior to the meeting or prior to the Consent Agenda being heard.

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

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

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

1. ROLL CALL

2. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION
   A. Conference with Labor Negotiators
      [Government Code Section 54957.6]
      VTA Designated Representatives:
      Joseph T. Smith, Chief Financial Officer
      Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
      Robert L. Escobar, Human Resources Manager
      Employee Organization:
      Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION

3. CLOSED SESSION REPORT

4. ORDERS OF THE DAY

5. AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS
   A. ACTION ITEM - Recognize Kris Solomita, Office Specialist II, Engineering &
      Construction Administration; Raymond Stafford, Light Rail Operator, Guadalupe
      Operations Division; and Patrick Garcia, Overhaul & Repair Mechanic, Cerone
      Maintenance Division, as Employees of the Month for September 2009.
   B. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a Resolution recognizing Irene Wang, Senior Real Estate
      Agent, for 35 years of service.

6. Remarks by Metropolitan Transportation Commission Chair Scott Haggerty.

7. 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.
8. REPORT FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER (Verbal Report)

9. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON (Verbal Report)

   Appoint Evaluation Committee for Performance Review of VTA General Manager (Sandoval)

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


CONSENT AGENDA

12. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of August 6, 2009.

13. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a resolution endorsing the California Transit Association's research activities related to pursuing a ballot measure that would protect state public transit funding from being diverted to the General Fund.

14. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a support position for SB 626 (Kehoe), which requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to evaluate policies related to the development of the electrical infrastructure that is needed to support the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles.

15. ACTION ITEM - Amend the resolution certifying that VTA is an eligible and responsible sponsor for the Hybrid Bus procurement replacing older model buses and authorize the General Manager to submit an amended application for 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding of the Hybrid Bus procurement, an ADA Bus Stop enhancement project, and allowable funding for transit operations.

16. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a sponsoring agency resolution for Transportation Infrastructure Generating Recovery (TIGER) grant funds for VTA's joint application with Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) for the BART Hayward Yard Reconstruction project. Authorize the General Manager to enter into any necessary agreements with BART, the State of California and/or the Federal Department of Transportation to receive these funds and implement this project.

17. INFORMATION ITEM - Update on the VTA Transformation Program Progress.

18. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for April to June 2009.


20. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute Cooperative Agreements with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), covering environmental, design, right of way, construction, landscaping, project close-out phases of Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program projects.
21. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to submit a comment letter on the proposed CEQA Guidelines Amendments to the California Natural Resources Agency, as presented in Attachment C.


23. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive a presentation on the Milpitas Community-Based Transportation Plan.

24. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Siemens Building Technology, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $643,894 to enhanced and expand the Closed Circuit Television system at the VTA Guadalupe Light Rail Facility. This contract will be 100% funded under the Department of Homeland Security Transit Security Grant Program (FY07-TSGP) and Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program.

25. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $298,998 for the procurement and installation of Closed Circuit Television at Light Rail Stations (Phase 4). This contract is 100% funded under the Department of Homeland Security Transit Security Grant Program (FY07-TSGP) and Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program.

REGULAR AGENDA

26. ACTION ITEM - Recommend the Board of Directors to formally adopt the addendum to the collective bargaining agreement negotiated between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Division 265.

27. ACTION ITEM - Sales Tax Auditing & Recovery Request for Proposal (RFP):

   1) Authorize the General Manager to execute a five-year contract with MuniServices, LLC for the amount of $84,000 for quarterly sales tax reporting services plus fees contingent on additional sales tax revenue generated from transactions and use tax (sales tax) audit services; and,

   2) Further authorize the General Manager to extend the contract for two additional one-year terms (for a maximum contract period of seven years) for the amount of $37,600 for quarterly sales tax reporting services plus fees contingent on additional sales tax revenue generated from transactions and use tax (sales tax) audit services; and,

   3) Adopt a resolution for the State Board of Equalization that authorizes MuniServices LLC to examine sales and use tax records.
28. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to submit comments on the MTC’s draft/proposed programs to distribute transportation funding under the recently adopted Regional Transportation Plan (T2035).

29. ACTION ITEM - Approve the following project design features for inclusion in the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Recommended Project Description:

- Design Feature A: Dixon Landing Road Alignment
- Design Feature B: Curtis Avenue to Trade Zone Boulevard Alignment
- Design Feature C: Milpitas Station Transit Center
- Design Feature D: Berryessa Station
- Design Feature E: Berryessa Extension Yard
- Design Feature F: Tunnel Alignment near Coyote Creek

OTHER ITEMS

30. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

31. MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE HISTORY MATRIX

32. 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

33. 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)

34. 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
35. 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

36. ANNOUNCEMENTS

37. ADJOURN
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Employees of the Month for September 2009

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Kris Solomita, Office Specialist II in the Engineering & Construction Division at Milmont, is the Administration Award Winner for September. Kris has over 9 years of dedicated service with VTA. In his current role, Kris performs complex administrative and record keeping functions to help support the smooth operations of the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Design Engineering group. Kris’ management recognizes his initiative, resourcefulness in solving problems, and commitment to teamwork. Kris’ willingness to assist others helps create a positive work environment at VTA and sets a great example for his fellow employees. Congratulations to Kris Solomita, Administration Employee of the Month for September!

Raymond Stafford, Guadalupe Division Light Rail Operator, is September’s Operations Award Winner. Throughout his nearly 25 years at VTA, Ray has received numerous commendations for his observations of potential safety hazards and his quick actions in notifying the Operations Control Center to have the problems corrected. Recognized by his supervisors for his exceptional professionalism, Ray sets a great example for his fellow Operators. As a conscientious and dedicated employee, Ray upholds VTA’s commitment to community-focused transportation, and is very deserving of this award. Congratulations to Raymond Stafford, Operations Employee of the Month for September!

Patrick Garcia, Overhaul & Repair Mechanic at Cerone Division, is our Maintenance Employee of the Month for September. An employee of VTA since 1981, Pat diagnoses, rebuilds and tests critical components of VTA buses including transmissions. He takes great pride in his work, ensuring that the VTA buses are in top condition for providing reliable service to our passengers. Recognized by his supervisors as a well-respected employee with a great attitude, Pat is an excellent role model to his coworkers. Whether he is working independently
or as a member of a team, Pat upholds VTA’s standards of quality job performance. Congratulations to Patrick Garcia, Maintenance Employee of the Month for September!

Prepared By: Mitsuno Baurmeister
Memo No. 2209
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Resolution for Retiring VTA Employee Irene Wang

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a Resolution recognizing Irene Wang, Senior Real Estate Agent, for 35 years of service.

BACKGROUND:

Irene Wang, has provided outstanding public service in several positions throughout her distinguished 35 year career with the County and VTA.

Irene's career began with 12 plus years with the County Laboratory of Criminalistics and 22 plus years with VTA. She started with the Santa Clara County Transportation Agency on April 20, 1987 as a Junior Real Estate Agent. Nine months later she was promoted to an Assistant Real Estate Agent, and then promoted to an Associate Real Estate Agent and finally finished her career at VTA as a Senior Real Estate Agent in the Appraisal Section of the Real Estate Department in the Congestion Management Agency.

Irene's work ethics are exemplary. She is very dependable, highly experienced and well respected within her field of expertise. She always demonstrated courtesy, respect and congeniality with everyone with whom she worked. She was always there when you needed someone to step up to the plate and take on any challenging project. Irene will be truly missed by her colleagues and those with whom she interacted.

Congratulations to Irene Wang.
FISCAL IMPACT:

N/A

Prepared by: Roberta Notrangelo
Memo No. 2190
RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION
BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
GIVING SPECIAL TRIBUTE, DUE HONOR, AND RECOGNITION TO
SENIOR REAL ESTATE AGENT
IRENE WANG

WHEREAS, Irene Wang retired from Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) after 35 plus years of distinguished public service; and,

WHEREAS, Irene Wang promoted to Assistant Real Estate Agent, Associate Real Estate Agent, and Senior Real Estate Agent at VTA; and,

WHEREAS, Irene Wang has served as a role model at all levels at VTA, establishing a strong work ethic, promoting dependability, courtesy, cooperation and professionalism; and,

WHEREAS, Irene Wang, as an employee of VTA, was an extraordinarily knowledgeable, skilled and dedicated employee; now,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority does hereby give special tribute, due honor, and recognition to Irene Wang for over 35 years of dedicated public service.

PASS AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Board of Directors on this 3rd day of September 2009.

Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

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

Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
Thursday, August 6, 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 5:39 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>Present</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>Absent</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>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pyle</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Reed</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 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 present.

2. RECESSED TO CLOSED SESSION at 5:40 p.m.

Conference with Labor Negotiators
[Government Code Section 54957.6]

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

Employee Organization:
Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265
Ex-Officio Board Member Chu arrived at the meeting and entered Closed Session at 5:42 p.m.

RECONVENED TO OPEN SESSION at 6:03 p.m.

3. CLOSED SESSION REPORT
Conference with Labor Negotiators
[Government Code Section 54957.6]

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

Employee Organization:
Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265

There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.

4. ORDERS OF THE DAY
Chairperson Sandoval removed the following Item from the Agenda: Agenda Item #32.
Approval of an Addendum to the Labor Agreement between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Local 265.

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

5. AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS

A. Employees of the Month for July and August 2009
Chairperson Sandoval recognized and presented an award to Christina Jaworski, Senior Environmental Planner, River Oaks Administration; Shannon Kirtley, Transit Radio Dispatcher, Guadalupe Division; and Miguel Martinez, Transit Mechanic, Cerone Maintenance Division, as Employees of the Month for July 2009.

Chairperson Sandoval recognized and presented an award to Debra Polm, Office Support Supervisor, Chaboya Division, as Supervisor of the Quarter for the third quarter of 2009.

Chairperson Sandoval recognized and presented an award to Minh Nguyen, Information Systems Analyst II, River Oaks Administration; Joseph Bradley, Coach Operator, North Division; and Patrick Mangan, Transit Mechanic, Cerone Maintenance Division, as Employees of the Month for August 2009.

B. Resolution for Retiring VTA Employee Jerry Oxsen
Chairperson Sandoval recognized and presented an award to Jerry Oxsen, Operations Manager, for 37 years of dedicated public service. Vice Chairperson Liccardo read the Resolution to Mr. Oxsen giving special tribute, honor, and recognition for his outstanding effort and dedication at VTA.

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to adopt a Resolution No. 2009.08.19 recognizing Jerry Oxsen, Operations Manager, for 37 years of service.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Ex-Officio Board Member Yeager arrived at the meeting and took his seat at 6:14 p.m.

6. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

James Wightman, Interested Citizen, queried if the City of Santa Clara will allow Paramount Great America to install a wooden rollercoaster within the theme park. Michael T. Burns, General Manager, responded staff will follow up and forward the information to Mr. Wightman.

Mr. Wightman asked where the new Forty-Niner Stadium will be constructed. Chairperson Sandoval responded that it will be determined by the voters at a later date.

Mr. Wightman referenced the current economical constraints facing VTA and expressed support for the impending service changes.

Tim Ranz, Interested Citizen, referenced Tuesday, July 28, 2009, where Route 32 arrived late at Monroe Street and expressed concern that the driver stated he would not be allowed to board and needed to wait for the next bus due to an emergency.

Mr. Burns referred the matter to Bill Capps, Deputy Director of Bus and Rail Transportation, to provide a response to Mr. Ranz and copy the Board of Directors.

Jim Fink, Interested Citizen, expressed concern the service changes to Route 27 have negatively impacted Highway 9. Mr. Fink expressed concern regarding the elimination of Route 15 Community Bus in Morgan Hill. He stressed the importance to reinstate the service on Route 27.

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, referenced his previous suggestions regarding VTA’s Light Rail Restructuring. Mr. Ludwig expressed support for the Vasona Line Extension to provide service to San Jose State University. Mr. Ludwig noted support for VTA to move forward with Restructuring Option #5.

Ross Signorino, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding the service reductions, noting the surplus vehicles could be sold to assist VTA with its financial constraints.

7. REPORT FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER

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

- VTA systemwide ridership for the month of June 2009 declined when compared to June 2008. Systemwide average weekday ridership declined by 10 percent. Bus average weekday ridership declined by 8.2 percent and light rail average weekday ridership declined by 15 percent. VTA’s interagency partners are experiencing significant ridership decreases, such as the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) train, which has declined 26 percent; Caltrain has declined 12 percent; and Capitol Corridor has declined by 10 percent.

- VTA has developed a Mobility Option Travel Training Program to enhance the accessibility of bus and light rail transportation service. The Program will fulfill the broader goal of the Americans with Disability Act (ADA) by encouraging independency and self efficiency by providing free travel instructions to individuals with disabilities and seniors to allow the participants to make confident, convenient, and safe travel choices. On Friday, July 31, 2009, the Mobility Option Travel Training Program kick-off event was held at the South Side Senior Center in...
San Jose, where the mobility options bus was on site. Board Member Kalra attended and participated on behalf of VTA at the ribbon cutting event, which was well attended. VTA will receive a federal grant to pay for approximately 50 percent of the costs associated with the Program from the New Freedom Program.

- BART Silicon Valley Extension Public Outreach Meetings were conducted from July 28, 2009 through August 12, 2009, at various locations to provide the community with information on the project overview, schedule, funding updates, and design options. The next BART Silicon Valley Extension Policy Advisory Board (PAB) is scheduled on Wednesday, August 26, 2009 at 3:00 p.m.

- VTA received a request from the National Guard to provide transportation assistance for approximately 90 Service Personnel returning from Iraq. The Service Personnel would require transportation from the Mineta San Jose Airport to the Armory Reserve on Friday, August 7, 2009.

Mr. Burns directed attention to the presentation entitled, “Transit Service Reduction Plan effective January 11, 2020,” highlighting: 1) Financial Overview; 2) Bus Service Changes; 3) Light Rail Service Changes; 4) Impacts; 5) Environmental Review; 6) Public Outreach; and 7) Schedule.

Mr. Burns reported VTA was not entirely successful with achieving all of the labor savings anticipated; therefore, service reductions are necessary to address VTA’s budgetary constraints. Sales tax receipts have been significantly reduced. VTA will conduct several public meetings regarding the service reductions. The service reduction information will be forwarded to the October 1, 2009 Board of Directors meeting for consideration and if approved will be implemented January 2010.

Mr. Burns stated the Transit Association was successful in the Appellate Court regarding the State Transportation Assistance (STA) funding; however, the State has advised they will appeal the decision to the State Supreme Court.

Mr. Burns commented on the 8.6 percent decrease in bus service hours, which will impact 62 of VTA’s 73 bus routes. Routes 33, 34, 43, 76, 101, and River Oaks Shuttle will be discontinued. Several routes will increase headway and decrease frequencies.

Mr. Burns commented on the 6.5 percent decrease in light rail car hours, noting the discontinuance of the Mountain View service after 10:30 p.m. and reducing train consist size.

The service changes require an Environmental Review, which is required as part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). VTA will conduct an initial study to determine the impact, noting the document will be available for public review and comment from August 10 – 31, 2009. A public hearing is scheduled on August 18, 2009 at 6:00 p.m. The environmental review document regarding service reductions will be forwarded for consideration at the October 1, 2009 Board of Directors Regular meeting.

Mr. Burns stated VTA has conducted extensive public outreach efforts, noting staff anticipates working with Board Members and local officials regarding the service changes. The service changes will be presented to VTA’s Advisory Committees on August 12 and 13, 2009; VTA’s Standing Committees on September 17, 2009; September 25, 2009 Board of Directors Workshop meeting; and forwarded for consideration at the October 1, 2009 Board of Directors Regular meeting.
Mr. Burns stated the overall anticipated savings related to the service changes is $6.4 million annually with a projected 1.1 million loss in ridership annually.

Eugene Bradley, Santa Clara VTA Riders Union, referenced VTA’s fare increases and queried if VTA would reinstate the current fares if STA funding is received. Mr. Burns stated there are many uncertainties of what may happen, noting the State’s intention to appeal the decision on the STA funding to the State Supreme Court.

Chairperson Sandoval referenced the State’s intention to appeal the decision, noting the case may take several years before a decision is completed.

Mr. Wightman referenced the current economical constraints and expressed support of VTA’s proposed service reduction plan.

Mr. Fink stressed the importance for VTA and the Board of Directors to always consider fare box increases over service reductions, noting customers would rather pay higher fares than have service cuts and poor service.

8. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON

Chairperson Sandoval commented on the Filipino American Festival held on Wednesday, July 22, 2009 at VTA’s River Oaks Campus. The event was organized by VTA employees from the Filipino American community with the goal of celebrating the Filipino American culture.

Chairperson Sandoval announced the Jazz Festival scheduled on August 7 - 9, 2009, noting her, Vice Chairperson Liccardo, and Terry Firma, VTA’s mascot, will attend the event representing VTA.

Chairperson Sandoval stressed the importance for Board Members to respond to meeting polling notices in order to confirm attendance and determine if a quorum is established for the scheduled meeting.

Chairperson Sandoval referenced the September 17, 2009 League of Cities Conference, noting VTA’s Standing Committee Meetings are scheduled for that date as well.

Chairperson Sandoval urged the Board Members to contact the Office of the Board Secretary regarding their attendance at the September 17, 2009 Standing Committee Meetings.

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

Noel Tebo, CAC Chairperson, provided a report, highlighting the following: the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) decided to prepare and forward an independent response to the Civil Grand Jury. Mr. Tebo stated the CAC Committee is scheduled to discuss the independent response report at the August 12, 2009 CAC meeting.

Alternate Board Member Moylan requested the CAC Committee forward a copy of the independent response report to the Board of Directors.


Chuck Page, PAC Vice Chairperson, reported there was no Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairperson’s Report due to the cancellation of the June 11, 2009 and July 9, 2009 PAC Committee Meetings.
8. **REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON** (continued)

Chairperson Sandoval referenced the 2010 Board of Directors Meeting Calendar and requested the Board consider not scheduling the July 2010 Board of Directors Committee of the Whole (COW) Meeting.

Board Member Gage suggested the Board consider scheduling two meetings in June 2010 to ensure items are addressed in a timely manner and to prevent an excess of items being forwarded for consideration to the August 2010 Board of Directors Regular Meeting.

Starting in September the closed session will begin at 5:30 p.m. and followed immediately by the open session. I’m also going to ask our Board Secretary to modify our meeting notices in the future so we can start our regular meeting as soon as Closed Session has ended.

Board Member Reed recused himself per Government Code Section 84308 from the Consent Agenda.

Board Member Reed recused himself and left his seat at 6:49 p.m.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

11. **Regular Meeting Minutes of June 4, 2009**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of June 4, 2009. Board Member Reed recused.

12. **Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) Highway Program Semi-Annual Report**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to receive the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) Highway Program Semi-Annual Report. Board Member Reed recused.

13. **Guadalupe North Line Public Address System Upgrade Contract Award**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with HSQ Technology, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $481,930 for the Guadalupe North Line Public Address System Upgrade Project. This contract is 80 percent federally funded. Board Member Reed recused.

14. **Bus Stop Pavement Improvements FY09 Contract Award**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Weber Tractor Service, the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of $255,781 for the construction of the Bus Stop Pavement Improvements FY09. This contract is 80 percent federally funded. Board Member Reed recused.

15. **Bill Position: AB 1158 (Hayashi)**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for AB 1158 (Hayashi), which adds 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. Board Member Reed recused.
16. **Bill Position: SB 425 (Simitian)**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors adopt a support position for SB 425 (Simitian), which specifies that an employer subject to the requirement to implement a parking cash-out program may not deduct the cost of parking subsidies from its gross income unless it is in compliance with this requirement. In addition, this bill provides a tax credit to small businesses for qualified commute reduction expenditures. Board Member Reed recused.

17. **Rail Rehabilitation – Market Street and Almaden Boulevard Crossings Contract Award**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Stacy and Witbeck/Con-Quest (a joint venture), the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of $1,337,842 for construction of the Rail Rehabilitation Market Street and Almaden Boulevard Crossings. This contract is 80 percent federally funded. Board Member Reed recused.

18. **FY 09 Federal Formula Fund Program**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to authorize the General Manager to submit Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2009 grant applications and execute grant agreements with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula, and Section 5309 Fixed Guideway programs. Board Member Reed recused.

19. **FY 10 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Program**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to adopt Resolution No. 2009.08.20 authorizing the filing of an annual claim to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for allocation of FY 2009-2010 Transportation Development Act (TDA) and State Transit Assistance (STA) funds. Board Member Reed recused.

20. **Vasona LRT Project – Hamilton Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) Wall Stabilization Contract Award**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Con-Quest Contractors Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in an amount of $343,649 for construction of the Hamilton MSE Wall Stabilization Project improvements. Board Member Reed recused.

21. **Core Network Equipment Leasing**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to authorize the General Manager to lease up to $595,650 in electronic "core" network equipment, primarily switches and routers that control and direct electronic data, from Cisco Systems Inc. and AT&T Inc., under cooperative purchasing agreements negotiated by the State of California on behalf of local agencies. This “lease to own” purchase agreement is to be funded via five annual payments of approximately $119,000. At the end of the proposed five year term, and after making the five payments as outlined, the VTA may exercise an option to own the equipment outright. Board Member Reed recused.
22. **County Earmark Proposals for Federal Surface Transportation Program Reauthorization Legislation (County Item)**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to recommend that the VTA Board of Directors support the County's projects for inclusion in the Federal Surface Transportation Program reauthorization legislation and direct staff to submit a letter of support to the appropriate federal departments. Board Member Reed recused.

23. **Substance Abuse Testing, Medical Review Officer and Medical Examination Services**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to authorize the General Manager to approve the award of a contract to U. S. Health Works for Substance Abuse Testing, Medical Review Officer Services, and Medical Examination Services for three years at a cost of $877,440, with an option for two one-year extensions priced at $410,132 for a total authorization of $1,287,572. Board Member Reed recused.

24. **Investment Consulting Services**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Mercer Investment Consulting, Inc. (Mercer) to provide investment consulting services, including quarterly evaluations of money manager performance with recommendations to retain or not retain; and, to provide other services (i.e. asset allocation study, money manager searches, etc.) as needed, in an amount not to exceed $235,000 for a period of two years; and, further authorize the General Manager to extend such contract for one year periods not to exceed three additional years with an amount not to exceed $337,000 total for the third, fourth, and fifth year of the contract (five years not to exceed $572,000). Board Member Reed recused.

25. **Freight Railroad – Utility Relocation Spending Authority Augmentation**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to 1) Increase the General Manager’s spending authority for Freight Railroad Relocation (FRR) and the WP Milpitas Corridor clearance utility relocations in an amount not to exceed $5 million, for a revised authorized amount of $38.52 million. This authorization increase will complete all utility relocation activities for the FRR and will allow for the commencement of non-FRR preliminary utility relocation design for clearance of the Corridor between Fremont and San Jose; and further, 2) Authorize the General Manager to execute new utility relocation agreements and/or amend existing utility relocation agreements for FRR and non-FRR corridor clearance activities in a total amount not to exceed the Board authorized $38.52 million. A combined utility relocation authorization is recommended for financial flexibility and ease of cost administration. Board Member Reed recused.

26. **Lifeline Transportation Program – Supplemental Call for Projects – Cycle 2**

M/S/C (Pyle/Gage) on a vote of 9 ayes and 1 recusal to approve the programming of FY 09/10/11 Lifeline Transportation Program funds. Board Member Reed recused.

Board Member Sellers arrived at the meeting and took his seat at 6:50 p.m. Board Member Reed returned to his seat at 6:50 p.m.
REGULAR AGENDA

27. **Mission Warren Truck Rail Program – Adoption of Resolution to Hear Resolutions of Necessity**

Chairperson Sandoval stated the Mission Warren Truck Rail Program – Adoption of Resolution to Hear Resolutions of Necessity was presented at the June 4, 2009 Board of Directors Regular Meeting; however, there were not enough Board Members at the meeting to vote on the item since it required 10 affirmative votes to pass.

M/S/C (Gage/Caserta) to adopt Resolution No. 2009.08.21 electing to hear resolutions of necessity for the Mission Warren Truck Rail Program, as required by State law.

28. **Approval of the Labor Agreements between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA) Local 21, American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 101, and Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 521**

Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer, reported contract negotiations have concluded and the item is to adopt the amended successor labor contract agreements negotiated between VTA and Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects Association (TAEA) Local 21, American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Local 101, and Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 521.

Mr. Lopez reported the term of the contract agreements are for two year limits from July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2011. The contract agreements represent a collaborative effort between VTA and the unions to strike a balance between surviving the current economic crisis and protecting hard working employee rights and interests.

The contract agreements include a salary rate freeze for two years and implementation of a mandatory unpaid work furlough program. Mr. Lopez stated over the next two fiscal years the labor contract agreements are projected to generate a combined cost savings in the amount of $13,000,000.

Mr. Lopez reported contract negotiations were difficult considering the economical environment, but were assisted with the shared goal and mutual efforts of protecting jobs and transit service. Mr. Lopez expressed appreciation and thanked the unions for their diligent work and good faith in the process. Staff working collaboratively with the unions was able to craft programs that will yield savings and save jobs, while maintaining the unions’ core rights and entitlements.

Board Member Gage expressed appreciation and thanked management and the unions for working collaboratively to reach a mutual agreement on the labor contract agreements.

Ron Roberts, Assistant Chief Steward of the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 521, expressed appreciation and thanked the Board Members for their patience and for allowing management and the unions to work through the negotiations process. Mr. Roberts stated the end goal for everyone was to save money for VTA.

Mr. Roberts spoke on behalf of SEIU Local 521, noting SEIU Members support the approval of the successor labor contract agreement with VTA.
Vice Chairperson Liccardo expressed appreciation to the unions for their diligent work and sacrifices to work through the negotiations process to achieve a mutual agreement.

Chairperson Sandoval thanked everyone for their hard work and effort, noting the importance for VTA to do everything possible to continue to provide good transit service for its customers.

Board Member Pyle expressed appreciation and thanked everyone for their understanding, diligent work, focusing on the big picture, and for all the sacrifices made to attain a mutual contract agreement.

M/S/C (Gage/Pyle) to authorize the General Manager to approve and formally adopt the amended successor labor agreements negotiated between the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and Transportation Authority Engineers and Architects (TAEA), American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), and Service Employees International Union, Local 521 (SEIU).

Board Members Gage and Caserta left their seats at 6:55 p.m.

29. **40-Foot Low-Floor Diesel Hybrid Bus Procurement**

Chairperson Sandoval stated a revised Board Memorandum dated July 29, 2009, specifies the selected vendor and additional information in the recommendation.

Chairperson Sandoval noted a letter of protest was received and subsequently withdrawn on the purchase contract.

Michael Hursh, Operations Maintenance and Security Deputy Director, reported the recommendation is to execute a contract in the amount of $46,464,153 with the Gillig Corporation of Hayward, California, for the purchase of 70 buses with an option to purchase an additional 37 buses, if funding becomes available.

The purchase of the new buses will replace older high floor model vehicles purchased in 1997 and 1998, which have reached their useful life and have recurring lift failures. The new buses will be powered by hybrid diesel electric technology, which is a responsible energy saving alternative to regular diesel buses and more reliable and cost effective than Zero Emission Buses (ZEBs).

VTA received bid proposals from the following vendors: Gillig of Hayward, California; Orion Buses of Oriskany, New York; and New Flyer Industries Limited of St. Cloud, Minnesota. VTA’s evaluation committee selected Gillig Corporation based on the evaluation criteria, price, and responsiveness to technical requirements.

Board Member Caserta retuned to his seat at 6:59 p.m.

The engineer’s estimate for the bus vehicles was $70,137,649 and Gillig’s bid proposal was $70,353,112. New Flyer Industries was not selected due to failure to meet the final published specifications and cost and Orion was not selected due to failure to meet the technical specifications on the length of the buses. VTA received one protest letter but the protest was denied and added the manufacture elected not to proceed with the protest procedure.
Mr. Hursh stated the buses selected have related equipment that complies with the January 2010 new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) emissions requirements and are low floor vehicles with the highest capacity ramp commercially available. VTA has worked diligently to maximize ADA accessibility features and is aware of the request for additional bike rack space.

Board Member Gage returned to his seat at 7:01 p.m.

Mr. Hursh stated each of the manufacture’s submitted proposals offering a two-position bike rack; however, VTA will continue to work collaboratively with the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and Gillig to seek approval of installation of larger bike racks.

VTA will purchase the initial 70 new bus vehicles with $42.4 million of Federal Stimulus American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds and with $4.1 million of VTA Transit funds.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo referenced the current economical constraints and queried why there is not a reduction in the bus manufacture pricing. Mr. Hursh responded it is an extremely good time for bus manufactures with the pressure to construct environmentally friendly vehicles on the rise, noting manufacture purchase order books are filled.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo referenced the life and cost of the bus vehicle batteries and if VTA has an estimate of the costs needed in the future years. Mr. Hursh the technology is evolving everyday, noting battery replacement costs will need to be programmed in future years.

Mr. Ludwig expressed support for VTA to purchase the new diesel hybrid buses; however, opposed the low floor vehicle models, noting they only accommodate a limited amount of customers. Mr. Ludwig stated the low floor models negatively impact seniors by making it more difficult for them to move through the vehicle.

Jim Stallman, Vice Chairperson Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC), expressed concern that VTA’s Advisory Committees were not given adequate time to provide input regarding the new bus vehicles. Mr. Stallman noted the City of Saratoga is grateful for receiving several bicycle racks from the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) grant program.

Mr. Bradley expressed concern that the Gillig new low floor bus vehicle windows are placed too high, which prevents customers from seeing outside the windows and queried if VTA plans to lower the windows. Mr. Hursh responded the high window placement is a safety provision.

Mr. Bradley suggested VTA consider purchasing one of each bus model to allow drivers and customers to provide input and rate the best model before VTA purchases future buses.
M/S/C (Pyle/Herrera) to authorize the General Manager to execute a contract in the amount of $46,464,153 with the Gillig Corporation of Hayward, California, for the purchase of 70 buses, with an option to purchase an additional 37 buses should funding become available, for a total of up to 107 forty-foot low-floor diesel hybrid buses and related equipment. The execution of the award will be subject to compliance with the FTA pre-award requirements and the satisfactory clearance of any protests. The initial 70 bus procurement will be funded with $42.4 million of Federal Stimulus American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds (ARRA) and $4.1 million of VTA Transit funds.

30. Fare Increase Proposal Effective Date Change

Joe Smith, Chief Financial Officer, reported the recommendation is to amend the fare increase effective date from January 1, 2010 to October 1, 2009. Mr. Smith stated the Board adopted a resolution at the June 4, 2009 Board of Directors Regular meeting to establish new rates and fares for VTA bus, light rail, and paratransit services to be implemented on January 1, 2009; however, due to current fiscal challenges VTA has no other choice but to implement the changes sooner than anticipated.

Mr. Smith reported VTA’s third quarter FY 09 sales tax revenues were down 21 percent compared to last year, noting preliminary estimates for VTA’s fourth quarter FY 09 revenues are expected to be down 15 percent compared to last year.

Mr. Smith stated accelerating implementation of the fare increase in October 1, 2009 will generate an additional $1 million in FY 2010, if the Board approves the amendment then staff will move forward to conduct community outreach efforts to inform the public of the date change.

Chairperson Sandoval noted the PAC Committee had recommended that the fare increase be implemented sooner due to current fiscal challenges facing VTA.

Torrance Phillips, Interested Citizen, spoke on behalf of Lupe Medrano, Interested Citizen, and expressed concern regarding the impending fare increases and the negative impact it will have on the transit dependent low income community. Ms. Medrano urged the Board to implement 50 percent of the fare increase in October 2009 then the remaining 50 percent effective in January 2010.

Ms. Medrano stressed the importance for VTA to audit ridership during the peak hours of the day in order to attain a fair representation of ridership levels.

Mr. Bradley concurred with Ms. Medrano’s comments, noting the fare increase and the service reduction will severely impact the low income community. Mr. Bradley urged VTA and the Board Members to do everything possible to receive the STA funding for public transit as soon as possible. Mr. Bradley stressed the importance to ensure transit services are affordable for everyone.

Board Member Gage stated VTA’s goal is to provide good reliable transportation services for the community.

Board Member Gage added VTA worked diligently to prevent fare increases and service reductions; however, due to the current economical constraints, VTA has no other option but to proceed forward with the fare increases and service reductions.
Mr. Ludwig expressed concern regarding the fare increase effective date change to October 1, 2009, noting the economical impact it will have on the low income community who live on a fixed income.

M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to adopt Resolution No. 2009.08.22 amending Resolution 2009.06.15, Establishing Rates and Fares, to change the effective date to October 1, 2009.


Michael T. Burns, General Manager, reported on VTA’s response to the 2008 – 2009 Civil Grand Jury Report, noting VTA has to submit its response by September 1, 2009. Mr. Burns stated VTA has worked diligently to ensure its responses are factual and neutral. Mr. Burns noted a request from Board Member Casas regarding some changes to VTA’s response report in terms of reaction, language, and tone. Mr. Burns stated the requested changes do not affect the substance of VTA’s response.

Mr. Burns requested the Board Members approve VTA’s response report with the expectation that staff will make the requested changes to ensure VTA’s response report is factual and straightforward. Mr. Burns concurred with the requested changes, noting Board Member Casas’ request does not change the substance of VTA’s response report but changes the tone.

Board Member Reed concurred with Board Member Casas’ assessment, noting the following three areas he would like staff to edit: response #s 10, 11, and 14.

Alternate Board Member Moylan stressed the importance for VTA to request additional time to submit VTA’s response report to the Santa Clara County Grand Jury.

Alternate Board Member Moylan expressed concern that VTA’s response report did not include the actions VTA and the Board Members have taken to address the areas of concern identified in the Hay Group Assessment and State Audit.

Board Member Gage stated the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury deadline is scheduled; therefore, VTA must adhere to the deadline. Board Member Gage added a different group of individuals are currently in the process to be appointed to the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury.

Chairperson Sandoval stated the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury deadline timeline is set by the Civil Grand Jury; therefore, VTA does not have the option to request an extension to submit its response report.

Alternate Board Member Moylan stressed the importance for VTA to acknowledge its progress and accomplishments in addressing several of the areas of concern, noting the establishment of the Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Process and Subcommittee.

Board Member Casas requested VTA’s revised response be presented at the August 20, 2009 Standing Committee meetings for Board Member review.

Chairperson Sandoval requested Board Members forward suggestions regarding the areas that need to be addressed to Mr. Burns to ensure the information is included in the report for VTA’s Standing Committee Meetings.
Mr. Burns stated VTA’s Civil Grand Jury response report will be revised and agendized on each of VTA’s August 20, 2009 Standing Committee Agendas.


Mr. Bradley expressed support to VTA for submitting a civil response to the Santa Clara County Civil Grand Jury.

Mr. Signorino queried what standing committee would VTA’s civil response report be presented. Mr. Burns responded the information will be agendized on each of VTA’s Standing Committee Meeting Agendas scheduled for August 20, 2009.

Alternate Board Member Moylan requested VTA’s Advisory Committees receive the information at the September 9, 2009 and September 10, 2009 Committee Meetings.

32. (Removed from the Agenda)
Addendum to the Labor Agreement between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Local 265.

OTHER ITEMS

33. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

34. MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE HISTORY MATRIX

Mr. Bradley referenced H.R. 2746 to allow for additional transportation assistance grants and queried when VTA will state its position on the bill. Mr. Bradley stressed the importance and requested the item be agendized for the September 3, 2009 Board of Directors Regular Meeting.

Chairperson Sandoval referred the matter to VTA’s Government Affairs Department to provide a response. Chairperson Sandoval noted information will be included in the Chairperson’s Report at the September 3, 2009 Board of Directors Regular Meeting.

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Monthly Legislative History Matrix was accepted as contained in the Agenda packet.

35. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Board of Directors Committee of the Whole (COW) in lieu of Board Standing Committees

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the July 16, 2009 Board of Directors Committee of the Whole (COW) in lieu of Board Standing Committees Meeting Record were accepted as contained in the Agenda packet.

B. Administration and Finance Committee

There was no report from the Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee.
C. **Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee**

There was no report from the Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee.

D. **Transit Planning and Operations Committee**

There was no report from the Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee.

E. **Audit Committee**

There was no report from the Audit Committee.

36. **REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES**

A. **Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA)**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the June 10, 2009 Cancellation Notice and July 8, 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 June 10, 2009 and July 8, 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 June 10, 2009 and July 8, 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 June 11, 2009 Cancellation Notice and July 9, 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 June 11, 2009 and July 9, 2009 Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Cancellation Notices were accepted as contained in the Agenda packet.
37. REPORTS FROM JOINT POWERS BOARDS (JPBs) & REGIONAL COMMISSIONS

A. Peninsula Corridor JPB

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the July 2, 2009 and August 6, 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 June 24, 2009 and July 22, 2009 Summary Notes from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) were accepted as contained on the dais.

E. Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the June 8, 2009 and July 13, 2009 Summary Notes from the Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority were accepted as contained on the dais.

38. REPORTS FROM VTA POLICY ADVISORY BOARDS (PABs)

A. Vasona Light Rail PAB

There was no report from the Vasona Light Rail PAB.

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

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

C. Downtown East Valley PAB

There was no report from the Downtown East Valley PAB.

D. Highway PAB South

There was no report from the Highway PAB South.
39. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Board Member Casas requested the December 3, 2009 Audit Committee Meeting be rescheduled to December 10, 2009 and immediately follow the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors Regular and Workshop.

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, stated staff will contact the Audit Committee Members to coordinate the rescheduling of the December 2009 Audit Committee Meeting to immediate follow the December 10, 2009 Board of Directors Meeting and Workshop.

40. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle M. Garza, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Transit Funding Ballot Measure Research

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution endorsing the California Transit Association's research activities related to pursuing a ballot measure that would protect state public transit funding from being diverted to the General Fund.

BACKGROUND:

Public Transportation Account: The Public Transportation Account (PTA) was established as a trust fund to provide funding for mass transportation and transportation planning purposes. Revenues in the account are derived primarily from the following four sources:

- Sales tax on diesel fuel.
- Sales tax on 9 cents of the state excise tax on gasoline.
- Proposition 42.
- Spillover.

On the expenditure side, how PTA revenues are allocated varies by funding source. In the case of the amount generated by the sales tax on diesel fuel, the sales tax on 9 cents of the state excise tax on gasoline, and the spillover, 50 percent of the money goes to the State Transit Assistance Program (STA), which provides funding for public transit operating and capital purposes. STA funds are apportioned to regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs) according to a formula based on population and annual transit operator revenues, and are then distributed by the RTPAs to the various public transit a within their regions. In the San Jose-San Francisco-Oakland Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) usually receives about 38 percent of the state’s available STA funds per year. Historically, VTA’s annual share has ranged from about $5 million to as high as $14 million.
The remaining 50 percent of PTA money is used to fund:

- Mass transit planning activities of Caltrans and the California Transportation Commission (CTC).
- Passenger rail safety responsibilities of the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC).
- Operating costs of the state’s intercity rail system.
- Rolling stock acquisitions and other capital projects for intercity rail.
- California High-Speed Rail Authority.
- Beginning in FY 2008, transportation for the clients of the state’s regional occupational centers.
- Transit capital improvement projects, including public transit vehicle purchases, that are programmed through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process.

With regard to PTA revenues derived from Proposition 42, 75 percent goes to STA and 25 percent for intercity rail and public transit capital improvement projects programmed through the STIP process.

Public Transportation Account Diversions: Persistent state budget deficits have taken their toll on the PTA. Over the past three fiscal years -- FY 2008 through FY 2010 -- roughly 72 percent of all PTA funding ($3.44 billion) has been diverted to pay for General Fund obligations, primarily debt service on transportation-related bonds. In addition, as part of the FY 2010 budget that was initially enacted in February of this year, funding for STA was eliminated for the next four fiscal years -- through FY 2013.

California Transit Association Lawsuit: In September 2007, the California Transit Association filed a lawsuit challenging actions taken on the part of Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger and Legislature to divert PTA revenues to the General Fund as part of the FY 2008 budget. Recently, the Third District Court of Appeals in Sacramento ruled against the state in this lawsuit and said $1.2 billion of this diversion was illegal. The appellate court’s ruling hinged on the following three key determinations:

1. Spillover revenues must be deposited in the PTA, and must be used for mass transportation and transportation planning purposes.

2. “Mass transportation” means “public transportation” or “public transit.” Therefore, PTA revenues cannot be used for yellow school bus service or for transportation for the clients of the state’s regional occupational centers.

3. PTA revenues cannot be used to reimburse the General Fund for past debt service payments related to any transportation bonds. With regard to the current fiscal year, PTA revenues can be used for debt service payments related to public transit bonds (i.e., Proposition 108), but not for transportation bonds generally.

The state is expected to appeal this decision to the California Supreme Court. If the Supreme
Court agrees to take the case, it could be some time before the questions raised in the Association’s lawsuit are finally resolved.

**DISCUSSION:**

The recent cuts to state transit funding have left many public transit operators in California with dwindling resources amid growing demands for service. As the state deals with an economic recession and growing public awareness of climate change, more and more people from all walks of life are turning to public transit as the way to meet their day-to-day transportation needs. Therefore, it is vital that public transit have permanent, stable and sufficient funding at the state level in order to be able to provide the level of service desired by California’s communities.

More and more, public transit is becoming recognized as a means to achieving a wide variety of policy goals that have been deemed to be important, including:

- Reducing congestion on our roadways.
- Cutting greenhouse gas emissions.
- Conserving energy.
- Relieving our dependence on foreign oil.
- Stimulating our economy.
- Providing access to education, health care and social service programs.
- Enhancing mobility for our aging society.

Arguably, the PTA has been used too many times this decade to close General Fund deficits. Particularly troublesome is the fact that the decision on the part of Gov. Schwarzenegger and the Legislature to provide no STA funding for the next four fiscal years comes at a time when public transit operators in California are seeing their other revenue sources erode because of the economy. As a result, service reductions, fare increases and employee layoffs, all of which negatively impact our communities, are becoming unavoidable and common.

Moreover, Californians, including Santa Clara County residents, have voted on a number of occasions to support and to protect public transit funding. Yet, throughout this decade, these dollars have repeatedly been diverted from their intended purpose and used to shore up the General Fund.

In response, the California Transit Association is engaging in polling and focus group activities to determine the feasibility of developing a public transit funding protection initiative for possible placement before the voters, perhaps as early as November 2010. The Association has asked its public transit agency members to consider adopting a resolution supporting this research effort. We recommend that the Board of Directors do so.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could decide not to adopt a resolution supporting the California Transit Association’s polling and focus group activities related to a possible ballot measure protecting state public transit funding.
ADVISORY/STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item on August 20, 2009, and recommended that the Board of Directors support the staff recommendation. In response to a question from Director David Casas, staff affirmed that the California Transit Association’s effort would include research into the loopholes in current law that have allowed the Governor and Legislature to divert PTA revenues to the General Fund, and consideration of ways to close those loopholes.

The Citizens Advisory Committee also considered this item as part of its consent calendar on August 12, 2009, and unanimously recommended that the Board of Directors support the staff recommendation.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact associated with this recommendation.

Prepared by: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
Memo No. 1847
Resolution No. ____

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
SUPPORTING THE RESEARCH, POLLING AND FOCUS GROUP ACTIVITIES OF THE
CALIFORNIA TRANSIT ASSOCIATION REGARDING THE POSSIBLE PLACEMENT OF
A TRANSIT FUNDING PROTECTION INITIATIVE BEFORE THE VOTERS OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority was formed to provide public transportation to all citizens of the County of Santa Clara; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority relies on funding from the State of California for public transit operations and capital investments; and

WHEREAS, in Fiscal Years 2008, 2009 and 2010, the Governor of California and the California State Legislature diverted approximately $3.4 billion combined from public transit programs and placed the funds instead in the State General Fund; and

WHEREAS, the California State Budget signed into law by the Governor on February 20, 2009, eliminates funding for the State Transit Assistance Program (STA) for the next four fiscal years; and

WHEREAS, the elimination of funding for the STA Program would result in a significant loss in statewide public transit investments between Fiscal Years 2010 and 2013, including a loss of an estimated $12 million per year to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority; and

WHEREAS, the voters of the State of California and the County of Santa Clara have repeatedly passed measures designed to preserve and protect transportation funds; and

WHEREAS, the California Transit Association is engaging in polling and focus group activities to determine the feasibility of developing a public transit funding protection initiative for possible placement before the voters of the State of California; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary for the California Transit Association to have the support of as many of its Public Transit System member agencies as possible.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, that the Board does hereby encourage and support the efforts of the California Transit Association to conduct polling and focus group activities in order to determine the feasibility of submitting an initiative to the voters of the State of California that would preserve and protect funding for public transit investments.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the California Transit Association and be entered into the official records of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on September 3, 2009, by the following vote:

AYES: Directors:

NOES: Directors:

ABSENT: Directors:

______________________________  ________________________________
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson  Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  ATTEST:

______________________________  ________________________________
Kevin D. Allmand, General Counsel  Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Bill Position: SB 626 (Kehoe)

Policy-Related Action: Yes

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a support position for SB 626 (Kehoe), which requires the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) to evaluate policies related to the development of the electrical infrastructure that is needed to support the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles.

BACKGROUND:

The production, marketing and use of petroleum fuels in California cause significant degradation of public health and environmental quality due to the release of air and water pollutants. Clean alternative fuel sources, such as plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles, have the potential to considerably reduce the impacts of those pollutants. Greenhouse gas emissions also pose a serious threat to the health of California’s citizens and the quality of the environment. California’s transportation sector contributes about 40 percent of the state’s annual greenhouse gas emissions, more than any other sector.

Current state law encourages the use of alternative fuels and the de-carbonization of the transportation sector. For example, the California Energy Commission, in partnership with the California Air Resources Board (CARB), is required to prepare and adopt a state plan to increase the use of alternative fuels without adversely affecting air and water quality, and without causing negative health effects. In response to this requirement, the commission released a report, “The State Alternative Fuels Plan,” which recommends an increase in the use of alternative fuels to 20 percent of on-road transportation fuel use by 2020 and 30 percent by 2030.

Consistent with reducing greenhouse gas emissions and increasing the use of alternative fuels,
the Energy Commission created the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program. This program is intended to increase the use of alternative and renewable fuels, and spur the development of innovative technologies that will transform California’s fuel and vehicle types to help achieve the state’s climate change goals.

Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger’s Executive Order S-01-07 also supports the efforts being made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in California. It calls for CARB to create a low carbon fuel standard for a reduction of at least 10 percent of the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuels by 2020. Furthermore, it directs CARB to consider initiating a regulatory proceeding to establish and implement the standard. In response, CARB identified the low carbon fuel standard as an early action item pursuant to the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, with a regulation to be adopted and implemented by 2010.

SB 626 represents another step in this direction. It requires the CPUC to develop and implement policies to overcome the barriers associated with the widespread deployment of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. The legislation requires the policies to address all of the following:

1. Impacts on the state’s electric infrastructure of the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles.
2. Role and development of public charging infrastructure.
3. Impact of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles on grid stability and the integration of renewable energy resources.
4. Technological advances that are needed to ensure the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles, and what role the state should play to support the development of this technology.
5. Existing code and permit requirements that will impact the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles.
6. Any recommended changes to existing legal impediments to the widespread use of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles.
7. 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.
8. 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 Global Warming Solutions Act, and what steps should be taken to address possibly shifting emission reduction responsibilities from the transportation sector to the electric industry.

DISCUSSION:

The purpose of SB 626 is to facilitate the deployment of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles to assist in reducing greenhouse gas emissions generated by the transportation sector. While the
various programs currently being implemented by CARB and the Energy Commission examine lower carbon fuels and the infrastructure required to deploy those fuels, the state also needs to analyze and evaluate how electric vehicle infrastructure will be integrated into California’s power grid. The impact of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles on the state’s electric utility systems and infrastructure could be significant unless utilities are able to shift the time that consumers charge them to off-peak periods. Utilities need to evaluate potential impacts of large numbers of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles on their systems, and to develop strategies to address this electrical load. This legislation directs the CPUC to begin this process.

SB 626 provides the CPUC with express authority to examine in detail how transforming into an electric vehicle economy will effect the state’s energy system from grid reliability to which sources of energy will be used to provide the electricity for plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. It also requires the commission to take steps to administratively put in place rules and policies that would support the widespread deployment of plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. Therefore, we recommend that the Board of Director support this measure.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could decide to adopt a position for SB 626 that is different from the one being recommended, or could opt to take no position on this bill at this time.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item on August 20, 2009, and recommended that the Board of Directors support SB 626. In response to a question from Director David Casas, staff confirmed that while the bill deals specifically with plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles, it would not preclude the development and deployment of other types of hybrid vehicles.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this recommendation.

Prepared by: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
Memo No. 2178
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Amendment to VTA’s Resolution for 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Transit Funds

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Amend the resolution certifying that VTA is an eligible and responsible sponsor for the Hybrid Bus procurement replacing older model buses and authorize the General Manager to submit an amended application for 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funding of the Hybrid Bus procurement, an ADA Bus Stop enhancement project, and allowable funding for transit operations.

BACKGROUND:

On March 5, 2009, the VTA Board of Directors took action to adopt a resolution for 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Transit Funds. That resolution allowed VTA to submit an application to the Federal Transit Administration for the Hybrid Bus Replacement project. VTA did submit an application on May 28, 2009 and FTA awarded VTA a grant totaling $47,504,684 on July 10, 2009, satisfying all timeliness deadlines associated with the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

On June 24, 2009, the President signed H.R. 2346, allowing transit operators to dedicate up to 10% of their ARRA formula funds to transit operations. The original ARRA funding was restricted to capital projects.
**DISCUSSION:**

VTA staff believe that it is in VTA's best interests to revise the grant to dedicate $4,750,468, 10% of the approved grant total, to transit operations. To take advantage of this new stipulation, it is necessary to amend the approved grant.

As part of the applicant process, project sponsors are required to submit a Resolution of Local Support to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The resolution is included with this memo as Attachment A.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action if the Board of Directors wishes to dedicate 10% of the approved 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act grant total, to transit operations. This Resolution of Local Support is required as part of the application for 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will allow VTA greater budget flexibility by revising 10% of the approved 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act transit grant total to be eligible for transit operations. This action will also enable VTA to receive the funds for transit operations sooner – as FTA grant funds are paid on a reimbursement basis and transit operations expenditures would be incurred sooner.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item at the August 20, 2009 meeting, unanimously recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation for this item, and have the item placed on the Consent Agenda for the September Board meeting.

Prepared by: Jeffery Ballou
Memo No. 2182
Resolution No.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
Authorizing the filing of an application for federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) funding and stating the assurance to complete the project.

WHEREAS, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) (herein referred as APPLICANT) is submitting an application to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for approximately $47,504,684 in transit funding from the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) for the HYBRID BUS REPLACEMENT, ADA BUS STOP ENHANCEMENT, and TRANSIT OPERATING ASSISTANCE (herein referred as PROJECTS) for the MTC Regional ARRA Program (MTC Resolution No. 3885) (herein referred as PROGRAM); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to ARRA, and any regulations and/or guidance promulgated thereunder, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive Regional ARRA funds for a project shall submit an application first with the appropriate Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), for review and inclusion in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the MPO for the nine counties of the San Francisco Bay region; and

WHEREAS, MTC has adopted a Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised applicable to federal ARRA fund delivery and has adopted (or is scheduled to adopt) in MTC Resolution No. 3885 such additional requirements as are necessary or appropriate to meet the obligations/award deadlines in the ARRA; and

WHEREAS, ARRA funds for transit projects are provided through Federal Transit Administration Formula Programs (23 U.S.C. §53); and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT is an eligible project sponsor for FTA Section 5307, Section 5309 FG, or Section 5311 funds; and

WHEREAS, APPLICANT is an eligible project sponsor for ARRA funds; and

WHEREAS, as part of the application for ARRA funding, MTC requires a resolution adopted by the responsible implementing agency stating the following:
1) That the sponsor understands that the ARRA funding is fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be expected to be funded with additional ARRA or other MTC-programmed funds; and

2) That PROJECTS will comply with the procedures specified in MTC’s Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, revised) and with all project specific requirements as set forth in MTC’s Regional ARRA Program (MTC Resolution No. 3885); and

3) That PROJECTS as described in the application, and if approved, as included in MTC's TIP; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, that APPLICANT is authorized to execute and file an application for funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for PROJECTS; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the APPLICANT by adopting this resolution does hereby state that:

1. APPLICANT understands that the ARRA funding for the project is fixed at the MTC approved programmed amount, and that any cost increases must be funded by the APPLICANT from other funds, and that APPLICANT does not expect any cost increases to be funded with additional ARRA or MTC-programmed funds; and

2. APPLICANT understands the funding deadlines associated with these funds and will comply with the applicable provisions and requirements of the Regional ARRA Program (MTC Resolution No. 3885) and Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606, as revised); and

3. PROJECTS will be implemented as described in the complete application and in this resolution and, if approved, for the amount programmed in the MTC federal TIP; and

4. PROJECTS will comply with all the project-specific requirements as set forth in the ARRA and appropriate applicable regulations or guidance; and be it further

RESOLVED, that there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and be it further

RESOLVED, that there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECTS, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECTS; and be it further

RESOLVED, that APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with MTC for ARRA funding for the PROJECTS as referenced in this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the MTC in conjunction with the filing of the application; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the MTC is requested to support the application for the PROJECTS described in the resolution and to include the PROJECTS, if approved, in MTC’s TIP.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on September 3, 2009, by the following vote:

AYES: Directors:

NOES: Directors:

ABSENT: Directors:

Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

APPROVED AS TO FORM: ATTEST:

Kevin D. Allmand, General Counsel
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief SVRT Program Officer, Carolyn M. Gonot

SUBJECT: TIGER Grant Application Resolution

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a sponsoring agency resolution for Transportation Infrastructure Generating Recovery (TIGER) grant funds for VTA's joint application with Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) for the BART Hayward Yard Reconstruction project. Authorize the General Manager to enter into any necessary agreements with BART, the State of California and/or the Federal Department of Transportation to receive these funds and implement this project.

BACKGROUND:

On June 17, 2009, the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) issued a call-for-projects for the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Transportation Infrastructure Generating Recovery (TIGER) grant program. The TIGER program will provide Economic Stimulus funds for transportation projects of national, statewide and regional significance. Projects will be selected primarily based on the degree to which they bring the existing transportation system into a “State of Good Repair”, contribute to a region’s economic competitiveness, livability, sustainability and improve safety. The initial round will provide $1.5 Billion nationwide, with a maximum of $300 million total for any one state. Excepting special circumstances, the minimum grant request is $20 million. Applications are due to DOT on September 15, 2009.

There is tremendous demand for the TIGER program; the State of California collected more than $2 Billion in potential project requests when it polled Caltrans and the regional transportation agencies in late June. The State is compiling a priority project list which will receive the Governor’s endorsement for submittal to the USDOT. Locally, Metropolitan Transportation
Commission (MTC) is coordinating and prioritizing the Bay Area’s submittals to the State.

**DISCUSSION:**

VTA staff submitted three projects to MTC and Caltrans on July 6, 2009:

1. BART Hayward Yard - Expansion and Reconstruction (joint application with BART): $50M
2. Capitol Expressway Light Rail Expansion to Eastridge: $25M
3. Vasona Light Rail Expansion to Vasona Junction: $25M

MTC received 18 project submittals, totaling $584,840,000. MTC staff evaluated the applications based on the federal DOT’s project selection criteria, and MTC’s own ARRA investment principles. On July 22, 2009, the MTC Commission adopted the VTA/BART South Hayward Yard Enhancement project as one of the Bay Area’s four priority projects for TIGER funding.

The South Hayward Yard Reconstruction Project provides for additional storage and maintenance capacity for future BART expansion, including the BART Silicon Valley extension. In addition, this facility is already almost 40 years old and in need of rehabilitation, expansion and modernization to reflect BART’s recently adopted Strategic Maintenance Program. The project submitted to MTC focused on the increased storage needs at the Hayward Yard.

Of the three projects submitted by VTA, this best met the Federal criteria of improving the condition of a significant existing transit system (State of Good Repair), improving safety (for riders and maintenance workers), economic development and energy efficiency (enabling expansion of the BART system to Santa Clara County). Additionally, the project is relatively quick to construct as BART already owns the necessary real estate.

The final application to Federal DOT requires a governing board action showing local support and commitment to the project. The VTA resolution is included with this memo as Attachment A.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action if the Board of Directors wishes to submit the BART Hayward Yard project for TIGER funding.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no immediate fiscal impact to VTA. If this application is successful, an undetermined amount of Measure A expenditure will be funded by ARRA funds.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration and Finance Committee (A&F) reviewed this item at its' August 20, 2009 meeting. The General Manager emphasized to the Committee that the TIGER program is highly competitive, nationwide program with over $2 Billion in potential applications from California alone.

The Committee unanimously recommended this item to the Board for approval.

Prepared by: Marcella Rensi
Memo No. 2186
Resolution No.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
ARRA- TIGER Grant Application for BART Hayward Yard Reconstruction and Expansion Project

WHEREAS,  Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) (herein referred as APPLICANT) is jointly with the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) submitting an application to the Federal Department of Transportation (USDOT) for up to $50,000,000 in TIGER funding from the federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) for the BART-HAYWARD YARD RECONSTRUCTION & EXPANSION project (herein referred as PROJECT); and

WHEREAS,  pursuant to ARRA-TIGER program, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive TIGER funds for a project shall submit an application with the USDOT, for review and evaluation; and

WHEREAS,  APPLICANT is an eligible project sponsor for ARRA-TIGER funds; and

WHEREAS,  as part of the application for ARRA funding, USDOT requires a statement of support adopted by the responsible implementing agency stating the following:

1) That the sponsor understands that the ARRA funding is fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be expected to be funded with additional TIGER funds; and
2) That PROJECT will comply with all the project-specific requirements as set forth in the federal ARRA and appropriate applicable regulations or guidance.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, that APPLICANT is authorized to execute and file an application for funding under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 TIGER program for the PROJECT; and be it further

RESOLVED that the APPLICANT by adopting this resolution does hereby state that:

1. APPLICANT understands that the ARRA-TIGER funding for the project is fixed at the USDOT-approved programmed amount, and that any cost increases must be funded by the APPLICANT from other funds, and that APPLICANT does not expect any cost increases to be funded with additional ARRA-TIGER funds; and
2. APPLICANT understands the funding deadlines associated with these funds and will comply with the applicable provisions and requirements of the ARRA-TIGER Program; and
3. The PROJECT will be implemented as described in the complete application and in this resolution; and
4. PROJECT will comply with all the project-specific requirements as set forth in the ARRA and appropriate applicable regulations or guidance; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for the funds; and be it further

RESOLVED that there is no pending or threatened litigation that might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such projects; and be it further

RESOLVED that APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director, General Manager, or designee to execute and file an application with USDOT for ARRA – TIGER funding for the PROJECT as referenced in this resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the USDOT conjunction with the filing of the application; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is requested to support the application for the PROJECT described in the resolution and to include the PROJECT, if approved, in MTC's TIP.

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

AYES: Directors:

NOES: Directors:

ABSENT: Directors:

___________________________________  ____________________________________
Kevin D. Allmand, General Counsel          Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

APPROVED AS TO FORM: ATTEST:

___________________________________  ____________________________________
Kevin D. Allmand, General Counsel          Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: N/A

FROM: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

SUBJECT: VTA Transformation Program Progress Report

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

On June 1, 2007, I announced a transformation organization structure for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, which incorporated many of the recommendations from the Organizational and Financial Assessment. I directed the executive management team to work with the Transformation Program Director, Karen Antion of KAC Consulting, to develop a Transformation Program, and to implement the program.

Since then, the Transformation Team has been working to execute the tasks listed in the VTA Transformation Program work plan. The attached scorecard enumerates the activities conducted in each area, lead responsibility and staff participation, and accomplishments to date. As the scorecard indicates, work has been completed in most program areas. The Transformation Team has also adopted plans for institutionalizing these changes in VTA’s organization, effectively implementing the recommendations from the organizational and financial assessment.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration and Finance Committee received the report at its meeting of August 20, 2009.

Prepared By: Ann Carey, Executive Assistant to the General Manager
Memo No. 2090
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop a Transformation Project Work Plan and Scorecard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop a Project Work Plan and Scorecard that includes recommendations to be implemented in the Transformation Program managed by KAC.</td>
<td>K. Antion Lead</td>
<td>A. Carey</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Developed the Transformation Project Work Plan; initiated and coordinated a VTA Transformation team; Board approved Phase 1 work plan on 4/5/07, and Phase 2 work plan on 8/30/07.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5/23/07 presentation to A&amp;F Committee: Phase 1 scorecard, Phase 2 work plan. 8/30/07 presentation to Board on accomplishments in the Finance, Organization, and Governance areas, and resulting benefits. Interim progress reports to A&amp;F Committee. Monthly reports to the General Manager. Final Report to A&amp;F Committee on 08/20/09 and Board on 09/03/09.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Manage the Project Work Plan and Report Progress</td>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;F Committee</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Managed the Project Work Plan; provided status briefings and written monthly reports to GM and Project Manager; facilitated bi-monthly VTA Transformation team meetings; convened meetings with VTA staff to address transformation tasks and resolve issues. Directed the work of all subcontractors, including defining scope-of-work and level-of-effort, monitoring progress, and reviewing work products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manage the Project Work Plan and Scorecard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Actively Manage the Project Work Plan and Scorecard, including all Transformation Program tasks, resources, schedule, progress reporting and issue resolution.</td>
<td>K. Antion Lead</td>
<td>A. Carey</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop a Communications Strategy and Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop a Strategy and Plan to improve communications with VTA Stakeholders and Employees</td>
<td>B. Bolger Lead</td>
<td>G. Helm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Communications staff updated annual VTA Marketing/Public Affairs Plan. Hired consultant to provide outside perspective on Communications Strategy and Plan for improving communications with stakeholders and employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Execute near term communication activities that support the plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Developed VTA Board and staff communications regarding transformation; advised on VTA Transformation Plan media releases; Reviewed COA Outreach program; worked with Communications Department on specific COA communication pieces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Execute Communications Strategy and Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Bolger Lead</td>
<td>G. Helm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8/12/2009
# VTA Transformation Program Scorecard

## August 2009

**Status Accomplishments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement Governance Process and Practices to Enable Transformation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an Audit Committee as a Standing Committee of the Board</td>
<td>K. Antion Lead Yes General Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Developed an Audit Committee Charter which was approved by the Board. Worked with General Counsel on language for changes to the Administrative Code and Rules of Procedure to create an Audit Committee as a standing committee of the Board. Revised Administrative Code and Rules of Procedure approved by the Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop an Audit Committee Charter for consideration by the Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Work with the Administration and Finance Committee to finalize and adopt their Committee Charter</td>
<td></td>
<td>A&amp;F Committee</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement an Auditor General function</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes General Manager Audit Committee Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Create a position description for the Auditor General. Recommend this position description to the General Manager and Audit Committee Chair</td>
<td>K. Antion Lead General Manager Audit Committee Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>This project is complete. The selection of the Auditor General has been approved by the Audit Committee of the Board. The Auditor General has proposed a prioritized list of audits which has been approved by the AC and the first 4 task orders have been issued to perform those audits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop a Request for Proposal including a scope of work to procure a firm to provide audit resources, including an interim Auditor General.</td>
<td>K. Antion Assist T. Smith Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work with the Contracts and Materials Management department to procure these services</td>
<td>K. Antion Review T. Smith Audit Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiate Board Training on Duties and Responsibilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Plan, Develop and Conduct Board Workshops:</td>
<td>General Manager A&amp;F Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Participated in strategy and planning sessions with Judy Nadler and Jim Kouzes to develop the Board Vision and Mission Workshop scheduled for November 2007. Developed a message for the GM to communicate to the Board the cancellation of the November workshop and the Scheduling of the Board Summit. Reviewed and provided input to meeting materials submitted by Jim Kouzes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. VTA Vision and Mission</td>
<td>VTA Executive Staff VTA Board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Participated in strategy and planning sessions with the General Manager, Board Secretary, Executive Assistant to the General Manager, Judy Nadler and Jim Kouzes to develop the Board Summit scheduled for February 1, 2008. Developed and recommended to the Chief of External Affairs and the Board Secretary a communications strategy for the Board Summit. Worked with the Board Secretary and Chief of External Affairs to execute the communications strategy for the Board Summit. Facilitated the Board Summit on February 1, 2008. VTA staff created survey to solicit employee input in the development of the Vision and Values statements. Obtained input from all Advisory Committees and A&amp;F committee members. Incorporated input from staff, advisory committees and board members in final draft of Vision, Mission and Values which were adopted by Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review and Evaluate Governance Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Term of Office for Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Worked with Directors Sellers and Casas, the GM, and Policy Advisor to the GM on Governance issues including a strategy and proposal for extending the term of office for Directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Procedures for selection of Directors by city groupings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Worked with Directors Sellers and Casas, the General Manager and his staff to develop a proposal for strengthening VTA’s governance structure as it pertains to the procedures for selection of Directors by city groupings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VTA Transformation Program Scorecard
### August 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formalize Good Governance Practices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Board Orientation Programs for New Board Members</td>
<td>J. Nadler</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>G. Helm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. New Board Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. New Board Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. New Board Committee Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Offer Board Governance Sessions for New Board Members</strong></td>
<td>J. Nadler</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Plan, Develop and Conduct Board Information Sessions for new Board Members:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Ethics and Leadership Camp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Sarbanes-Oxley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Framework for Ethical Decision Making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop and Implement Board Self Assessment Program</strong></td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop a Board Self Assessment Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Present the recommended Program to the Administration and Finance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work with the General Manager and Board Chair to implement the first annual assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve the Quality of Information that the Board Receives</strong></td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Work with the Board Secretary to develop a new template for the Board package that is responsive to the Board’s needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Develop an Annual Work Program for the Board and its Committees</strong></td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Work with the General Manager to develop the Annual Work Program for the Board and its Committees. Present the recommended Work Program to the Board Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Staff from Government Affairs have been conducting briefings for all new board and committee members. In addition, orientation materials have been reviewed and updated, converted to an electronic format. Technology Department exploring potential interactive presentation, in addition to the new on-line format. Training was provided to all advisor committee chairs/co-chairs, including exercises on meeting facilitation and building consensus.
- All board members have been provided with training on fiduciary duties and applicable sections of Administrative Code and Rules of Ethics to guide their decision making as VTA board members.
- Topic included in standard ethics training that all Board members take as required for elected officials.
- Board self-Assessment Program was developed and administered. Board approved procedures for administration of the Board Self Assessment on an annual basis and completed its first self assessment.
- Worked with the Board Secretary and Committee Chiefs to define a new business process for the creation of the Board Agenda and items for the Agenda. Participated in the Board Office automation project. Board meeting agendas have been streamlined to pull majority of items on consent calendar after thorough vetting in Board Standing committees and review in Advisory Committees. Board memos now include section that reflects input received at Advisory Committee and Standing Committee meetings so that Board members do not have to cross reference meeting minutes and wait for verbal presentation on item to know what was discussed in previous meetings. Changes have also been made to memos to clearly call out potential conflicts of interest and to set forth budget/fiscal implications associated with requested action.
- Worked with the Board Secretary to improve the information sent to the Board and to make Board and Committee information accessible to the Board on the VTA Website. To further the VTA sustainability efforts, VTA now provides board/committee packets electronically unless hard copies are requested and in all cases where a large volume report is provided, it is provided as CD to reduce copy costs and waste.
- Worked with the VTA Executives on the development of an annual workplan for the Board and standing committees of the Board.
# VTA Transformation Program Scorecard

**August 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>Team Lead</th>
<th>Level of Effort</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Work with the appropriate Executive Staff to develop an Annual Work Program for each Standing Committee of the Board</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>G. Helm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager, General Counsel</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Work with the appropriate Executive Staff to develop an Annual Work Program for each Advisory Committee of the Board</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>G. Helm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager, General Counsel</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the Number of Advisory Committees</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>G. Helm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager, General Counsel</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Work with the Policy Advisory Committee &amp; the Technical Advisory Committee to consolidate the responsibilities, goals and objectives of the two committees.</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>G. Helm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager, General Counsel</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Recommend to the Administration and Finance Committee a new mission, goals, objectives and work program for a new Policy Advisory Committee that consolidates the responsibilities of the Technical Advisory Committee into the Policy Advisory Committee.</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>G. Helm</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager, General Counsel</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the Conduct of Board and Committee Meetings</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>General Manager, General Counsel</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Work with the Board Chair and the General Counsel and General Manager to review the conduct of Board meetings.</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>General Manager, General Counsel</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Revise rules of procedure to reflect Board decisions concerning conduct of Board meetings.</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>General Manager, General Counsel</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Code/Oath of Office</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>VTA Board</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Revise the Administrative Code to reflect all Board decisions.</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>VTA Board</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Modify the Oath of Office to reflect regional decision making capabilities</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>General Counsel</td>
<td>VTA Board</td>
<td>No NA</td>
<td>Not included in the scope of the approved project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Organization Recommendations</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Develop Roles and Responsibilities for Senior Management Positions</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Develop new Position Descriptions for Executive and Senior Management positions</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Work with Executive and Senior Managers to design and finalize the Transformational Structure</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**VTA Executives and the Board Secretary to develop guidelines for submission of items for action for the standing committees of the Board. Presented the Guidelines for submission of items to the Standing Committee of the Board and the annual Work Plans for the Board and Standing Committees of the Board to the General Manager. Worked with the Board Secretary to develop procedures and a schedule for the monthly revision of the Board Work Plan. Revised the Agenda for the Agenda Review meeting with the General Manager to include a review of the revised annual Board Work Plan. VTA staff working with Board Automation project vendor, to incorporate an agenda/work plan feature in the new automation system.**

**This “Comprehensive Board and Committee Workplan” is now updated on an on-going basis, with 6-month reviews with the Board Chair to ensure alignment with board and agency goals. The Advisory Committees are now reviewing the 6 month plan and focusing on ensuring that items are coming to appropriate committees early in the policy development process.**

---

**As part of the “Advisory Committee Enhancement” (ACE) process, VTA staff have been discussing with ACE Task Force various options for committee consolidation to improve efficiency, use of resources, and communication amongst stakeholder groups. Options include potential merger of one or more committees; it is anticipated that a recommendation will be coming to the A&F committee in September for consideration.**

---

**Training provided for Advisory Chairs and Co-Chairs on effective meeting facilitation and consensus building. Training materials provided to Board Chair on creating “Culture of Inquiry” to improve meeting quality.**

---

**Reviewed and finalized VTA and divisional organization charts**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d. Revise FY07/08 Goals and Objectives to support the new organization structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Review, revise and finalize the FY07/08 Goals and Objectives to support the new organization structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Work with the GM to recruit or appoint the following positions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Assisted the GM and Chief Administrative Officer with the recruiting of key executive positions including the Chief Financial Officer, Chief Information Officer and Chief of External Affairs. Conducted research and contacted executive search firms to assist in the recruiting process. Participated in interview panels for all three positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Permanent Chief Financial Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Participated in interviews and panels with prospective CFO candidates. Successfully completed the recruitment of the Chief Financial Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Chief Information Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Participated in interviews and panels with prospective CIO candidates. Successfully completed the recruitment of the Chief Information Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Chief of External Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Participated in interviews and panels with prospective CEA candidates. Successfully completed the recruitment of the Chief of External Affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Create the Office of External Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Prepared, reviewed and revised the External Affairs organizational chart. Created Office of External Affairs, consolidating Government Affairs, Board Office, and Communications functions under one division. Successfully completed the recruitment for the Chief of External Affairs. Newly created PIO position filled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the Implementation of the Transformational Organization Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Worked with the Chief of External Affairs to finalize the roles and responsibilities for the division managers. Worked with the Chief of the SVRT Program Office, the Chief CMA Officer and the Chief Engineering and Construction Officer on clarifying roles and responsibilities and managing the capital program at a detailed level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Engineering and Construction Division</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>M. Robinson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Consolidate all Engineering and Construction functions (except SVRT) into a new Engineering and Construction Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Construction Division roles and responsibilities for contract accounting and payment processing have been further defined as presented in the Construction Administration Manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Move Construction's contract accounting and payment processing functions into Fiscal Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>• Supported discussion on VTA’s November 2008 ballot measure on the proposed sales tax for BART operations and maintenance. Ballot measure was successful. • Project began Federal environmental clearance process. • Program Office has submitted all required documents for review by FTA for entry into federal New Starts Funding Program. • Set course for activities over the next two years. • Incorporated program budget, scheduled and project design activities into the Program Office. • Continued to administer budget for Freight Railroad relocation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. SVRT Project Office</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>C. Gorot</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Worked with the Chief of the SVRT Program Office and her staff in creating a work plan for the SVRT Program Office. Identified consulting firms with appropriate experience in the FTA New Starts Process and Community Outreach program elements. Participated in discussions to evaluate experience of identified consultants. Worked on development of a contracting strategy. Worked on the development of a strategy for the update of Revenue and Expenditure Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Work with the Chief SVRT Program Officer to create the SVRT Program Office reporting directly to the GM.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Worked with the Chief of the SVRT Program Office and her staff in creating a work plan for the SVRT Program Office. Identified consulting firms with appropriate experience in the FTA New Starts Process and Community Outreach program elements. Participated in discussions to evaluate experience of identified consultants. Worked on development of a contracting strategy. Worked on the development of a strategy for the update of Revenue and Expenditure Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Development &amp; Congestion Management Division</td>
<td>J. Nadler</td>
<td>J. Ristow</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Developed Work Plan for CMA Chief &amp; Division to upgrade visibility as regional player. Worked with the CMA Chief and staff on the scope of services for the development of the RFP for joint development services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Activities</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Recruit a Deputy Director of Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Revised position roles and responsibilities of key Deputy and Manager positions. Worked with the CMA Chief on reviewing a Deputy Director of Development. Reviewed and discussed with the CMA Chief resumes of candidates for the position. Participated on a panel to interview and evaluate candidates for the Deputy Director of Development. Position has been filled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Move Real Estate functions to Fiscal Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Moved FTE to Fiscal Resources for new Grants Accounting position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Merge Policy &amp; Community Relations functions to Government Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Included in the responsibilities of the manager of government affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Administrative Services Division</td>
<td>B. Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Worked with the CAO on transition of management responsibilities within the Technology Division to Administrative Services. Developed and presented a short term plan for addressing near term Technology Department issues. Worked with the CAO and IT Managers to re-prioritize and resource priority technology projects. Participated in strategy sessions with the CAO and IT Department staff on a direction for the upgrade of the SAP system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Transfer IT Department to the Administrative Services Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Operations Division</td>
<td>D. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Fiscal Resources Division</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Balance VTA's 30 Year Revenue and Expenditure Plan</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>1) 2000 Measure A outstanding debt reduced by $72.2 million resulting in reduction of interest expense in FY2008-$2.1 million. 2) VTA has developed a financial planning tool to analyze the Measure A program. At December workshop, staff initiated a discussion with the Board to consider an approach based on a near-term planning horizon, taking into consideration funding commitments already made by the Board, and the volatility and uncertainties surrounding long term forecasts. 3) The total FY10 &amp; FY 11 Measure A Capital Program budget reflects the planned spending over the next two fiscal years. In order to facilitate the transition to this change in methodology, some prior year appropriations were de-obligated from the original project and re-programmed to different projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Develop an effective asset management system</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>1) Implemented a cash management reporting system for all of VTA’s funds. 2) Implemented various cash management procedures improvements resulting in increased cash balances and interest income, such as: Accounts Payable terms and conditions enforced on contracts with annual potential savings of $200,000. Accelerated billings on grants resulting in receipt of $150 million in less than 90 days providing VTA with accelerated investment income of $2.5 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Strengthen financial reporting for VTA decision making</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>1) Quarterly Revenue and Expense Statement reports placed on the Board of Directors agenda for approval. 2) Monthly Investment Reports presented to the Administration and Finance Committee for review. 3) Measure A audited annual report presented to the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Board of Directors for approval. 4) Comprehensive Annual Financial Report presented to the Board of Directors for acceptance. 5) Improved the Budget Variance reporting procedure to include forecasting of year end results. 6) FY08 &amp; FY09 Adopted Biennial Budget process was streamlined with meaningful presentation of the budgets to the Board of Directors. 7) Initiated monthly Capital Project Status Review meetings with Project Managers, Budget Coordinators and various other stakeholders including monthly updates and review of the Capital Project Funding Report to improve communication and information sharing between departments. 8) Streamlined and formalized Fiscal Impact Statement on Board Memos to provide to the Board a more meaningful and consistent explanation on funding sources, appropriation available and operating impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Activities</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>VTA Team Lead</td>
<td>Level of Effort</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Include financial policy as a prominent part of Board fiduciary duty</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Review and revise contract evaluation process and procedures</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Implement vendor scorecards to help staff monitor suppliers and communicate issues to suppliers</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Improve the Budget Variance reporting procedure to include forecasting of year end results</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) OPEB Actuarial Report was presented to the A&F Committee and Board of Directors.

1) Began internal control review to implement the spirit of Sarbanes-Oxley; internal control reviews are underway that are improving and strengthening internal controls policies and procedures. 2) At the March 5, 2009 Board meeting, the Board reaffirmed VTA financial policies by approving a summarized version of financial policy statements.

1) Weekly disclosure to the Board of Directors concerning the volatility of interest rates on the auction rate securities and variable rate demand bonds. 2) The introduction of Enterprise Risk Management analysis for the management decision process as well as project decision making process; categorizing cost estimates as to types of estimates to provide the degree of project definition and the level of uncertainty. 3) Improvement made to the methodology of applying General and Administrative (ICAP) costs to operations and to capital projects. 4) Debt Reduction Funds established with reallocation of cash for both the Enterprise fund and the Measure A fund totaling $116 million. 5) VTA net cash position increase of $204 million between March 31, 2007 and January 31, 2008 net of debt reduction of $72.2 million. 6) Improvements made to the procurement processes for material and commodities purchases; three Cost Plus Fixed Fee contracts converted to Lump Sum contracts resulting in risk mitigation and cost control with lower administration costs for VTA and contractors.

7) Reduced variable interest rate risk on portion of outstanding debt resulting in savings of interest and interest risk on refunding Series F and G bonds totaling $138.5 million from Auction Rated Securities to fixed rate avoiding current variable rate crisis-$9,671 per month for each 1% over the fixed rate of 4.6%. 8) Savings on financial guaranty insurance premium of $12 million over the life of 2006 Measure A, Series F & G Bonds. 9) Portion of VTA Enterprise long-term debt refunded with savings of $1.6 million. 10) Reviewed assumptions for FY10&11 capital and operating budgets with A&F and Board early in the budget preparation process; apprised A&F and Board of significant changes in assumptions and implications for proposed budget; adjusted expenditure plans to account for revised revenue projections.

1) This has been accomplished through the work of the two Process Task Forces we established. Over the past months the Procurement Task Force and the Contracting Task Force have met numerous times to review and improve the process, and have now completed their work. They have developed an extensive contracting/procurement process. Policies and Procedures are being re-written to incorporate those changes and changes that were recommended in the recent FTA Procurement System Review. 2) Selecting Firms From Established Lists Policy and Selecting Firms From Established Lists Procedure which were adopted on June 10, 2009. The purpose of the policy and procedure is to assure that contracts awarded to firms selected from lists that have been established by formal Request for Proposals (RFP) processes are selected using an approved procedure.

The upgraded version of SAP will provide the opportunity to track vendor performance with the SAP System.

Budget Variance reporting with forecasting fiscal year end results being performed manually at the VTA Enterprise level. Full implementation of forecasting will be in place after SAP is upgraded and budget controls changed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ix. Develop financial stability and sustainability strategies</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>In-Process</td>
<td>Debt Reduction Funds established for both VTA Enterprise and Measure A Fund.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Introduce Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) analysis for the management decision process and the project decision making process.</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>In-Process</td>
<td>ERM has been implemented in the Project Request procedure to evaluate projects, to flag and quantify the risks associated with the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. Implement Sarbanes Oxley spirit</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>In-Process</td>
<td>Internal control reviews being performed improving and strengthen external controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. Implement cost estimation definition categories for estimates to provide Management and the Board an order of magnitude for estimates, project or otherwise.</td>
<td>J. Smith, M. Robinson</td>
<td>In-Process</td>
<td>The adoption of AACE (the Association for the Advancement of Cost Engineering) recommended Practice 18R-97 Cost Estimate Classification System for defining the estimate class to the degree of project definition which will allow management and the Board of Directors to have a confidence level of the estimate, the “Cone of Uncertainty”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xiii. Improve the allocation of General and Administrative Overhead to capital projects</td>
<td>J. Smith</td>
<td>In-Process</td>
<td>New Indirect Cost Allocation Plan (ICAP) model developed pending audit by external consultant and acceptance by FTA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Joint Development/Real Estate**

| L. Colosi | Lead | Yes | J. Smith, J. Ristow | Yes |
| Upgraded Position to Deputy Director | Complete | Revised job description for Deputy Director of Development including roles and responsibilities. Participated in successful recruitment effort. |

**Developed SAP Real Estate Module**

| Complete | Implemented SAP Real Estate module |
| Property Portfolio Inventory | In-Process | Project to create a data base and map inventory of VTA development properties has been initiated and scheduled for completion in October 2009 |
| Initiated development of Property Acquisition Database | In-Process | Began development of data base to assist property acquisition tracking for capital projects |
| Re-confirm Board commitment to JD Program | On-Going | Conducted Workshop in January 2007, updated JD polices in April 2009, conduct regular update meetings with City staff and Board members to keep apprised of program activities. |
| Review, update & upgrade policies & procedures | Complete | Updated major revision of JD Policy and Procedures was completed and adopted by Board of Directors in April 2009 |

**Real Estate Portfolio Management**

| a. Request For Proposal |
| i. Develop a Scope of Work and RFP to procure services to strategically manage the acquisition and disposition of VTA real estate | Complete | Recruited and filled Sr Transportation Planner position to manage JD program, completed RFP and selection process to develop contract resources on-call list for all aspects of right of way and real estate related services necessary to support capital program, JD Program and property management of VTA Real Property assets, contracted with right of way consultant team to support SVRT Project and JD Program services as needed. |
| ii. Develop the evaluation criteria for the RFP | Complete | see above a.i. |
| iii. Develop contract terms and conditions for the RFP | Complete | see above a.i. |
| b. Consultant Proposals |
| i. Solicit and evaluate consultant proposals | Complete | see above a.i. |
| ii. Assist with negotiation of contract price, terms and conditions | Complete | see above a.i. |

**Implement VTA Staff Development Programs**

| K. Anton | Lead | B. Lopez | Yes |
| a. Create and implement an Organizational Development Plan, making training a priority | Complete | To strengthen VTA’s ability to achieve organizational goals, the Employee Development team designed a capacity development plan which enhances training as a priority. Implementation requires additional resources to support specific areas such as SAP super user management and customized training support for VTA divisions, supervisory personnel and staff. With the recruitment of a Human Resources Analyst with broad-based skills to manage SAP-related programs and organizational development functions, and subsequent loss of a support staff due to budgetary constraints, the organizational development team adopted a slightly modified plan that requires the service of fewer staff resources while using periodic journey-level professional support employees from other departments as needed. |
# VTA Transformation Program Scorecard

## August 2009

### Status Accomplishments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Level of Effort</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Establish and implement a Performance Management System</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>A streamlined performance management system was developed and implemented for managers and non-represented employees at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2008. This program requires a position-specific description of job duties and performance standards, an evaluation of the employee's effectiveness in achieving goals and standards, and a section for updated goals for the next rating period which incorporate and align personal/professional and organizational objectives. The program also links employee job performance with the level of any pay increases, assuming budget considerations allow. The program also requires a distribution analysis of performance ratings to ensure equity and consistency across divisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Revise and Implement the Executive Management Succession Planning Program</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>In September 2007, the Employee Development team redesigned the Strategic Leadership Development Program (Succession Plan) to assess human capital needs and opportunities as it relates to filling critical positions within the VTA. The revised design is a proactive, long-term, management level strategy for recruiting, selecting, and developing a core group of employees into management positions. The Employee Development also commenced work on a customized succession plan for the Construction team all in line with the transformation plan recommendation. In addition, the Employee Development team created a database of VTA-wide training record, cost and impact to be reported on biannual basis to the GM. The goal of the VTA-wide comprehensive tracking system is to capture the design. Division contacts provide division-specific information on a spreadsheet on (a) types, (b) cost, and (c) benefits of division-level trainings from an enterprise approach and how it impacts or is intended to impact core competencies of participants. The information gathered will assist us identify key needs as it relates to migrating core competencies into a VTA Succession Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Institute workforce planning processes that reflect current and projected workforce needs at all levels of the organization</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Elements of this project activity were addressed through a collaborative process by the transformation team. Issues relating to staffing levels and position control were addressed, and a process for approving the filling critical position vacancies was developed and implemented. An assessment of the age and tenure of the VTA workforce was conducted for the purpose of projecting and planning for the recruitment of key positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Implement Division and Program Specific Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Information Technology</th>
<th>K. Antion</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>G. Miskell</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade the SAP System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Strategic Oversight for SAP Upgrade</td>
<td>K. Antion</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>G. Miskell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request For Proposal</th>
<th>Reviewed plans and contracts for the SAP upgrade, held briefings with the IT management team to review SAP upgrade plans and contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Develop an RFP for consultant services to upgrade the SAP System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## VTA Transformation Program Scorecard
### August 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. Develop the evaluation criteria for the RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Develop contract terms and conditions for the RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Solicit and evaluate consultant proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Negotiate price and contract terms and conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For IT governance, assign separate TSC and TWG leadership</td>
<td>G. Miskell</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
<td>The TWG is being led by the Technology PMO position &amp; Technology Sr. Staff under guidance of CIO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate resource allocation and align existing resources with ongoing projects. Acquire additional resources where necessary</td>
<td>G. Miskell</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked with the CAO to develop a short term plan for addressing near term Technology Department issues. Presented the plan to the General Manager for approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritize internal IT projects and ensure that they are aligned with major capital projects</td>
<td>V. Alvino &amp; IT Sr. Staff</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td></td>
<td>Worked with the CAO and IT Managers to re-prioritize and resource priority technology projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design incentives to retain and recruit SAP professionals</td>
<td>A. Ofrecio</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hired a CIO with experience in SAP and ERP implementation. Working with Recruitment staff to identify best advertising vehicles for recruitment of staff proficient in SAP, including recruitment effort for Technology Manager: Applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hire and/or train staff with experience in the Agency’s key operational applications, such as Trapeze, SCADA</td>
<td>G. Miskell</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Key appointments have been in the Technology Operations unit with employees with experience and proficiency with operational systems, including SCADA and TVM systems. Replacement vacancies remain in this unit at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the IT Strategic Plan</td>
<td>V. Alvino &amp; IT Sr. Staff</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Elements of the existing IT Strategic Plan have been updated, including a) Five Year Network Roadmap &amp; Capital plan; b) Five Year Server Roadmap &amp; Capital plan; and c) Five Year Applications Roadmap &amp; Capital plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### b. Administrative Services Division

#### Develop a Labor Negotiation Strategy in Preparation for Labor Negotiations

| L. Andrews | Lead | B. Lopez | Yes | Complete |

The Board of Directors in June of 2006 adopted an expenditure policy that provided guidance for the VTA in establishing a strategy for labor negotiations. In March of 2007, Employee Relations implemented a strategy building process in anticipation of contract negotiations with ATU to take place beginning November 2007. The team met monthly and refined the proposals and the scope of the negotiations during that six month period. Wages, benefits and work rules where reviewed, proposals written, cost/benefit analyses completed, and arguments developed as part of the preparations for the negotiations. Negotiations were successfully completed in October of 2008 for a three year agreement which achieved management’s primary objectives. This same approach was used to successfully reach agreement with the remaining three employee unions, SEIU, AFSCME, and TAEA, in the Spring of 2009.

#### ATU Attendance Program

| NA | | | | |

It was determined not to include the Attendance Program as a part of the labor negotiations with ATU for a comprehensive labor contract, as it is not part of the contract and can be negotiated at any time. In July 2009 changes were tentatively negotiated with ATU to effect savings; ratification of the changes is pending.

i. Work Rules

| Complete |

Worked with Deputy Directors, departmental managers and associated supervisory staff to identify and prioritize proposed changes to existing procedures. Reviewed proposals with Chief Officers and Deputy Directors of each Division to further evaluate the impact of the changes and make refinements for the final proposals.

ii. Wages

| Complete |

Developed cost estimates for labor negotiations based on current operations and future resource needs in collaboration with the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) and Fiscal Resource Managers. Expenses were based on recommended operational changes, proposed increased utilization of Community Bus Operators (CBO’s) and Part Time Operators for ATU negotiations. For the three administrative unions with contracts expiring in 2009, declining revenues necessitated the negotiation of wage freezes and unpaid employee furloughs.
## VTA Transformation Program Scorecard
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii. Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developed cost estimates for benefit increases based on forecasted future costs and analysis of prior expenditures. Worked with Human Resources Managers and Fiscal Resource Managers to identify cost estimates based on prospective staffing levels. Negotiated increased employee contributions for medical insurance, and increased vesting terms for retiree health care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative Services Division Policies and Procedures have been revised and updated to reflect current organizational structure and processes. The internal review, revision, approval, and publication process has commenced for other VTA Policies and Procedures that have been prioritized by division Chiefs; this will be an ongoing process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Administrative Services policies and procedures to include new functional responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Transitional Work Program continues to produce savings in excess of six figures quarterly in disability benefit payments. There is also a continuing downward trend in both new claims reported and lost work days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Workers’ Compensation focusing on loss control initiatives, vendor use, selection and management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In spring 2007 staff submitted a new unbundled services model for administering Workers’ Compensation claims to the Board. The Board authorized the award of 3 new contracts (for a third party administrator, a medical management company and a bill review service) to create the new program. The vendors were selected through the Request for Proposal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Operations Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Service Planning and Operations Planning functions have been consolidated, the Deputy Director of Service and Operations Planning now responsible for those functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate Q/A and warranty functions in the Maintenance Engineering group</td>
<td>L. Andrews</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>D. Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate operations planning functions under one department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guadalupe has a dedicated Operations Manager for maintenance on site who oversees Light Rail vehicle maintenance and repair, the Way, Power and Signal Dept. &amp; Vehicle Engineering. A 2nd Operations Manager for Transportation oversees the Guadalupe Transportation Division, Bus and Light Rail Operations Control Center personnel, Field Supervision &amp; the Service Delivery group. This Operations Manager is also responsible for the transportation units at Cerone, Chaboya &amp; North &amp; spends a reasonable amount of time at these locations. A 3rd Operations Manager for Bus Maintenance is primarily at Chaboya Division due to the size of the bus fleet &amp; the number of maintenance employees assigned there. This Operations Manager is also responsible for bus maintenance at Cerone Overhaul &amp; Repair facility, Cerone &amp; North &amp; spends a reasonable amount of time at these locations. The staffing works well due to good communication practices. A decision to staff an Operations Manager at each location, as suggested, would require another position to be created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Activities</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Level of Effort</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate operating smaller trains and/or increasing the number of single cars operating during off peak periods</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate Operations staff more fully into the COA</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a general plan for improving the information flow and working relationship between VTA and OUTREACH</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit financial records and databases to ensure that resources are being used efficiently, as allowed by the Agreement between VTA and OUTREACH</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with OUTREACH to ensure OUTREACH’s current reporting &amp; invoicing processes are providing VTA with the information it needs when it needs it</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revisit the Paratransit Business Practice Improvement Plan to identify opportunities for further expense reductions</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fill the Chief of Protective Services position</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move responsibility for grant application &amp; grant management out of protective services department</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renegotiate security contracts with Santa Clara County Sheriff’s and Securitas</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze protective services staffing and deployment</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Level of Effort</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate the service planning functions under one department</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>The Service Planning and Operations Planning functions have been consolidated; the Manager of Service and Operations Planning is responsible for those functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce regular updates regarding the Service Management Plan as an element of the quarterly Transit Operations Performance Reports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>The Quarterly Performance Report is being modified to provide route level performance information. The measure is Boardings per Revenue Vehicle Hour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set productivity standards for light rail service and include these performance measures, by line, in the quarterly reports</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>The new VTA quarterly report will include this information. This quarterly report will begin with the first quarter of 2008.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Contracted Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Level of Effort</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform a comprehensive review of all contracted services and assess the impact of these agreements on internal staff, funding and daily operations</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Light Rail Shuttles - DASH, River Oaks, Great America have been brought in-house under Community Bus program. ACE Shuttles are managed under contract to San Joaquin Regional Rail Authority under full cost recovery including VTA labor. Interagency service agreements are approved by VTA Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review negotiating procedures and set goals/standards for similar contracts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Service Design Guidelines incorporate standards for these services. Contracts Dept. works with Operations on developing agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure that appropriate contractual obligations for data collection, reporting, meeting attendance are in place and being monitored and fulfilled</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>VTA staff reviews agreements and compliance to ensure that involved parties are performing per the agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Engineering and Construction Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Level of Effort</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Engineering and Construction Division</td>
<td>K. Anton</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M. Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop, document and implement a Project Delivery Model that requires collaboration between all divisions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>KAC Project Team</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Update the Construction Division Administration Manual to include current organization structure, roles, responsibilities, policies and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update the Construction Division Administration Manual to include current organization structure, roles, responsibilities, policies and procedures</td>
<td>J. Ristow</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Construction Administration Manual has been revised, reissued, and posted in SOS as of November 2007.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. CMA Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Sustainability Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Board approved policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Operation Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Board approved new bus service plan August 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Transportation Plan Update</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>VTP 2035 was adopted by the Board of Directors in January 2009.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiated Capital Project Planning Phases of BRT, Airport People Mover, Caltrain Improvement &amp; Highway Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Completed Project Delivery Model, which guides organizational roles of VTA Capital Program. Planning phases of capital projects are on-schedule of project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-organized department to align with new responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting new Deputy Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Recruitment of DD is complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed Project Delivery Organization Chart with roles &amp; responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Together with E&amp;C Division completed Project Delivery Model (PDM) to organize and guide VTA Capital Program activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed consistent procedures and practices with Program Management Consultant - SBTA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Completed PDM as well as updated QA/QC process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming &amp; Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-organized roles &amp; responsibilities to prepare for transfer of Grants accounting tasks to Fiscal Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgraded Capital Project Grant support roles &amp; staffing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement CMA fund programming enhancement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Includes required grant recipients to acknowledge VTA as source of funds for projects, improved grant announcement process, formalized grant scoring committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Develop Strategies with the General Manager on Transformation Program Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Activities</th>
<th>KAC Project Team</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Accomplishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td>Level of Effort</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Strategies with the General Manager on Transformation Program Initiatives</td>
<td>K. Anton</td>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 April - June 2009 is attached for review. This report provides the latest status on discretionary funded projects. A project summary sheet highlighting projects with funds expiring 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 expiring in 2009 fall into the "green" category and are progressing smoothly.

The next Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report will be prepared for the quarter between July and September 2009.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE REVIEW/RECOMMENDATION:

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) received this item as part of their respective consent agendas at their August 13, 2009 meetings. There was no discussion of this item in either meeting.
STANDING COMMITTEE REVIEW/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Planning and Programming Committee (CMPP) received this item as part of its consent agenda at its' August 20, 2009 meeting. The Committee did not discuss the item, and forwarded to the full Board for inclusion in the Board's September consent agenda.

Prepared By: Bill Hough
Memo No. 2067
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-Capitol Expressway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL050072</td>
<td>$895,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-Foothill Expressway Bike Improvements under Loyola</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070051</td>
<td>$320,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-Oregon/Page Mill Expressway Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL050075</td>
<td>$1,256,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Under construction.</td>
</tr>
<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 on 1/27/2009-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>Project specs to be re-submitted for Caltrans’ review and approval due to revised RC-UDBE changes that became effect on June 2, 2009.</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>City had its preconstruction meeting with the contractor in early July.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills - El Monte Road Pathway</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070025</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>Completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas-Sr. Abel &amp; Sr. Main Streetscape Imps. - Phase 1</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>SCL070037</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td>02/01/09</td>
<td>City received the E-76 for construction approval from Caltrans.</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 received the E-76 for construction approval from Caltrans.</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 the E-76 for construction approval from Caltrans.</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>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor:</td>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Project Title:</td>
<td>ACE Track Improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Funds ($000)</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALA010015</td>
<td>Construct 8,000 ft. passing siding between UPRR milepost 56.9 &amp; 30.8 in the Livermore Valley.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>10/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Brian Schmidt</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>09/03</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(209) 944-6220</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>00/01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brian@acerail.com">brian@acerail.com</a></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Project: US 101/SR 87 Trimble Road Landscaping

**Project No:** SCL050013

**Project Description:** US 101 from SR 87 interchange to 0.4 km north of Trimble Road. Landscape mitigation.

<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>$23</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Manager Name:** Nick Saleh
- **Phone/Fax:** (510) 286-6355/ (510) 622-5460
- **E-Mail:** nick_saleh@dot.ca.gov
- **Funds Expire:** 6/30/11
- **Last Updated:** 7/8/2007

### Project: Guadalupe, riparian habitat

**Project No:** SCL990041

**Project Description:** Route 87 San Jose - Julian Street to Route 101 - Upgrade 4-lane highway to 6-lane freeway with high occupancy vehicle lanes (monitor riparian habitat)

<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>

- **Manager Name:** Nick Saleh
- **Phone/Fax:** 510-286-6355/510-622-5460
- **E-Mail:** nick_saleh@dot.ca.gov
- **Funds Expire:** 6/30/11
- **Last Updated:** 7/8/2008
**Project Title:** Route 680 Southbound HOV Lane Between Route 84 and Route 237

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: Caltrans</th>
<th>Project Title: Route 680 Southbound HOV Lane Between Route 84 and Route 237</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description: Construct final southbound HOV lane on I-680 between Rte 84 and Rte 237, including aux. lanes &amp; ramp metering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>RTIP $11,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Emily Landin-Lowe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(510) 286-5124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:emily_landin-lowe@dot.ca.gov">emily_landin-lowe@dot.ca.gov</a></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>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$8,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$8,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds Expire</td>
<td>obligated/awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** Under construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: City of Campbell</th>
<th>Project Title: East Campbell Avenue Master Plan Project (BEP Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL070022</td>
<td>East Campbell Ave from Railroad Ave to Union Ave; Reconfiguring intersection, widen the bridge over Los Gatos Creek, install bike lanes where feasible plus landscaping, streetscaping &amp; public art.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/9</td>
<td>2007/9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% design completed. Anticipated construction beginning in 10/09.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Matthew Jue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-866-2154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:MATTHEWJ@ci.campbell.ca.u">MATTHEWJ@ci.campbell.ca.u</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gilroy Pedestrian Enhancement

**Project No:** SCL070010  
**Project Description:** Gilroy: Construct sidewalks and a pedestrian bridge across Miller Sough.  
**Fund Source:** CMAQ $323  
Local $277  
**Manager Name:** Don Dey  
**Phone/Fax:** 408-846-0450  
**Email:** don.dey@ci.gilroy.ca.us

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current Year</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>$20</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $600  
**Last Updated:** 7/13/2009

---

### Gilroy 6th Street Streetscape West/East

**Project No:** SCL070039  
**Project Description:** On 6th St. btw Eigleberry & Monterey St. and Monterey & Railroad Street; streetscape enhancements including decorative sidewalks, curb bulbouts, pedestrian lighting, banners, shade trees, bike racks & street furniture.  
**Fund Source:** CMAQ $1174  
Local $197  
**Manager Name:** Don Dey  
**Phone/Fax:** 408-846-0450  
**Email:** don.dey@ci.gilroy.ca.us

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current Year</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>$48</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $1,174  
**Last Updated:** 7/14/2009
**Adobe Creek Bike and Pedestrian Bridge Replacement (BEP Project)**

**Awarded construction on April 15. Construction will occur during summer 2009.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Los Altos</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Adobe Creek Bike and Pedestrian Bridge Replacement (BEP Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL070028</td>
<td>Bridge that crosses Adobe Creek along the Hetch Hetchy ROW and connects Los Altos with Palo Alto; Replacement bridge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Funds ($000)</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>Completed</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>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA3 $265.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Greiner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>650-947-2623/650-947-2732</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:terry.greiner@ci.los-altos.ca.us">terry.greiner@ci.los-altos.ca.us</a></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Milpitas</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>So. Abel &amp; So. Main Streetscape Imps. - Phase 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Planning</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>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $850</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local $450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Joe Ezeokeke</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 586-3316</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jezeokeke@ci.milpitas.ca.gov">jezeokeke@ci.milpitas.ca.gov</a></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


City of Milpitas
### Project Title: 3rd Street Promenade Project

<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>$378</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fund Source**
- CMAQ-$1,700,000
- Local-$488,000

**Manager Name**
- Yat Cho

**Phone/Fax**
- 408-776-7337

**E-Mail**
- yatc@morganhill.ca.gov

**Project Description**

**Project Title**
- CMAQ-$1,700,000
- Local-$488,000

**Funds**
- **Total:** $4,000

**Funds Expire**
- obliged/awarded

**Last Updated**
- 6/30/2009
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
April-June 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Palo Alto</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Integrated Fueling Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Funds ($000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of 3</td>
<td>01SC04</td>
<td>This project will upgrade the City's CNG fueling facility, add a publicly accessible CNG dispenser, and construct a propane fueling facility.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local $300</td>
<td>TFCA $300 (2001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Karen Bengard</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(650) 329-2636</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.bengard@cityofpaloalto.org">karen.bengard@cityofpaloalto.org</a></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Palo Alto</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Funds ($000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 3</td>
<td>SCL050091</td>
<td>Traffic signal upgrades requiring the installation of hardware and software at 9 major intersections in Palo Alto.</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Earmark $368</td>
<td>Local $98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Sam Peiris</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>650-329-2425</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sam.Peiris@CityofPaloAlto.org">Sam.Peiris@CityofPaloAlto.org</a></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Palo Alto
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th><strong>City of Palo Alto</strong></th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th><strong>Stanford Avenue-El Camino Real Intersection Project</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 of 3</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report April-June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCL070023</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Local ($334)</th>
<th>TE ($1,334)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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>$140</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>4/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>4/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Manager Name | Shahla Yazdy | Design | $0 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>650-617-3151</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>$1,513</th>
<th>09/10</th>
<th>8/10</th>
<th>8/11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| E-Mail | Shahla.Yazdy@CityofPaloAlto.org | Total | $1,668 | |

**Funds Expire** 6/30/2010
**Last Updated** 7/14/2009

City of Palo Alto
### Silicon Valley Transportation Management Center (TMC)

<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>SCL010041</td>
<td>Construct a new regional Traffic Management Center in the SJ Civic Center that will allow for better integration of local &amp; regional traffic management</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Lily Lim-Tsao  
**Design:** 2/09  
**Phone/Fax:** (408) 975-3269  
**E-Mail:** lily.lim-tsao@sanjoseca.gov  
**Last Updated:** 7/16/2009

### San Jose - Various Streets Rehabilitation

<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>SCL050028</td>
<td>Various MTS Roadway Within City Limits: Resurface and rehab various MTS roadway.</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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Manager Name:** Amanda Lei  
**Design:** $1,806  
**Phone/Fax:** 408-277-5516 / 408-277-3621  
**E-Mail:** amanda.lei@sanjoseca.gov  
**Last Updated:** 7/2/2009
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### Almaden Expressway Pedestrian Bridge (BEP Project)

**Project No**: SCL050039  
**Project Description**: 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.

<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>$113</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>9/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **PE E76** received. City has secured SCVWD buy-in and is working with Caltrans to define a modified design approach.

### Project Phase Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/08</td>
<td>9/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund Source

Earmark $496

### Manager Name

Yves Zsutty

### Phone/Fax

(408) 793-5561

### E-Mail

yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov

### Last Updated

5/25/2009

---

### San Jose State University/Japantown Pedestrian Improvements

**Project No**: SCL050061  
**Project Description**: 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).

<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>$59</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- City to issue notice to proceed in July. Construction to start in August 2009 with completion anticipated in January 2010.

### Project Phase Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed</td>
<td>1/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fund Source

CMAQ HIP $1,555  
Local $391

### Manager Name

Rufino Ortiz

### Phone/Fax

(408) 975-3285

### E-Mail

Rufino.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov

### Last Updated

7/14/2009

---

### Sponsor

City of San Jose

### Manager Name

Yves Zsutty  
Rufino Ortiz

### Phone/Fax

(408) 793-5561  
(408) 975-3285

### E-Mail

yves.zsutty@sanjoseca.gov  
Rufino.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov
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#### Silicon Valley TIMC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Sponsor: City of San Jose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>Earmark $6,038, Local $1,510</td>
<td>Devin Gianchandani</td>
<td>(408) 975-3254/ 292-6093</td>
<td><a href="mailto:devin.gianchandani@sanjoseca.gov">devin.gianchandani@sanjoseca.gov</a></td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE/ENV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds ($000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated 7/16/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Lower Guadalupe River 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>Sponsor: City of San Jose</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>CMAQ $1,377, Earmark $11,214, Local $705</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>City of San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PE/ENV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior Years 7/08 1/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right of Way</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds ($000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last Updated 6/25/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**City of San Jose**
### Bay Trail Reach 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</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>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Bay Trail Reach 9</td>
<td>Earmark $675, Local $2,365</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>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$180</td>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>3/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>06/07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** PE underway. Support letters as required by NEPA have been secured. NEPA-related studies being conducted.

### Coyote Creek Trail (BEP Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</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>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Coyote Creek Trail (BEP Project)</td>
<td>Earmark $3,774, Local $5,095</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>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$270</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>9/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>3/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** 1st community meeting occurred April 16. Conceptual alignment has been developed. 2nd community meeting scheduled for August 20.
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### Jackson Street 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>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>Planning</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>2009</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:** Rufino Ortiz, Jr  
**Phone/Fax:** (408) 975-3285  
**E-Mail:** Rufino.Ortiz@sanjoseca.gov

### 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>Schedule</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Sponsor:** City of San Jose  
**Fund Source:** CMAQ $1,300, Local $246  
**Project Phase:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funds ($000):**  
- Planning: $37  
- PE/ENV: $30  
- Right of Way: $0  
- Total: $1,546  

**Funds Expire:** obligated/awarded

**Last Updated:** 7/14/2009

---

**Sponsor:** City of San Jose  
**Fund Source:** CMAQ $550, Demo $1,409, FAU $1,187, TFCA $835 (1998)  
**Project Phase:**  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Funds Expire:** obligated

**Last Updated:** 7/16/2009

---

**City of San Jose**  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Santa Clara</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>San Tomas Aquino/Saratoga Creek Bike/Path, Reach 3 (BEP Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 of 1</td>
<td>Project No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCL050010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project under construction. City expects completion in July 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct grade separated crossings at Central Expressway, Walsh, and SRR tracks within Reach 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RIP $2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noel Lozano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(408) 615-3013/ 985-7936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:nolozano@santaclaraca.gov">nolozano@santaclaraca.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>06/07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
<th>awarded/obligated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total        | $2,000             |
|              |                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>6/25/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

City of Santa Clara
### DeAnza Trail (BEP Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Saratoga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL070026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Saratoga: DeAnza Trail between Saratoga-Sunnyvale Rd and Saratoga Ave; Development and construct bike/pedestrian trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,400 Local $571</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>DeAnza Trail (BEP Project)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $1,400 Local $571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>Start: 2006/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>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 August 2009 again.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>John Cherbone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 868-1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cherbone@saratoga.ca.us">cherbone@saratoga.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saratoga Village Pedestrian Enhancements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor:</th>
<th>City of Saratoga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No</td>
<td>SCL070038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $425 Local $253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Saratoga Village Pedestrian Enhancements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>CMAQ $425 Local $253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Start: 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>City obtained E76 for construction on March 16, 2009, anticipates going out to bid November 2009 and starting construction early 2010.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Macedonio Nunez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-868-1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mnunez@saratoga.ca.us">mnunez@saratoga.ca.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Last Updated | 7/20/2009 |
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## Project No: SCL070050

**Highway 9 Safety Improvements (BEP Project)**

<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>Fund Source</strong></td>
<td><strong>Projects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $462, HSIP $900, Local $160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonio Nunez</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone/Fax</strong></td>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408-868-1218/408-868-1281</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-Mail</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:mnunez@saratoga.ca.us">mnunez@saratoga.ca.us</a></td>
<td>$1,522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning

- **Funds ($000):** $0
- **Programmed Year:** 2008/09
- **Start:** 11/08
- **End:** 1/09
- **Current:**  |

### PE/ENV

- **Funds ($000):** $1,522
- **Programmed Year:** 2008/09
- **Start:** 11/08
- **End:** 1/09
- **Current:**  |

### Right of Way

- **Funds ($000):** $0
- **Programmed Year:**  |
- **Start:**  |
- **End:**  |
- **Current:**  |

### Comments

- City obtained E76 for PE on March 16, 2009.

### Fund Source

- CMAQ $462
- HSIP $900
- Local $160

### Last Updated

- 7/20/2009
## Mathilda Avenue Bridge Replacement

### Project Details
- **Project No**: SCL050006
- **Project Description**: On Mathilda Avenue, over Caltrain/UPRR at Evelyn Ave. Widen structure along both sides, add south bound aux lane, realign, replace.
- **Fund Source**: HHRR (10/11) $28,826 Local $3,735
- **Manager Name**: Manny Kadkhodayam
- **Phone/Fax**: 408-730-7430
- **E-Mail**: mkadkhodayam@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us
- **Funds Expire**: 2013
- **Last Updated**: 7/13/2009

### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current Start</th>
<th>Current End</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$3,522</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$84</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: $33,386

### Comments
- Design 100% complete and submitted to Caltrans. Awaiting E76 for construction.

## Sunnyvale - Various Streets Rehabilitation

### Project Details
- **Project No**: SCL050027
- **Project Description**: Phase 1: Rehab and overlay Mary Avenue, Fair Oaks Ave, Hollenbeck Ave, & Kifer Rd; Phase 2, AC overlay at Shawnee, Commercial, Kifer and Washington
- **Fund Source**: Local $308 STP $2,369
- **Manager Name**: Richard Chen
- **Phone/Fax**: 408-730-7414
- **E-Mail**: rchen@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us
- **Funds Expire**: obligated/awarded
- **Last Updated**: 6/30/2009

### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current Start</th>
<th>Current 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>$10</td>
<td>05/06</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: $2,677

### Comments
- Phase 1, Construction completed in October 2008.
- Phase 2, construction began in July 2009.
### Tasman/Fair Oaks Area Enhancements

<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>SCL070015</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>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$82</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>complete</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>Richard Chen</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$253</td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7414</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2,180</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>02/09 07/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Updated</th>
<th>6/30/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Murphy Ave Streetscape Revitalization

<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>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>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Chuck Neumayer</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$787</td>
<td></td>
<td>completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-730-7834</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$3,981</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7/09 3/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
<th>obligated/awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>6/30/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sponsor: City of Sunnyvale

- **Project Title:** Tasman/Fair Oaks Area Enhancements
- **Project Title:** Murphy Ave Streetscape Revitalization

---

City of Sunnyvale
# Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
## April-June 2009

### Sponsor: County of Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Capitol Expressway Rehabilitation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL050072</td>
<td>Capitol Expressway between SR 87 and Seven Trees Blvd; minor repair of any failed roadway areas, and place microsurfacing surface treatment.</td>
<td>Oregon/Page Mill Expressway Pavement Rehab</td>
<td>Construction contract awarded on 4/21/2009, currently under construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Local $117</th>
<th>STP $895</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local $166</td>
<td>STP $1,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Manager Name | Design | | 
|--------------|--------|
| Mike Griffis | $0 | complete |

| Phone/Fax | 408-573-2447/408-441-0276 |
| E-Mail | mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org |

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

| Total | $1,012 |
| Funds Expire | obligated/awarded |
| Last Updated | 6/25/2009 |

---

### Sponsor: County of Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Oregon/Page Mill Expressway Pavement Rehab</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Local $166</th>
<th>STP $1,256</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local $117</td>
<td>STP $895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Manager Name | Design | | 
|--------------|--------|
| Mike Griffis | $0 | complete |

| Phone/Fax | 408-573-2447/408-441-0276 |
| E-Mail | mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org |

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

| Total | $1,422 |
| Funds Expire | obligated/awarded |
| Last Updated | 6/25/2009 |

---

### Sponsor: County of Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Oregon/Page Mill Expressway Pavement Rehab</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Local $166</th>
<th>STP $1,256</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local $117</td>
<td>STP $895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Manager Name | Design | | 
|--------------|--------|
| Mike Griffis | $0 | complete |

| Phone/Fax | 408-573-2447/408-441-0276 |
| E-Mail | mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org |

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

| Total | $1,422 |
| Funds Expire | obligated/awarded |
| Last Updated | 6/25/2009 |

---

### Sponsor: County of Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Project Title:</th>
<th>Oregon/Page Mill Expressway Pavement Rehab</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Local $166</th>
<th>STP $1,256</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local $117</td>
<td>STP $895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Manager Name | Design | | 
|--------------|--------|
| Mike Griffis | $0 | complete |

| Phone/Fax | 408-573-2447/408-441-0276 |
| E-Mail | mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org |

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

| Total | $1,422 |
| Funds Expire | obligated/awarded |
| Last Updated | 6/25/2009 |

---

### County of Santa Clara

---
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### Various Non-Expressway Rehab

**Project No**: SCL050076  
**Project Description**: Various non-expressway roadways; Rehabilitation of pavement on various federal-aid eligible arterial/collectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget Sources</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Local $222  
STP $1,701 | Khoa Vo      | 408-494-1329/408-297-0530 | khoa.vo@rda.sccgov.org | Various Non-Expressway Rehab | Earmark $3,020  
Local $780 | Planning | $0 | | |
| | | | | | PE/ENV | $25 | 07/08 & 08/09 | complete | |
| | | | | | Right of Way | $0 | | | |
| | | | | | Planning | $25 | 07/08 & 08/09 | complete | |
| | | | | | Design | $25 | 07/08 & 08/09 | complete | |
| | | | | | Construction | $1,973 | 07/08 & 08/09 | 9/09 2/10 | Funds Expire | obligated | |
| | | | | | Total | $2,023 | | | Last Updated | 6/25/2009 | |

**Oregon-Page Mill Expressway Improvements**

**Project No**: SCL050080  
**Project Description**: Traffic improvements including traffic signal upgrade, optimizing timing plans & bike and pedestrian facilities on Oregon-Page Mill Expressway between US 101 and SR 82.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Budget Sources</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Earmark $3,020  
Local $780 | Mike Griffis | 408-573-2492/408-441-0276 | mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org | Oregon-Page Mill Expressway Improvements | | Planning | $0 | | Conceptual engineering is underway |
| | | | | | PE/ENV | $0 | 12/08 5/09 | |
| | | | | | Right of Way | $300 | | | |
| | | | | | Planning | $0 | | | |
| | | | | | Design | $300 | 06/07 6/09 10/09 | | |
| | | | | | Construction | $3,700 | 08/09 12/10 12/11 | | Funds Expire | no expiration | |
| | | | | | Total | $4,300 | | | Last Updated | 6/25/2009 | |

**Sponsor**: County of Santa Clara  
**Notes**: Phase 1 construction complete. Phase 2 project specs to be re-submitted for Caltrans' review and approval due to revised RC-UDBE changes that became effect on June 2, 2009. Anticipated project advertisement in August/September and award in September/October 2009.
### Almaden 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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7/08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>$300</th>
<th>06/07</th>
<th>9/08</th>
<th>3/10</th>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
<th>no expiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$4,679</td>
<td>07/08 &amp; 08/09</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>Funds Expire</td>
<td>no expiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-573-2492/408-441-0276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<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>Schedule</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>2006</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 | Design | $36  | 2006 | complete | | | |
| Phone/Fax    | 408-573-2492 | | 2009 | 8/09 | 4/10 | Funds Expire | obligated |
| E-Mail       | dan.collen@rda.sccgov.org | | | | | | |

Total: $5,429

Last Updated: 6/25/2009

**Comments:**
- Property acquisition and design underway.
- Funds Expire: no expiration

### Sponsor: County of Santa Clara

**Fund Source:**
- Earmark $2,642
- Local $2,215

**Fund Source:**
- CMAQ $249
- Local $25
- TDA3 $125

**Manager Name:**
- Mike Griffis
- Dan Collen
**Project Description:**
Improve bike lane safety on Foothill Expressway at the Loyola Drive underpass.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL070051</td>
<td>CMAQ $320</td>
<td>Mike Griffis</td>
<td>408-573-2447/408-441-0276</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org">mike.griffis@rda.sccgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Title:**
Foothill Expressway Bike Improvements under Loyola (BEP Project)

<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>SCL070051</td>
<td></td>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$12 2009</td>
<td>Current: completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL070051</td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funds ($000):**
- **CMAQ $320**
- **Local $145**
- **Total $465**

**Funds Expire:**
- Obligated/awarded 6/25/2009
### Diridon Station Track/Signal/Terminal Upgrade

**Project No:** JPB991001  
**Project Description:** 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $6,593</td>
<td>The IFB documents for the construction contract that includes the South Terminal and Santa Clara Station Improvement projects were finalized by the end of June and the construction contract will be advertised during the next quarter. The start date for the construction phase is December 2008, which was the award date for the contract for demolition, removal of hazardous materials and site preparation work at the South Terminal. The completion of the construction contract is projected 01/02 &amp; 02/03.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joel Slavit</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>01/02 &amp; 02/03</th>
<th>12/08</th>
<th>12/11</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(650) 508-6476</td>
<td>$10,056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/2/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:slavitj@samtrans.com">slavitj@samtrans.com</a></td>
<td>$10,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Caltrain/ACE Santa Clara Train Station

**Project No:** SCL991060  
**Project Description:** Rebuild the track and passenger platforms and construct track connections to enable ACE trains to stop at the Santa Clara Station.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMAQ $3,098 (2006)</td>
<td>This project has been combined with work at the Diridon Station. IFB documents for the construction contract were finalized by the end of June and the construction contract will be advertised during the next quarter. The start date for the construction phase at the Santa Clara Station is December 2009 with the completion of the construction contract remaining as December 2011, with project close-out by June 2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joel Slavit</td>
<td>$701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>01/02</th>
<th>12/09</th>
<th>12/11</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(650) 508-5476</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td></td>
<td>01/02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7/2/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-Mail</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:slavitj@samtrans.com">slavitj@samtrans.com</a></td>
<td>$3,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

## April-June 2009

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTC990005</td>
<td>Planning, programming &amp; monitoring activities in the San Francisco Bay Area.</td>
<td>AB3090 $346 (06/07) RTP $133 (07/08) RTP $229 (08/09) RTP $29 (06/07) RTP $44 (04/05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Kao</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkao@mtc.ca.gov">kkao@mtc.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(510) 817-5768</td>
<td>$662</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>AB3090 - $346 allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06 &amp; 06/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP $58 allocated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/08</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP $30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09</td>
<td></td>
<td>RTP $120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCL978008</td>
<td>STP 3% set-aside for planning purposes.</td>
<td>Local $271 STP-G $3,943</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manager Name</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Kao</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkao@mtc.ca.gov">kkao@mtc.ca.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(510) 464-7842</td>
<td>$4,214</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99/00 to 04/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing program managed by MTC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99/00-01/02</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 99/00-01/02: STP $2,141,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 02/03: STP $452,000 - oblig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/04</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 03/04: STP $671,000 - oblig. 9/3/03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 04/05: STP $679,000 - oblig. 8/12/04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/06</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 05/06: STP $690,000 - oblig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/07</td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 06/07: STP $700,000 - oblig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funds Expire</th>
<th>Last Updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/1/09</td>
<td>10/10/2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
April-June 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: VTA</th>
<th>Project Title: STIP Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL010004</td>
<td>STIP Planning, Programming and Monitoring - Santa Clara County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>RTIP $547 (08/09) RTIP $547 (09/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Amin Surani Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>(408) 546-7989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amin.surani@vta.org">amin.surani@vta.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor: VTA</td>
<td>Project Title: US-101/Tully Road Interchange Modifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Project Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Earmark $7,000 Local $25,020 Other: I-BOND-CMIA $30,000 Other: ST-CASH-T2 ($955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Ven Prasad Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-321-5647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ven.prasad@vta.org">ven.prasad@vta.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programmed Year** | **Current** | **Comments** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmed Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programmed Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**
- Funds Expire obligated
- Last Updated 4/15/2009
## Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report

### April-June 2009

#### Project No: SCL070002

### Project Description:
Interchange improvements at the I-280/I-880/Stevens Creek Blvd interchange.

#### Fund Source:
- City of SJ $1,500
- Earmark $19,549
- VTA LPR $500

#### Manager Name:
Sajeeni DeAlwis-Mima

#### Phone/Fax:
408-952-4175

#### E-Mail:
Sajeeni.DeAlwis-Mima@vta.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>3/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>06/07</td>
<td>3/10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments:
- E-76 for PE received.

#### Total Funds:
$23,630

#### Last Updated:
7/10/2009

---

#### Project No: SCL070016

### Project Description:
San Jose/ Milpitas: On I-880 btw SR 237 & US 101; Operational and safety improvements including widening to accommodate HOV lanes in both directions.

#### Fund Source:
- Local ($23,400)
- Other I-Bond/CMIA ($71,600)

#### Manager Name:
Lam Trinh

#### Phone/Fax:
408-952-4217

#### E-Mail:
Lam.Trinh@vta.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$8,100</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>06/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments:
- Project is approved-completed PAED phase on 6/26/2009. 35% PS&E completed with 65% plans to be done in 10/2009.

#### Total Funds:
$95,000

#### Last Updated:
6/30/2009
## Project 1: US101 Auxiliary Lanes - SR85 to Embarcadero Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: VTA</th>
<th>Project Title: US101 Auxiliary Lanes - SR85 to Embarcadero Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No: SCL070024</td>
<td>Project Description: Santa Clara County: US 101 between Route 85 and Embarcadero Road; Construct auxiliary lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Local ($17,328) Other: I-bond/CMIA ($84,930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>PE/ENV ($3,534) 2008 07/07 07/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Right of Way ($6,612) 2009 07/09 11/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Lam Trinh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-952-4217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lam.trinh@vta.org">lam.trinh@vta.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report</td>
<td>April-June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Current Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>02/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>06/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Draft PSR/PR &amp; ED approved 2/2009. PAED phase is on schedule for completion in July 2009. 35% PS&amp;E completed with 65% plans to be done in 10/2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>6/30/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project 2: Route 152 new alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor: VTA</th>
<th>Project Title: Route 152 new alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No: SCL090016</td>
<td>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 &quot;trade corridor&quot; study from 101 to SR99.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>IIP $5 Local $5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Planning $10 08/09 6/09 3/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>PE/ENV $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Source</td>
<td>Right of Way $0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager Name</td>
<td>Darrell Vice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone/Fax</td>
<td>408-952-4214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:darrell.vice@vta.org">darrell.vice@vta.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report</td>
<td>April-June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmed Year</td>
<td>Current Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>Funds allocated by CTC in 12/2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated</td>
<td>7/6/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report
## April-June 2009

### Project: SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors

- **Project No**: SCL090029
- **Project Description**: Implement roadway pricing on the carpool lane-to-carpool lane direct connectors between SR 237 and I-880.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$3,960</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>5/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Manager Name**: Leo Scott
- **Phone/Fax**: 408-321-5972
- **E-Mail**: leo.scott@vta.org
- **Funds ($000)**: Total $7,960

- **Fund Source**: ARRA $2,700, Local $1,300, VPPP $3,960

- **Comments**: Funds Expire 7/9/2009

### Project: Santa Clara Caltrain Station Pedestrian Grade Separated Crossing

- **Project No**: SCL090031
- **Project Description**: 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>Funds ($000)</th>
<th>Programmed Year</th>
<th>Current</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE/ENV</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>10/08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Manager Name**: Ken Ronsse
- **Phone/Fax**: (408) 952-4129
- **E-Mail**: ken.ronsse@vta.org
- **Funds ($000)**: Total $0

- **Fund Source**: CMAQ $1,468

- **Comments**: CMAQ funds have been transferred to FTA. Funds Expire 4/21/2009

---

VTA Valley Transportation Authority
# I-880 Smart Park Project

**Project No:** SCL991013  
**Project Description:** Develop Smart Park at Tasman Drive and other I-880 Smart Corridor locations which incorporates various ITS features.  
**Fund Source:** CMAQ $780 (2000)  
Local $165  
**Manager Name:** Keith Roan  
**Phone/Fax:** (408) 321-7109  
**E-Mail:** keith.roan@vta.org  
**Funds Expire:** 6/10/2010  
**Sponsor:** VTA  

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

**Total:** $945  

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

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

## Integrated ITS Program

**Project No:** SCL991057  
**Project Description:** Develop an integrated Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) for VTA services.  
**Fund Source:** 5208 ITS $1,573 (2000)  
Local $629  
**Manager Name:** Keith Roan  
**Phone/Fax:** (408) 321-7109  
**E-Mail:** keith.roan@vta.org  
**Sponsor:** VTA  

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

**Total:** $2,202  

**Programmed Year**  
**Current**  

Federal audit completed.  
Pursuing contract negotiations with vendor.  
Estimated started date September 1, 2009.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Development Review Program Enhancements & Proactive CMP Report April-June 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.

These programs have been ongoing for more than a decade with occasional minor changes in how the data is reported. Staff has recently conducted an assessment of the Development Review Program and the Proactive CMP Report with the goals of building on its current strengths and improving its effectiveness. The initial results of this assessment, and a summary of ongoing and planned enhancements, are included in the discussion below. Following the discussion of enhancements is a summary of the April through June 2009 Proactive CMP Quarterly Report. The summary is intended to allow the reader to quickly access key elements and highlights contained in the report.
**DISCUSSION:**

**Overview of Development Review Program Enhancements**

The Development Review Program is fundamental to VTA’s role of promoting land use-transportation coordination. When considering building more livable communities and addressing congestion, VTA and Member Agencies share common goals. The current Development Review Program, even with its significant achievements, can be made more effective in helping VTA with its active role in achieving these goals. Accordingly, staff has conducted an assessment of the Program to enhance its effectiveness and value. The objectives of the enhancements are:

- Make VTA’s comments more useful to land use decision-making bodies and developers;
- Build stronger partnerships with Member Agencies in development review and land use decision processes, and enhance VTA’s advocacy role in supporting transit, pedestrian, and bicycle-friendly developments; and
- Advance VTA and Member Agency goals of compact mixed use development around transit, multimodal transportation options, a balanced approach to addressing congestion, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions;

These enhancements are following three parallel paths of development: improving reporting and internal processes; expanding outreach and influence; and conducting targeted research. Short-term efforts have been started and are expected to conclude in fall 2009. The longer-term activities will be initiated this year and may take 6 to 12 months to complete. The Proactive CMP Quarterly Report, provided as Attachment A, reflects the results of some of these initial enhancement efforts.

**Summary of the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report - April through June 2009**

Building on the steps described above, this Proactive CMP Quarterly Report for April through June 2009 (provided as Attachment A) includes several improvements. The report contains a new summary table and a new location map of all the projects reviewed. This is followed by the usual sections (Part 1 and Part 2 and a Glossary) as noted in the Background section above.

The following are highlights of several items in this edition of the Proactive CMP Report:

- VTA commented on 26 projects between April and June 2009. The largest number of projects were in the City of San Jose (6 projects), the City of Milpitas (5 projects) and the City of Mountain View (3 projects).

- Of the 26 projects upon which VTA commented, 18 were environmental documents, with a roughly even split between Notices of Preparation (NOPs), Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs), and Negative Declarations or Mitigated Negative Declarations. The remaining 8 documents were other planning submittals such as site plans, rezoning applications or informal review documents.

- Six out of the 26 projects upon which VTA commented, or almost 25%, were transportation
or infrastructure-focused projects. This includes 2 safety improvement projects on Caltrans rural highways, a pedestrian/bicycle overcrossing and undercrossing project in Mountain View, a recycled water pipeline project in Palo Alto, a jet fuel pipeline near San Jose Airport, and a regional electric transmission line project. The percentage of transportation or infrastructure-related projects in the April-June quarter was significantly higher than the previous quarter, when only 10% of the projects (2 out of 19) had this focus.

- Five projects for which VTA previously provided comments were approved during this quarter, including projects in Alameda County (Union City and Fremont), Milpitas, Mountain View, Palo Alto, and Santa Clara.
  - In June 2009, the Alameda County Transportation Authority (ACTA) approved the East-West Connector Project, a new/widened roadway connection between Paseo Padre Parkway and Mission Boulevard. VTA staff had requested clarification of whether this project was expected to change traffic volumes on several key roadways in Santa Clara County including Dixon Landing Road, Calaveras Boulevard, Tasman Drive, and Montague Expressway. The ACTA responded that any change in traffic conditions from the proposed project on these roadways is expected to be insignificant.
  - In June 2009, the Milpitas City Council approved the McCarthy Ranch Mixed Use project, on North McCarthy Boulevard between SR 237 and Dixon Landing Road. This project involves completing the final phase of the development program in the McCarthy Ranch Master Plan, including an Industrial Park development program at a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of up to 0.50, with a modification to accommodate General Commercial at a FAR of 0.23 on one of the three sites. VTA staff’s comments on the Draft EIR included a suggestion that the City consider requiring the developer to contribute to shuttle or local bus service to the site, implement ‘Immediate Action’ Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, and pay a fair-share contribution to the SR237/I-880 Express Connectors project. In its resolution approving the project, the City Council required the project to provide bus transit facilities, project-provided or fair-share contribution to shuttle service, and bicycle incentives and storage facilities. Consideration of fees or contributions to roadway improvements was deferred until the City completes and adopts its Deficiency Plan.
  - In June 2009, the Mountain View City Council approved the Grant Road/Levin Avenue residential development, which allows 54 single-family residences on 14.6 acres. This project will include the construction of six new public streets including sidewalks and landscape strips throughout the development, which is adjacent to VTA Local Bus Route 51.
  - In June 2009, the Palo Alto City Council approved the Palo Alto Recycled Water Project. This project is the next increment of the Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant’s (RWQCP) ongoing expansion of its recycled water system. The proposed project would mainly serve the Stanford Research Park Area and would include installation of a recycled water pipeline, a booster pump station, and a pump station at the RWQCP. In the City's response to VTA's comments on the Draft EIR, it clarified the specifics of the
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Traffic Control Plan that will be used during construction, and confirmed that the City will return any damaged road surfaces - including bus stop facilities - to pre-construction conditions or better.

- In April 2009, the City of Santa Clara Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit for the Airborne Gymnastics project on 1515 Walsh Avenue. In its response to VTA's comments on the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the City confirmed that the project will make a fair-share contribution to the conversion of the HOV lane to a mixed-flow lane at the Central Expressway/Lafayette Street intersection, as identified in the Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study.

Committee Input and Future Proactive CMP Reports
At their May and June meetings the Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) received a presentation and commented on proposed enhancements to the Development Review Program. At this month's meetings staff will provide a presentation on the proposed enhancements and solicit feedback from PAC, TAC and CMPP committee members. Staff will assess committee input and continue to develop refinements. Over the next several quarterly reporting cycles staff will introduce additional enhancements through committees as appropriate.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was on the regular agenda at the August CAC, BPAC, TAC and PAC meetings, and staff gave a brief presentation at each meeting. A CAC, a member asked for a clarification of one item in the Proactive CMP Quarterly Report, and another member offered positive feedback on the new report format. At BPAC, the group discussed the most common bicycle and pedestrian-related comments that VTA staff make in the context of the Development Review Program and members offered suggestions for how to improve and prioritize comments. At TAC, Chair Witthaus gave positive feedback on VTA's Development Review Program and said it added value for the City of Sunnyvale by serving as a type of "peer review"; he also encouraged VTA staff to reach out to City staff to make sure VTA's comments are as relevant as possible. At TAC, there were no questions or comments on this item.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee received a brief presentation on this item at the August meeting. Member Pyle offered positive feedback on the enhancements to the program, and Member Herrera offered positive feedback and stated that she looks forward to the brief staff updates on key projects in future quarters. Chairperson Liccardo stated that targeted research and data on trip generation rates or parking utilization, from Santa Clara County or similar urban settings, would be very useful. He also asked to what extent cities listen to VTA's comments through this program. Staff responded that VTA's comments meet with mixed success, but staff is seeing positive trends. Staff noted that it is difficult to track how Conditions of Approval are implemented due to the long lead times involved in development, especially in the current down real estate market; VTA will need to work with cities to track outcomes over time. General Manager Burns suggested that in the future VTA might use some
type of funding incentive to encourage Member Agencies to make better land use decisions.
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## Development Review Projects Summary
### April - June 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>Caltrans</td>
<td>CT0901</td>
<td>State Route 152 Hecker Pass Safety Improvement Project</td>
<td>Widen existing lanes to improve line of sight for motorists in 5 narrow or curving sections</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Bicycle accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>CT0902</td>
<td>State Route 9 Safety Improvement Project</td>
<td>Construction of improvements at three spot locations</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Bicycle accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>CU0901</td>
<td>Rosebowl</td>
<td>Public Improvements (bus stop improvements) for mixed-use development</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Bus stop improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>GI0904</td>
<td>Forest Street Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial development including 260 hotel rooms, 2 restaurants, and a 4-level parking structure</td>
<td>Neg. Dec.</td>
<td>Land use mix &amp; site design, bus service, pedestrian access, bicycle accommodations, freeway LOS, trip reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>LA0901</td>
<td>Community Center Master Plan.</td>
<td>Demolition and reconstruction of the Los Altos Community Center</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Transportation analysis, transit service &amp; pedestrian access to transit, bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>LG0901</td>
<td>Los Gatos General Plan Update</td>
<td>General Plan Update</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Land use/transit integration, multimodal streets/circulation analysis, roadway LOS standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</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 Warning</td>
<td>Freeway analysis, transit analysis, bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>ML0802</td>
<td>Milpitas Square Mixed Use Development</td>
<td>Phased construction of 900 residential units and an additional 12,800 SF of commercial space at existing shopping center</td>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>Transp. impacts &amp; mitigation measures, bus stop improvements &amp; other transit measures, bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>ML0807</td>
<td>McCarthy Ranch Mixed Use</td>
<td>Construction of 1.07 million SF of office and 407,000 SF of commercial on 58.5 acres.</td>
<td>DEIR/FEIR (project approved)</td>
<td>AQ &amp; climate change mitigation, site design, trip distribution, RR crossing, TDM, freeway impacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>ML0902</td>
<td>Milpitas Walmart Expansion Project</td>
<td>Addition of ~18,500 SF of building area to an existing Walmart store</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Pedestrian accommodations, bicycle parking, bus service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>ML0903</td>
<td>Bikeways Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Update to the City's 2002 Bikeways Master Plan</td>
<td>Neg. Dec.</td>
<td>Neg. Dec. recommended improvements, traffic impacts; Master Plan document edits</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>12</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>ML0904</td>
<td>2009 Housing Element Update</td>
<td>Update of the Milpitas General Plan Housing Element</td>
<td>Neg. Dec.</td>
<td>Transportation benefits and impacts, correction to text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</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>Site density &amp; land use mix, auto parking, bicycle accommodations, site design &amp; proximity to transit, TIA report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>MV0903</td>
<td>Permanente Creek Trail - overcrossing and undercrossing</td>
<td>Ped/bike overcrossing of US101 and undercrossing of Old Middlefield Way</td>
<td>IS – Mitigated Neg. Dec.</td>
<td>Coordination, land use &amp; planning, biology, temporary lane closures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>MV0904</td>
<td>Verisign TOD</td>
<td>TOD Permit for 101,760 SF office building directly adjacent to the Middlefield light rail station</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Site density, auto parking, bicycle accommodations, transit/ped. plaza and sidewalks, bus service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>PA0901</td>
<td>Palo Alto Recycled Water Project</td>
<td>Installation of recycled water pipeline, pump station at Regional Water Quality Control Plant</td>
<td>IS – Mit. Neg. Dec. (project approved)</td>
<td>Traffic Control Plan, impacts to bus service, VTA contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>SC0901</td>
<td>Airborne Gymnastics Relocation</td>
<td>Use permit, tenant improvements to an existing industrial warehouse facility</td>
<td>Mitigated Neg. Dec. (project approved)</td>
<td>Pedestrian access to transit, Intersection LOS impacts and mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>SC0902</td>
<td>Scott Boulevard Office Project</td>
<td>Demolition of 2 vacant industrial buildings and construction of 5-story, 215,520 SF office building</td>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>Site design &amp; ped. access, bicycle parking, TDM, intersection LOS &amp; mitigation, bus service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0715</td>
<td>Calderon's Tires Public Improvement Plans</td>
<td>Bus Stop Improvements assoc. with Public Improvement Plans for Calderon's Tires project</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Bus stop dimensions &amp; design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0824</td>
<td>Ohlone Mixed Use</td>
<td>PD Rezoning to allow up to 800 multi-family residences and 30K SF of comm. uses on 8.23 acres</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Transportation analysis, transit/bicycle/pedestrian system, parking, TDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0902</td>
<td>Lincoln-Willow Commercial</td>
<td>41,457 SF mixed-use development (office over retail) on 2.08 acres</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>Transit service, bus stop, site density &amp; site design, TIA report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0903</td>
<td>Santa Clara and 3rd Streets Residential Development</td>
<td>Conversion of 2nd-5th Floor of an existing building from office to single-room occupancy residential</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>Vibration impacts related to BART project, bus service, transit incentives</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>23</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0905</td>
<td>SJ International Airport Jet Fuel Pipeline</td>
<td>2-mile long underground jet fuel pipeline from Airport Fuel Farm to existing Kinder Morgan San Jose Terminal to the northeast</td>
<td>Neg. Dec.</td>
<td>Review of plans, construction access permit, restricted access permit, Roadway Protection Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0906</td>
<td>Ford Road Family Housing</td>
<td>PD rezoning for 95 affordable multi-family housing units on 3.06 acres</td>
<td>PD Rezoning</td>
<td>Land use &amp; site density, TIA report, bicycle accommodations, TDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SJ/Evergreen Community College District</td>
<td>SJEG0801</td>
<td>San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update</td>
<td>Draft Subsequent EIR for the San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2021</td>
<td>Draft Subsequent EIR, TIA</td>
<td>Land use &amp; transit access, TDM, bicycle parking, bus service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Transmission Agency Northern CA (TANC)</td>
<td>TANC0901</td>
<td>TANC Transmission Project</td>
<td>Building/upgrading transmission lines, substations, related facilities in Northern CA, including portions of Santa Clara County</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Construction Access Permit, Restricted Access Permit/Safety Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>ACTA0801</td>
<td>East-West Connector Project</td>
<td>Widen existing roadway, construct new roadway</td>
<td>FEIR (project approved)</td>
<td>Congestion on CMP facilities – clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>MV0809</td>
<td>Grant Road/Levin Avenue Residential</td>
<td>54 single-family residences on 14.6 acres</td>
<td>FEIR (project approved)</td>
<td>Bus service, site density &amp; transit, pedestrian &amp; bicycle accommodations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### State Route 152 Hecker Pass Safety Improvement

**In Santa Clara County, from the Santa Cruz County Line to approximately 0.17 miles east of Watsonville Road**

**Description:** Widen existing lanes to improve line of sight for motorists in narrow or curving sections of the traveled way at 5 locations within the project limits.

**VTA Comments:**
- **Transportation/Circulation - Bicycle Accommodations:**
  - The EIR, and the accompanying roadway designs, should take into consideration the needs and safety of cyclists. The EIR should document the existing utilization of this portion of SR 152 by cyclists, and discuss any benefits or impacts the proposed roadway modifications are expected to have on cyclists. The EIR should also address the consistency of the proposed roadway modifications with the 2008 Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan as well as any other relevant plans and policy documents.

### State Route 9 Safety Improvement Project

**Santa Clara County and Santa Cruz Counties between SR 17 and the Saratoga Gap Open Space Preserve**

**Description:** Construction of improvements at three spot locations.

**VTA Comments:**
- **Transportation/Circulation - Bicycle Accommodations:**
  - The EIR, and the accompanying roadway designs, should take into considerations the needs and safety of cyclists. The EIR should document the existing utilization of the relevant sections of State Route 9 by cyclists, and discuss any benefits or impacts the proposed roadway modifications would have on cyclists. The EIR should also address the consistency of the proposed roadway modifications on the 2008 Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan as well as any other relevant plans and policy documents.
**City of Cupertino**

**Agency File #** CU0901  
**CMP ID** Other  
**Type of Document** Other  
**Document Received** 6/2/2009  
**VTA Response Date** 6/18/2009

### Rosebowl
Southeast corner of Wolfe Road and Vallco Parkway

**Description:** Public Improvements (bus stop improvements) for mixed-use development.

**VTA Comments:**

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) staff have reviewed the proposed bus stop improvements for the Rosebowl mixed use development at the southeast corner of Vallco Parkway and Wolfe Road. The bus stop improvements were submitted to us by Caitlin Gilmore of Sandis. We have the following comments.

After discussion with Sandis and City staff, it has been agreed that the following bus stop improvements will be provided for the bus stop on Vallco Parkway:

1. A bulb-out style bus stop will be provided in order to minimize impacts to the parking area along Vallco Parkway.
2. There will be a 45-foot distance between the edge of the curb ramp and the new bus stop sign. The bus stop sign will be 2 feet behind the face of curb.
3. A PCC bus stop pavement pad will not be provided. The City has agreed to assume responsibility for maintenance of the pavement area at this bus stop location.

---

**City of Gilroy**

**Agency File #** GI0904  
**CMP ID** NegDec  
**Type of Document** NegDec  
**Document Received** 5/21/2009  
**VTA Response Date** 6/22/2009

### Forest Street Commercial
Northeast corner of Leavesley Road and Forest Street

**Description:** Commercial development including 260 hotel rooms, 2 restaurants, and a 4-level parking structure.

**VTA Comments:**

Land Use Mix and Site Design:

VTA supports the proposed land use mix and intensification of use on an infill site located near Monterey Street and several transit routes. Monterey Street is designated as a Corridor in VTA’s countywide Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework. VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework 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 cities and the county.
Existing Transit Services:
The Transportation Impact Analysis, submitted as an appendix to the Mitigated Negative Declaration/Initial Study, contains incorrect information about two existing VTA bus routes in the vicinity of the project. Figure 5 and the text on page 13 of the TIA show VTA Routes 68, 121 and 168 stopping at both bus stops nearest to Leavesley Road along Monterey Street. Please note that VTA Express Routes 121 and 168 both serve the stop near the intersection of Howson St. & Monterey St., but these routes do not serve the stop to the north, near the intersection of Ronan Ave. & Monterey St. The latter stop is only served by VTA Local Route 68.

Pedestrian Access:
VTA commends the project applicant for including a diagram of Existing Pedestrian Facilities in the TIA for the project (Figure 4); this figure is very helpful in highlighting gaps in the existing sidewalk system. VTA supports the requirement, on page 46 of the Mitigated Negative Declaration, for the applicant to construct frontage improvements including a sidewalk along the entire project frontage along Leavesley Road and Forest Street. VTA also supports the creation of a safe, convenient and direct system of pedestrian walkways within the project site, as a way of encouraging pedestrian trips within and to/from the site. We suggest that the City require the applicant to provide direct pedestrian paths from the sidewalks to building entrances, separate from the driveways for automobiles.

Bicycle Accommodations:
The Mitigated Negative Declaration does not appear to address bicycle parking within the project site. 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. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Freeway Level of Service Analysis:
The VTA TIA guidelines call for the documentation of freeway analysis determination. Please include freeway segment analysis of Hwy 101 and SR 152 as part of the TIA and also ensure that the freeway level of service data from the 2007 Monitoring and Conformance Report is used to do the analysis.

Trip Reductions:
For Table 9 (Project Trip generation rates and estimates of the draft transportation impact analysis), a 22% pass-by reduction was used for Sit-Down Restaurant. Page 30 of the TIA guidelines states that all vehicle trip reductions must be clearly explained, documented and justified. VTA requests inclusion of the reason for the 22% trip reduction.
Community Center Master Plan
West side of North San Antonio Road, generally between Angela Drive and Hillview Avenue

Description: Demolition and reconstruction of the Los Altos Community Center.

VTA Comments:

Transportation Analysis:
VTA is pleased to see that the proposed project will include improvements to the Edith Avenue/San Antonio Road/Main Street intersection on the western boundary of the project site, and that a Traffic Infusion on Residential Environments (TIRE) analysis to evaluate the effects of increases in traffic on neighborhood streets will be completed. VTA requests that the City of Los Altos coordinate with VTA to use input data from the VTA county travel demand model in the transportation analysis for the EIR.

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 the CMP.

Transit Service & Pedestrian Access to Transit:
VTA local bus Route 40 serves the project site with two stops within a short walk along San Antonio Road. This route provides important transit connections between portions of Los Altos, Foothill College in Los Altos Hills and the City of Mountain View. The EIR should address the role of transit in providing access to the site, as well as the project’s impacts on the transit system.

Maintaining and enhancing pedestrian connectivity from neighborhoods is important to supporting transit use and promoting walking and bicycling to the project site. 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. VTA requests that the EIR address pedestrian connectivity at the Edith Avenue/San Antonio Road/Main Street intersection, as well as at other connections to the surrounding neighborhoods.

Bicycle Parking:
The EIR should address bicycle parking for Community Center employees and other users. 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. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.
**Los Gatos General Plan Update**  
**Entire town**  

**Description:** General Plan Update.

**VTA Comments:**

**Land Use/Transit Integration:**  
VTA requests that the EIR and the General Plan Update process address the relationship between land use and transit in the Town, particularly as it relates to the future planned extension of the Winchester light rail line to Vasona Junction. VTA encourages the Town to consider policies that would intensify land uses and foster a multimodal transportation system. These measures can be an important way of supporting existing transit service and building demand for enhanced transit service and infrastructure in the future.

VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use, as well as VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy & Service Design Guidelines, contain recommendations for transit-supportive land use densities in light rail station areas and along bus transit corridors. These documents may be a helpful reference point for discussion in the Town’s General Plan Update and accompanying EIR process.

**Multimodal Streets in Circulation Element/Circulation Analysis:**  
VTA encourages the Town to adopt a multimodal approach in the Circulation Element portion of the General Plan Update, and to consider all modes in addressing mobility and congestion in the EIR Circulation Analysis. VTA operates bus service and maintains bus stops along many street corridors addressed in the Circulation Element. Consideration should be given to including enhanced transit stop amenities, transit priority treatments, supporting pedestrian improvements, and bicycle accommodations on key multimodal streets. These improvements would help make alternative modes more attractive for Los Gatos residents and workers and help reduce single-occupant automobile travel in the City.

**Circulation Analysis - Roadway LOS Standards:**  
The Circulation Analysis in the EIR should include a discussion of the roadway LOS standards applicable in the Town of Los Gatos. In our review of the Transportation and Circulation chapter of the General Plan Update Background Report, we found that the discussion of Current LOS Standards (page 12-2) did not clearly explain the relationship between the Town’s LOS standard and the VTA Congestion Management Program LOS standard. We suggest that the City clarify this discussion in future General Plan update materials, as well as in the EIR document.

VTA would like to work in partnership with the Town of Los Gatos in its General Plan update process. We would be happy to attend key meetings and present information on our CDT program, our Transit Sustainability Policy, the Congestion Management Program, or other VTA programs or efforts. Please do not hesitate to contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division to discuss how we can work with you in this process.
**Description:** Demolish 6 houses and construct a 30,000 SF library on a 1.86-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**

Freeway Analysis:
The VTA TIA Guidelines call for the documentation of freeway analysis determination. Please include a freeway segment analysis of Hwy 17 as part of the TIA and also ensure that the freeway level of service data from the 2008 Monitoring and Conformance Report is used to do the analysis.

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. Per the VTA TIA Guidelines, this TIA should include an analysis of transit facilities and service. This 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:
We suggest that the TIA and the project plans address provisions for bicycle parking. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the library use. 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 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 the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division.
**Milpitas Square Mixed Use Development**

**East side of Barber Lane at the terminus of Bellew Drive**

**Description:** Phased construction of 900 residential units and an additional 12,800 square feet of commercial space to an existing shopping center (bringing the total retail square footage to 167,000); option of a 380 room hotel in place of 205 dwelling units.

**VTA Comments:**

Transportation Impacts & Mitigation Measures:

VTA recommends early coordination in the planning process between the Lead Agency and the affected jurisdictions, specifically VTA and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in addressing the identified significant and unavoidable traffic impacts to the Congestion Management Program (CMP) and Caltrans intersection and roadway facilities. VTA supports the current policy that requires developers to pay their fair share of the improvement costs to mitigate the anticipated cumulative impact of traffic from new developments on future deficient roadways as cited on page 49 of the Final TIA Report. In addition, it is VTA’s understanding that the city of Milpitas is developing a citywide deficiency plan to identify local and regional transportation improvements. Please make sure that the improvements are consistent with the deficiency plan and with other future projects in the area.

As mentioned above, Section 4.2 of the DEIR notes that the proposed project would have several Significant Unavoidable impacts to the transportation system in the vicinity of the project. Given these impacts but also considering the potential benefits of the project in terms of improving the jobs-housing balance in Milpitas and reducing commute distances, the City and the applicant should strive to reduce the project’s impacts by promoting the use of alternative transportation modes to the greatest extent possible. The following sections discuss specific measures to promote alternative transportation use.

Bus Stop Improvements and other Transit Measures:

There are two bus stops across the street from the proposed project that will provide the closest access to transit. The bus stops are: 1) Westbound Bellew Drive, west of Barber Lane; and 2) Southbound Barber Lane, south of Bellew Drive. The bus stop on Bellew Drive is located in a narrow curb lane with a 5-foot wide sidewalk. There is a bike lane in the traffic lane adjacent to the Barber Lane bus stop. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to provide the following improvements for both bus stops:

* A bus duckout (per VTA standards)
* An 8’ x 40’ passenger waiting pad
* Locate all trees or obstacles outside the bus loading zone
* Provide adequate lighting for the bus stop area
Given that encouraging the use of mass transit and reducing commuting by automobile is one of the basic objectives for the proposed project (DEIR p. 32) and that proximity to transit is cited in other portions of the DEIR (Consistency with Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy on p. 45, Energy Efficiency and Use on p. 184), it seems reasonable for the applicant to provide these relatively low-cost bus stop improvements as a way of encouraging the transit use by project residents and visitors. VTA recommends that the City require these bus stop improvements as condition of approval of the project.

Similarly, the Air Quality section of the DEIR (p. 105) includes “explore options to share or provide shuttle service to the Tasman light rail station” and “provide Eco-passes to all new residents” as reasonable and feasible measures that would reduce air pollutant emissions from the project. VTA recommends that the City require these measures as conditions of approval of the project. VTA requests that the applicant and the City coordinate with VTA on these transit-related measures as the project advances through the development process.

Bicycle Parking:
The mitigation measures listed in MM TRANS-9 and MM AQ-1.1 include bicycle facilities and bicycle parking. However, the project description and the site plan in the DEIR make 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.

<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>

**McCarthy Ranch Mixed Use**

**N. McCarthy Boulevard between SR 237 and Dixon Landing Road**

**Description:** Construction of 1.07 million square feet of office and 407,000 square feet of commercial on 58.5 acres.

**VTA Comments:**

Air Quality and Climate Change - Mitigation 5-2:
VTA supports the inclusion of this mitigation measure as a way of addressing both the air quality and transportation/congestion impacts of the proposed project. We request that the City require these items, including the project-provided or fair share contribution to shuttle service to regional transit stations, as a Condition of Approval of the project. As noted in the DEIR, VTA’s local bus Line 33 runs on McCarthy Boulevard just south of the project site; there may be an opportunity for this project and other developments within the McCarthy Ranch Master Plan area to develop a financial partnership to help fund community or local bus service. We request that the City track this shuttle/transit requirement in its mitigation monitoring for the project, and consult with VTA as the project moves towards implementation.
Transportation/Circulation - Site Design:
VTA recommends that as the design for this project progresses, consideration should be given to transit-, pedestrian-, and bicycle-friendly design principles. This should specifically include how the commercial development on Parcel C will accommodate transit vehicle circulation (whether for shuttles, local buses or community buses). VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual is a valuable reference regarding how to incorporate transit accommodations into the site design, as well as other transit, pedestrian and bicycle-friendly design guidelines. We request that the developer and the City consult with VTA on incorporating transit into the design as the project moves towards implementation.

It should be noted that there are also bus stops located along McCarthy Boulevard in the project area that were installed but have not yet been used. These bus stops should be preserved for future use in the case that bus or shuttle service runs service in this direction along McCarthy Boulevard.

Trip Distribution:
Figure 14.7 Project Trip Distribution: Please provide the distribution factor on Dixon Landing.

Railroad Crossing at Dixon Landing and Warm Springs Blvd:
There are over 1,700 east bound vehicles at Dixon Landing/Warm Springs Blvd intersection. Please include traffic analysis to show whether if a grade separation over the railroad is warranted.

Immediate Implementation Action List:
The Draft EIR notes that the project will cause significant freeway impacts as well as air quality and climate change impacts. In this case, as noted in the Immediate Implementation Action List in Appendix D of VTA's TIA Guidelines, the project should undertake Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures aimed at reducing the number of vehicle trips generated by the project. Such TDM measures can 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
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Employee Services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Restaurants
<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>

**Milpitas Walmart Expansion Project**

**Bounded by North McCarthy Boulevard, Ranch Drive, McCarthy Ranch Marketplace**

**Description:** Addition of ~18,500 SF of building area to an existing Walmart store.

**VTA Comments:**

- **Pedestrian Accommodations:**
  
  The DEIR should address pedestrian accommodations on the site, including the adequacy of sidewalks, paths and crosswalks through the parking lot areas as well as pedestrian connectivity to adjacent land uses. VTA recommends that special attention be paid to pedestrian connections to the bus stops near the project site as well as to North McCarthy Boulevard, particularly given the significant new office development planned to the west of the site in the Campus at McCarthy Ranch project. VTA suggests that the site plan be modified to include a pedestrian path from the southwest corner of the store to the sidewalk on North McCarthy Boulevard.

- **Bicycle Parking:**
  
  The DEIR should address bicycle parking for store employees and customers. 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](http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes). For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

- **Bus Service:**
  
  There is an existing bus stop adjacent to the project on eastbound Ranch Drive, east of McCarthy Boulevard. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA requests the City to condition the developer to provide the following bus stop improvements:

  * Bus stop to remain at current area.
  * Provide a 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout per VTA standards
  * Provide an 8’ x 40’ passenger waiting pad
  * Install a 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad per VTA standards
  * Install a bus shelter and a 7’ X 20’ PCC shelter pad behind the sidewalk/passenger waiting pad
  * Locate all trees and landscaping outside the bus loading area.
**Bikeways Master Plan Update**

**Description:** Update to the City's 2002 Bikeways Master Plan.

**Citywide**

**VTA Comments:**

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) staff have reviewed the Negative Declaration for Milpitas Bikeways Master Plan Update, as well as the accompanying Master Plan Update document. Our comments on the two documents are summarized below:

**Negative Declaration:**

Section I - Project Description/Recommended Improvements:
VTA supports the proposed improvements to the Class I, Class II and Class III bicycle networks in the City of Milpitas, as well as the proposed improvements in wayfinding, bicycle-actuated traffic signals, and bicycle parking. These measures are consistent with the goals of the Congestion Management Program including reducing roadway traffic congestion and promoting a more balanced multi-modal transportation system.

Section XV - Transportation/Traffic Impacts:
VTA supports the intent of the proposals to reduce vehicle lanes along Dixon Road and North Park Victoria Drive and add Class II bicycle lanes to these roadways. These improvements would create a more balanced, multi-modal transportation system in Milpitas and improve the attractiveness of bicycle as a transportation option. While we recognize that these improvements would require further analysis before implementation (including analysis of impacts on automobile congestion), we do not anticipate congestion impacts to CMP facilities at this point.

**Bikeways Master Plan Update document:**

Executive Summary - The estimate of almost 800 bicyclists per day seems low for many reasons; it does not include those commuting to Milpitas employment sites from outside the City, and it only includes commute and school trips which the BATS has estimated to be only about 25% of all bicycle trips. As this plan states on page 5-6, there are many other trips taken by bicyclists. Possibly this statement is only meant to reflect the number of Milpitas residents who are bike commuters, but that is still under reporting all the other commuting by non residents and other utilitarian trips.

Section 3.8 - Please acknowledge all the waterways, particularly Coyote Creek south of SR 237 as well as the other creeks, in addition to the barriers listed.

Section 4.4 - Plans - Please reference the 2008 VTA Countywide Bicycle Plan and its recommendations.

Section 4.1.2 - Please clarify which roadways these are over, and indicate in figure 4-1, and clarify the following statement which is internally inconsistent: "TASP calls for ... the construction of two pedestrian/bicycle bridges over Montague Expressway, one over the proposed BART alignment near Piper Drive, and one bridge over northbound Capitol Ave."

Selected Projects Reviewed by VTA

Page 11 of 27
Section 4.2.5 - 10-4.06 Off Street Parking Regulations:
Current zoning for Bicycle parking: five percent (5%) of automobile stalls required in R4 and R5 zoning. It is recommended to base bike parking supply on land use size, not percentage of auto parking; please refer to the VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines (BTG) for more information.

Section 5-4 - It is not advisable to lump children in with adults in a discussing "party at fault" in bike collisions. In Table 5-3, adult cyclists and child cyclists should be separated out and then the comparison should be shown, otherwise no meaningful conclusions can be drawn, since this table is essentially comparing child cyclists to adult motorists The majority of reported bicycle collisions show the bicyclist to be at fault due to not obeying basic traffic laws. These often involve younger bicyclists riding on the wrong side of the road or being hit broadside by a vehicle at an intersection or driveway.

Section 6.4.1 - Bike Parking:
VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide extensive information and guidelines on bicycle parking types, quantities and locations, and we suggest that the BTG be referenced in the Master Plan Update document. In addition, we suggest referencing VTA’s bicycle e-Locker program in the discussion of e-Lockers. The text should note that there are now 12 e-Lockers using smart cards at the Great Mall Transit Center.

Section 6.2 - Bicycle detection at "actuated" traffic signals is now California law per AB 1581, effective Jan 1, 2008.

<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>

**2009 Housing Element Update**

Citywide

**Description:** Update of the Milpitas General Plan Housing Element.

**VTA Comments:**
Transportation Benefits and Impacts of Housing Element Update:
VTA strongly supports the direction of the City’s Housing Element Update in focusing the vast majority of housing activity within the Transit Area Specific Plan and the Midtown Specific Plan area. This direction will ensure that a greater proportion of housing in Milpitas is located near transit facilities and routes in the future, which will result in reduced dependence on single-occupant automobile travel and greater reliance on alternative transportation modes. VTA agrees with the assessment in the Initial Study checklist (p. 35) that “while development of additional housing would increase traffic, it would also make public transit access easier/more convenient to a higher residential population and further strengthen the potential for further enrichment of the transit network.”

Correction to Text:
The text in the Introduction, page 1, paragraph 3, states that Figure 1 shows Current Projects and that Figure 2 shows Opportunity sites. However, Figure 1 is actually Opportunity Sites and Figure 2 is Current Projects.
425 & 455 W. Evelyn Avenue

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

VTA Comments:

Site Density and Land Use Mix:
VTA supports the proposed site density (59 du/acre) on this important site located directly across the street from a regional transit station in downtown Mountain View, which is designated as a County Core in VTA’s countywide Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework. VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework 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.

VTA encourages the developer and the City to consider incorporating a small component of ground-floor retail into the project along Evelyn Avenue, given its proximity to transit. This would encourage an active, pedestrian-oriented street face, and could benefit the residents of the development, the users of the Mountain View Transit Center, and the surrounding neighborhood.

Automobile Parking:
VTA supports the reduced parking ratios that are proposed for the project, as shown in Sheets A0 and A7 of the informal review plan set, consistent with the standards in the Evelyn Corridor Precise Plan. This reduction in parking ratios is consistent with the site’s extremely close proximity to transit, the pedestrian and bicycle orientation of the neighborhood, and the proximity to retail and services.

Bicycle Accommodations:
VTA commends the developer for including secure bicycle parking for residents of the project as well as bicycle parking for guests. 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. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Site Design & Proximity to Transit:
VTA recommends that the developer advise residents of the new development that there will be a high volume of transit activity in the Mountain View Transit Center area with Caltrain, LRT, buses and in the future high-speed rail using the Caltrain alignment. Thus there may be noise issues and the developer should mitigate with adequate sound proofing. Depending on timing of projects there may be construction of high-speed rail and a Mountain View station parking structure in the vicinity of the proposed development.

VTA encourages the developer to consider providing wider sidewalk along the sides of the project facing Bush Street, Villa Street, and the new public street than are currently shown on Sheet A6, given the pedestrian activity generated by its proximity to the Transit Center.
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.

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>MV0903</td>
<td>IS/Mitigated NegDec</td>
<td>5/14/2009</td>
<td>6/1/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Permanente Creek Trail - Route 101 Overcrossing and Old Middlefield Way Undercrossing**
West of US 101 and Old Middlefield Way interchange

**VTA Comments:**
Section I - Coordination, p. 8:
Please replace text in 4th paragraph with the following:
"VTA is currently in the project approval and environmental documentation phase of the Route U.S. 101 Auxiliary Lanes Project. This project proposes to construct auxiliary lanes, lengthen existing HOV lanes, widen several ramps, and install ramp metering on U.S. 101 between State Route 85 and Embarcadero Road. Construction is anticipated to begin in 2011."

Section IIA - Land Use & Planning, p. 9:
Comment to A.1 and A.2: Please describe whether the project will conflict with the plans of Caltrans in coordination with VTA to improve U.S. 101 in the vicinity of this project. In particular, whether the placement of a column in the median of U.S. 101 will reduce the amount of right-of-way available for the improvements or require a design exception from Caltrans' standards.

Section IIG - Biology, p. 23:
Comment to G.4: Reference to authorization from the Corps under Section 404, should probably be CDFG since work may need to occur above and not below the OHWM.

General Comment:
The IS/MND should discuss any temporary lane closures to U.S. 101 and/or Old Middlefield Way anticipated during construction.
Verisign TOD
575 E. Middlefield Road, between Ellis St and SR 237

Description: TOD Permit for 101,760 s.f. office building directly adjacent to the Middlefield light rail station.

VTA Comments:

Site Density:
VTA supports the intensification of use (to a 0.5 FAR for the campus) on this important site located directly adjacent to the Middlefield light-rail station, which is designated in VTA’s countywide Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework. VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework 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.

Automobile Parking:
VTA supports the modest reduction in parking ratios proposed for the project site, as shown on Sheet A1.01 of the review plan set, consistent with the TOD overlay designation in the City’s zoning ordinance. This reduction in parking ratios is consistent with the site’s extremely close proximity to transit, and the good pedestrian and bicycle orientation of the site and surrounding area.

Bicycle Accommodations:
VTA commends the developer for including a bike plaza and secure bicycle parking (bicycle lockers) in the development plans. 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 the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Transit/Pedestrian Plaza and Sidewalks:
VTA commends the developer for including the extensive transit/pedestrian plaza in front of the new building, as well as the pedestrian path improvements elsewhere on the site. We suggest that the developer and City consider incorporating wider sidewalks along the entire length of the VeriSign frontage along East Middlefield, a relatively modest measure that would improve the pedestrian environment for VeriSign employees and other pedestrians in this important transit-oriented district.

Bus Service:
The proposed project incorporates a bus duckout on Middlefield Road. However, the dimensions of the duckout are substantially undersized for bus service.

The design of the duckout should be revised to meet the minimum dimensions of 50-foot approach, 55-foot tangent, and 50-foot merging taper with 10-foot depth per VTA bus duckout design standards and technical specifications.
We recommend that the developer submit a revised plan to VTA for review and approval prior to construction. VTA staff would be happy to assist the designer with the bus stop layout should any assistance be needed.

<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>

**Palo Alto Recycled Water Project**

**Central Palo Alto, RWQCP**

**Description:** Installation of a recycled water pipeline, a booster pump station, and a pump station at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP).

**VTA Comments:**

Traffic Control Plan:

VTA requests the opportunity to review the full traffic control plans when they become available in order to determine if there are potential impacts to CMP facilities during construction.

We also recommend a media campaign to notify the public about the duration of the construction, lane closures, and potential detour routes.

We recommend prohibiting construction before 9 a.m. and after 3 p.m. since the peak hour traffic on some of the CMP facilities in the area starts around 3 p.m.

Impacts to Bus Service:

Mitigation Measure TRA-1 requires that damaged road surfaces be returned to pre-construction conditions or better. We assume this includes bus stop facilities also.

Once the final pipeline route is determined, VTA would like to review it to determine which bus routes and bus stops will be impacted.

VTA Contacts:

If construction involves cutting through a VTA PCC bus stop pavement pad, a Construction Access Permit will be required and the project should include this requirement in the Special Conditions of the contract. The contractor should be directed to contact Debbie Dionne, Permits and Utility Locating Services, at (408) 321-5824.

If temporary relocation of bus stops is needed, the contractor should contact Steve Newgren at (408) 952-4106 at least 72 hours in advance.
**Airborne Gymnastics Relocation**  
1515 Walsh Avenue

**Description:** Use permit for a gymnastics facility in conjunction with tenant improvements to an existing industrial warehouse facility.

**VTA Comments:**

Pedestrian Access to Transit:

As noted in Section XV of the Initial Study, several bus routes and shuttles operate in the study area, and the closest bus stop is located along Scott Boulevard, about 0.2 miles from the project site. The Initial Study and Transportation Impact analysis (TIA) report indicate that sidewalks/pedestrian facilities currently exist along the project frontage between Scott Boulevard and Lafayette Street. However, from the site plan in the Initial Study it is not clear whether a sidewalk exists or will be retained directly on the project frontage on Walsh Street. If a sidewalk does not currently exist, the City may wish to consider requiring the project to construct a sidewalk to improve pedestrian access to transit from the project site.

TIA - 4.5-2 - Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service Impacts and Mitigation - Central Expressway and Lafayette Street:

The TIA Report indicates that the proposed project trips would cause a significant impact at the intersection of Central Expressway/Lafayette Street for the project conditions. VTA supports the proposed fair share contribution towards the mitigation measure of the conversion of the HOV lane to a mixed flow lane as identified in the Countywide County Expressway Planning Study to improve this CMP intersection.

---

**Scott Boulevard Office Project**  
3240-3450 Scott Boulevard

**Description:** Demolition of two vacant industrial buildings totaling 114,00 SF and construction of a new 5-story, 215,520 SF Class A office building.

**VTA Comments:**

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...
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 <http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes>. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

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

Transportation System Planning and Design
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 cross walk 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.

Bus Service:
VTA provides bus service along Scott Boulevard and maintains a bus stop adjacent to the project site on eastbound Scott Boulevard, opposite Octavious 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
### Calderon's Tires Public Improvement Plans

**Description:** Bus Stop Improvements associated with the Public Improvement Plans for Calderon's Tires project.

**VTA Comments:**

VTA concurs with the recommended approach by VER Consultants modify the plans to accommodate Caltrans requirements for construction of the tapers and transitions for the bus pad. The plans will still include VTA standards for construction of the bus stop pavement pad. We have the following specific comments:

- The shorter side of the bus stop pavement pad with angled transition (the side furthest from the curb) should measure a minimum of 55 feet.
- The angled approach and merging transition for the bus stop pavement pad per Caltrans standards is acceptable.
- The structural cross-section and materials for the bus stop pavement pad per Caltrans standards is acceptable.
- All trees should be placed outside of the bus loading area (the current drawing shows a tree well in the sidewalk adjacent to the bus stop).

### Ohlone Mixed Use

**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 Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for this Project at the southwest corner of West San Carlos and Sunol Street which would include up to 800 condominium/apartment and live-work residential units and 30,000 square feet of ground-level retail space on an 8.23 gross acre site. Prior to specifying comments on the Notice of Preparation, 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 regarding the scope and content of the environmental information to be included the Draft EIR:

Transportation Analysis:
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 will 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 specific VTA comments on the TIA for this Project, including CMP intersections to be analyzed, traffic count data, and freeway and expressway analysis, please refer to our comments on the TIA Notification form on March 4, 2009. For more information on VTA TIA-related guidelines, please contact Shanthi Ganji of the CMP.

Transportation Analysis - Transit, Bicycle and Pedestrian System:
The EIR should include information about the existing transit, bicycle and pedestrian system in the Project area, and an analysis of the Project’s relationship to these facilities. VTA recommends that the EIR transit analysis include an assessment of access from the Project to the Race Street light rail station and VTA bus routes in the Project area and the transit ridership benefits of the Project.

The EIR bicycle and pedestrian analysis should ensure that existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities are not impacted by the proposed Project, and should identify opportunities for improved bicycle and pedestrian access, including what facilities may be provided as part of the Project. Based on the information on page 5 of the Notice of Preparation, VTA supports the new site plan and circulation system which results in the creation of three small urban blocks, with new east-west pedestrian connections through the site. VTA encourages the Project applicant to design the site in such a way that these east-west connections are open to the general public in addition to residents of the development.

Transportation Analysis - Parking:
The EIR should include an analysis of Project parking for both automobiles and bicycles. VTA suggests that the applicant consider reduced automobile parking ratios for the residential portion of the Project given its proximity to high-frequency transit service, as well as the possibility of shared parking arrangements. VTA also recommends that the applicant consult VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines for guidance on estimating supply, siting, and design of bicycle parking facilities.
Transportation Analysis - Transportation Demand Management (TDM):
The Transportation analysis in the EIR should include consideration of TDM measures that could reduce the number of single-occupant vehicle trips generated by the Project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to this 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 Services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Restaurants
* Spaces for Car-sharing vehicles

As we noted in our letter on the PD Rezoning Application for this Project on December 2, 2008, this development represents a significant opportunity for the applicant, the City and VTA to work together to promote a transit- and pedestrian-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.

We would be happy to discuss our comments on this Notice of Preparation with you, and look forward to working together with the City as this development progresses through the environmental review and entitlement processes in the coming months.

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>SJ0902</td>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>5/4/2009</td>
<td>5/12/2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lincoln-Willow Commercial**
Southeast corner of Lincoln and Willow

**Description:** 41,457-square foot mixed-use development (office over retail) on 2.08 acres.

**VTA Comments:**
Transit Service:
VTA provides bus service on Willow Street and maintains a bus stop on Willow Street adjacent to the project site. The existing travel lane where the bus stop is located is 17 feet wide which can cause a conflict between dwelling buses and through traffic on Willow Street. If the center line
remains at the existing location, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to provide the following improvements:
* Provide, at minimum, a modified 5-foot deep bus duckout with 25-foot approach taper, 55-foot tangent and 25-foot merging taper on Willow Street on the far side (east of) Lincoln Avenue. The duckout may begin at the curb return or past the existing tree near the intersection.
* Provide a 10-foot wide monolithic PCC pavement pad for the duckout (5 feet inside the duckout and 5 feet outside the duckout) per VTA pavement details.
* Provide, at minimum, an 8-foot wide sidewalk along the bus duckout per Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.
* Provide a 7’ X 20’ PCC shelter pad to replace the existing shelter pad adjacent to and behind the sidewalk.
* Locate all trees outside of bus loading areas to prevent future conflicts with bus operations.
* Have the project developer submit the bus stop improvement plan and details to VTA for review prior to City project approval.
* Contact Steve Newgren of VTA 72 hours in advance of construction, for requesting temporary bus stop relocation and passenger notification.

Site Density and Site Design:
VTA supports the proposed intensification of land use in an area with frequent bus service including two local routes immediately serving the site and another within a half-mile radius. VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual may be a useful reference when designing this development. This document provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. The CDT Guidelines are available upon request to any agency staff. For more information on the CDT Guidelines, please call the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division. VTA would be interested in the opportunity to review the site plans at the PD Rezoning or PD Permit stage if possible.

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 the CMP.
Santa Clara and 3rd Streets Residential Development  
Southeast corner of Santa Clara and 3rd Streets  

**Description:** Conversion of 2nd-5th Floor of an existing building from office to single-room occupancy residential.

**VTA Comments:**

Vibration Impacts Related to BART Project:  
The proposed project is in close proximity to the BART Downtown San Jose Station (located at STA 693+00). At this location, the BART noise and vibration study projected the Ground Borne Noise (GBN) level with BART operations to be from 34 to 38 dBA. This range exceeds the FTA GBN threshold of 35 dBA. Therefore, the residential project should disclose this information to future residents and the project should be responsible for providing mitigation to meet FTA requirements for vibration mitigation. Mitigation could be in the form of a financial contribution to the BART project so that the BART project can provide this mitigation during construction.

Bus Service:  
The proposed project is adjacent to a VTA bus stop that serves lines 68 and 22. In order to provide convenient access for transit service, VTA recommends that the city condition the developer to provide the following improvement:  
* A 10’ X 75’ PCC bus stop pavement pad per VTA Bus Stop Pavement Details.

Transit Incentives:  
VTA recommends that the City consider requiring the project applicant to provide transit incentives such as Eco Passes 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 Pass 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.
VTA Comments:

Review of Plans:
VTA requests the opportunity to review plans and pertinent information related to the section under VTA right-of-way. The project will need to conform to all appropriate standards and regulations including cathodic protection where necessary.

Construction Access Permit:
Our understanding is that the contractor (Wickland Pipelines) is in the process of obtaining a construction access permit from VTA.

Restricted Access Permit:
Because a portion of the work will occur within the active rail operating envelope, a Restricted Access Permit will also be required. All Contractors needing access to any restricted access area used for VTA Right of Way must complete the Light Rail Roadway Worker Protection safety training course and obtain written permission (Restricted Access Permit) prior to entry so that VTA can monitor activities and make sure that the work is done safely. Our current Policy adopted October 7, 2004 also established that fees would be collected for Restricted Access Permits, Training, the level of protection required, including power removal, flagmen, Bus Bridge etc, or any unscheduled disruption to bus or train revenue vehicles.

Roadway Protection Training (RWP) will occur on Fridays. The times are below:
- UPRR: 8:00 AM to 9:30 AM
- VTA Basic: 9:30 AM to 11:30 AM
- VTA Advanced: 11:30 AM to 1:00 PM

Class sizes of 15 or below will be held at Light Rail Technical Training (LRTT), Guadalupe Division Bldg H. Larger class sizes may be held at the Chaboya Training Center. LRTT will advise all trainees of the class location prior to their training date.

Attendance at the Track Allocation Meetings is required. These meetings detail future and present contractor activities and resolve any conflicts regarding any such activities within the VTA Right of Way. During the meetings, restricted access request forms are completed and submitted by those individuals requesting access for future activities. The restricted access permits staff review’s submitted forms giving special attention to dates, times, locations, power status, on-track safety protection requirements and access priority. The Track Allocation Meetings are held at the Guadalupe Light Rail Division, Building B, located at 101 West Younger Ave, San Jose CA. 95110, every Wednesday at 1:00 PM.
Ford Road Family Housing
North side of Ford Road, 550 feet east of Monterey Road

Description: PD rezoning for 95 affordable multi-family housing units on 3.06 acres.

VTA Comments:

Land Use and Site Density:
VTA supports the proposed land use and density (approximately 31 units/acre) on this site located in close proximity to several transit routes. Monterey Road is designated as a Corridor in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework. This framework 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.

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.

Bicycle Accommodations:
The PD Rezoning submittal does not address provisions for bicycle parking. 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. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the City require implementation of a TDM program as a condition of approval of the PD Rezoning for the project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to this project include:
* Direct or Indirect Payments for Taking Alternate Modes
* Transit Fare Incentives such as Eco Pass and Commuter Checks
* Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks

Some cities in Santa Clara County have recently required the developers of residential projects, both market-rate and affordable, to provide Eco Passes for the residents of the project for an initial period after the project is completed.
San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2021
Bounded by I-280, Moorpark Ave., Rexford Way, Kingman Ave., Fruitvale Ave., Laswell Ave., and South Bascom Ave.

**Description:** Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for the San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2021.

VTA Comments:

**Land Use & Transit Access:**
VTA supports the proposed land use intensification within the existing developed areas of the campus, at a location served by several VTA bus routes and within two-thirds of a mile of the Fruitdale light rail station. The location of the project promotes fuel conservation through pedestrian activity and nearby access to public transportation. This helps improve transportation energy efficiency and address greenhouse gas emissions. The compact site design of the proposed development is also consistent with the principles in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual such as intensifying land use activities and focusing on existing areas.

**Transportation/Traffic Mitigation Measures - Transportation Demand Management:**
VTA previously commented on the topic of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures in response to the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study in a letter dated November 6, 2008. In our previous letter, we requested that the DSEIR address potential TDM measures in the analysis of Transportation/Traffic impacts, and included a list of specific TDM measures that may be applicable to the San Jose City College context. Page 2-7 of the DSEIR states that "a Traffic Study (TIA) is being prepared for the Update and will discuss TDM measures and will utilize VTA’s Guidelines when preparing the TIA." However, the TIA dated February 2009 does not address TDM measures, other than a brief discussion of transit services. The DSEIR does not address TDM measures, other than a brief mention on page 5-56 in the summary of consistency with plans and policies.

Considering that the project will have a significant impact on several nearby intersections, VTA requests that the SEIR be revised to address TDM measures. This should include a discussion of existing measures that are already used on the campus, as well as potential new or expanded measures to reduce single-occupant trips to and from the campus. This will ensure consistency with Section 10.6 of VTA’s TIA Guidelines, which states that "Project mitigation measures shall be defined to include programs used to reduce project trip generation, including TDM programs as well as capital improvements to roadways, transit facilities, and bike and pedestrian access improvements, if not already included in the proposed project description."

**Transportation/Traffic Mitigation Measures - Bicycle Parking:**
Page 5-56 of the DSEIR states that "Under the Prior Plan, the Campus has been re-organized into a more bicycle-friendly environment with new bike racks and lockers, among other improvements." However, the Existing Bicycle Facilities section on page 5-93 notes that there are no bike lockers on campus at present, and provides no further information on plans for bicycle parking. VTA requests that the DSEIR clarify what bicycle parking is planned as part of the Facilities Master Plan Update, including types, quantities and locations of bicycle 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/vta cmp/Bikes <http://www.vta.org/news/vta cmp/Bikes>. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Bus Service:
VTA supports the mitigation measure, on page 5-118 of the DSEIR, which incorporates our recommended bus stop improvements for the existing bus stops on Leigh Avenue (south of Moorpark Avenue) and on Leigh Avenue (opposite Kingman):
* 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see VTA standards)

<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>

**TANC Transmission Project**
Northern and Eastern Santa Clara County

**Description:** Building and upgrading transmission lines, substations and related facilities in Northern CA, including portions of northern and eastern Santa Clara County

**VTA Comments:**
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) staff have reviewed the NOP for a draft EIR to build and upgrade utility lines in northern California. We have the following comments:

If work will be done within VTA right-of-way, a Construction Access Permit and possibly a Restricted Access Permit/Safety Training will be required. For further information, please contact Debbie Dionne at (408) 321-5824.
### Lead Agency

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

#### East-West Connector Project

**Decoto Road and Paseo Padre Parkway**

**Description:**
Widen existing roadway and construct new roadway between Paseo Padre Parkway and Mission Boulevard.

**VTA Comments:**

Comment 7-1:
Does the proposed East-West connector, along Decoto Road and Paseo Padre Parkway (connecting I-880 on the west and Mission Boulevard on the east), change any traffic volumes along any of the following connectors in Santa Clara County in the years 2015 and 2035:
- Dixon Landing Road
- Calaveras / 237
- Tasman Drive
- Montague Expressway

The transportation and traffic section of the Draft EIR does not address traffic on any of the above mentioned roadways.

**City/County Response**

Response 7-1:
This comment asks if the implementation of the proposed project would change traffic volumes on several major roadways in Santa Clara County, including Dixon Landing Road, Calaveras/237, Tasman Drive, and Montague Expressway (all in Santa Clara County) in 2015 and 2035.

None of the roadways projects listed by the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) are within the study area of the analysis. The nearest roadway, Dixon Landing Road, is 7 miles from the southern limit of the study area (Mowry Avenue). Given the distance of these roadways from the project area, any change in traffic conditions resulting from the proposed project is expected to be insignificant.

No changes to the Draft EIR are required.
**McCarthy Ranch Mixed Use**

**N. McCarthy Boulevard between SR 237 and Dixon Landing Road**

**Description:** Construction of 1.07 million square feet of office and 407,000 square feet of commercial on 58.5 acres.

**VTA Comments:**

Comment 7.01 - Air Quality and Climate Change - Mitigation 5-2:
VTA supports the inclusion of this mitigation measure as a way of addressing both the air quality and transportation/congestion impacts of the proposed project. We request that the City require these items, including the project-provided or fair share contribution to shuttle service to regional transit stations, as a Condition of Approval of the project. As noted in the DEIR, VTA’s local bus Line 33 runs on McCarthy Boulevard just south of the project site; there may be an opportunity for this project and other developments within the McCarthy Ranch Master Plan area to develop a financial partnership to help fund community or local bus service. We request that the City track this shuttle/transit requirement in its mitigation monitoring for the project, and consult with VTA as the project moves towards implementation.

Comment 7.02 - Transportation/Circulation - Site Design:
VTA recommends that as the design for this project progresses, consideration should be given to transit-, pedestrian-, and bicycle-friendly design principles. This should specifically include how the commercial development on Parcel C will accommodate transit vehicle circulation (whether for shuttles, local buses or community buses). VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual is a valuable reference regarding how to incorporate transit accommodations into the site design, as well as other transit, pedestrian and bicycle-friendly design guidelines. We request that the developer and the City consult with VTA on incorporating transit into the design as the project moves towards implementation.

Comment 7.03 - It should be noted that there are also bus stops located along McCarthy Boulevard in the project area that were installed but have not yet been used. These bus stops should be preserved for future use in the case that bus or shuttle service runs service in this direction along McCarthy Boulevard.

Comment 7.04 - Trip Distribution:
Figure 14.7 Project Trip Distribution: Please provide the distribution factor on Dixon Landing.

Comment 7.05 - Railroad Crossing at Dixon Landing and Warm Springs Blvd:
There are over 1,700 east bound vehicles at Dixon Landing/Warm Springs Blvd intersection. Please include traffic analysis to show whether if a grade separation over the railroad is warranted.

Comment 7.06 - Immediate Implementation Action List:
The Draft EIR notes that the project will cause significant freeway impacts as well as air quality and climate change impacts. In this case, as noted in the Immediate Implementation Action List in Appendix D of VTA’s TIA Guidelines, the project should undertake Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures aimed at reducing the number of vehicle trips generated by the project. Such TDM measures can 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
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Employee Services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Restaurants
* Guaranteed Ride Home Program
* Carsharing

Comment 7.08 - Project Impacts and Mitigations (Impact 14-6/Mitigation 14-6 - Project Impact on Freeway Segments):
The Draft EIR indicates that the project would cause significant increases in traffic volumes of more than 1% of freeway capacity on the four identified freeway segments. The Draft EIR also indicates that the mitigation measures to increase the roadway capacity in this area not feasible and would be unreasonable to request an individual development project to bear responsibility for such extensive transportation system improvements; therefore the traffic impacts are deemed significant and unavoidable. VTA’s current Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines states that if a project causes transportation impacts that cannot meet that a deficiency plan must be provided. As the City of Milpitas is in the process of developing its deficiency plan, VTA recommends that the City of Milpitas consider requesting the project developer to provide a fair share contribution to the SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project as a mitigation measure. The SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project is located within the impacted freeway segments indicated in the DEIR. The SR 237/I-880 Express Connectors project is listed in the approved Countywide Transportation Plan also known as VTP 2035 and is currently is in the preliminary engineering and environmental documentation phase. The project is scheduled for completion in the fall of year 2010.

City/County Response
Response 7.01:
The City will consider these recommendations in the future discretionary deliberations that will be required for this project as its design progresses. This specific request for the City and the developer to consult with the VTA on incorporating transit-, pedestrian-, and bicycle elements into the design as the project moves toward implementation has been forwarded to the City of Milpitas Director of Planning for consideration.

Response 7.02:
Please see response to Comment 7.01 above. The City will consider these recommendations in the future deliberations that will be required for this project as its design progresses.

Response 7.03:
Please see response to Comment 7.01 above. The City will consider these recommendations in the future deliberations that will be required for this project as its design progresses.
Response 7.04:
No specific trip distribution was allocated to Dixon Landing Road for purposes of the DEIR transportation impact analysis. It is expected, however, that project-related drivers will utilize Dixon Landing Road when coming from points east or north of the project. It is estimated that about 15 percent of project office trips and 19 percent of project shopping (retail) trips would utilize Dixon Landing Road.

Response 7.05:
According to the "Railroad-Highway Grade Crossing Handbook - Revised Second Edition August 2007", an at-grade highway-rail grade crossing should be considered for grade separation or otherwise eliminated across the railroad right of way whenever one or more of the following conditions exist:

I. The highway is a part of the designated Interstate Highway System.
II. The highway is otherwise designed to have full controlled access.
III. The posted highway speed equals or exceeds 113 km/hr. (70 mph).
IV. AADT exceeds 100,000 in urban areas or 50,000 in rural areas.
V. Maximum authorized train speed exceeds 177 km/hr. (110 mph).
VI. An average of 150 or more trains per day or 300 million gross tons per year.
VII. An average of 75 or more passenger trains per day in urban areas or 30 or more passenger trains per day in rural areas.
VIII. Crossing exposure (the product of the number of trains per day and AADT) exceeds 1 million in urban areas or 250,000 in rural areas; or
IX. Passenger train crossing exposure (the product of the number of passenger trains per day and AADT) exceeds 800,000 in urban areas or 200,000 in rural areas.
X. The expected accident frequency for active devices with gates, as calculated by the U.S. DOT Accident Prediction Formula including five-year accident history, exceeds 0.5.
XI. Vehicle delay exceeds 40 vehicle hours per day.

The UPRR tracks at this location are being used by only a few freight trains per day. Based on the criteria listed above, the existing at-grade railroad crossing at Dixon Landing Road would not warrant improvement to provide a grade separation, with or without the project.

Response 7.06:
The City will fully consider these VTA-listed TDM measures in its required future discretionary actions on this project. The DEIR identifies a significant Background Plus Project Conditions scenario impact on four of the ten study freeway intersections evaluated. The DEIR does not identify a significant year 2030 cumulative-plus-project impact on study freeway segments (see DEIR Table 14.3). Although the DEIR transportation consultant (Hexagon Transportation Consultants) concurs that implementation of the listed TDM measures could reduce the project's vehicular traffic, these measures would not eliminate the traffic impacts on the freeway segments. The recommendation that the project should undertake TDM measures aimed at reducing the number of vehicle trips generated by the project has been forwarded to the City of Milpitas Director of Planning for consideration.

Response 7.08:
The City will consider these recommendations in the future deliberations that will be required for this project as its design progresses. The City is in the process of developing a Deficiency Plan to identify future transportation deficiencies and develop a program to either fix the deficiencies or implement other, additional improvements to offset identified deficiency freeway facilities. In order to establish impact fees to contribute to
funding specific transportation improvement projects, such as the SR237/I-880 Express Connectors project, a nexus analysis would need to be conducted to identify and prioritize transportation improvements projects within the City and identify the appropriate fees and fee mechanisms to fund to the costs of these improvement projects. Until the Deficiency Plan has been completed and adopted, impact fees for specific projects cannot be established.

<table>
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<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Agency File #</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>VTA Comment Date</th>
<th>City/County Response Date</th>
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</table>

**Grant Road/Levin Avenue Residential**

**Southeast corner of Grant Road and Levin Avenue**

**Description:** 54 single-family residences on 14.6 acres.

**VTA Comments:**

Comment B-1 - Bus Service:
VTA provides bus service on Grant Road adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the developer be conditioned to relocate the existing northbound bus stop (just north of Levin Avenue) to a location just north of the new signalized intersection at Covington (see attached map for further detail). This relocated bus stop, as well as the existing southbound bus stop (just south of Covington), should be provided with the following improvements:
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (see attached VTA standards)
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see attached VTA standards)
* An 8’ X 40’ PCC passenger waiting pad in the passenger waiting area
* A bus stop pole
* Place all trees and landscaping plants outside of the bus stop area

Please note that the provision of these bus stop improvements will allow for the removal of two bus stops as noted in the attached map.

Comment B-2 - Site Density & Transit:
The proposed density of just under 4 du/acre (gross density) is lower than desirable to promote the use of public transit, on a site adjacent to a VTA bus route with connections to Caltrain and VTA light rail service. VTA, through its Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use, recommends a minimum residential density of 7 du/acre in suburban areas within 1/3 mile of bus service. Considering the site’s General Plan designation which allows densities of up to 6 du/acre, VTA suggests consideration of a higher density on the site, such as that considered in the Increased Density Alternative (DEIR p. 117).

Comment B-3 - Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations:
VTA commends the project proponent for including new sidewalks along the project frontages on Grant Road and Levin Avenue, as well as pedestrian and bicycle-friendly street designs including a gridlike layout and traffic calming measures. If the Alternative Site Plan involving the
closure of Preston Drive is pursued (as shown in DEIR pp. 114-115), VTA recommends that pedestrian and bicycle access from Preston Drive to Grant Road be maintained; otherwise, this site plan would be less favorable in terms of pedestrian and bicycle access than the preferred site plan.

City/County Response:
Response B-1:
The comment is noted. The relocated bus stop is not proposed as part of this project. No further response is required as the comment does not raise any environmental issues or questions about the adequacy of the EIR.

Response B-2:
The comment is noted. A higher density development, such as what is shown in the Increased Density Alternative, is not proposed as part of the project. A higher density project would differ from the surrounding pattern of development on all adjacencies to the project site as well as throughout the broader surrounding neighborhoods. No further action is required as the comment does not raise any environmental issues or questions about the adequacy of the EIR.

Response B-3:
The City of Mountain has not made a decision on the future of the Preston Drive opening to Grant Road at this time. If the City of Mountain View decides to close vehicular access from Preston Drive, the maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle access will be considered at that time.
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**Palo Alto Recycled Water Project**
Central Palo Alto, RWQCP

**Description:** Installation of a recycled water pipeline, a booster pump station, and a pump station at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP).

**VTA Comments:**
Comment 6-1 - Traffic Control Plan:
VTA requests the opportunity to review the full traffic control plans when they become available in order to determine if there are potential impacts to CMP facilities during construction.

We also recommend a media campaign to notify the public about the duration of the construction, lane closures, and potential detour routes.

We recommend prohibiting construction before 9 a.m. and after 3 p.m. since the peak hour traffic on some of the CMP facilities in the area starts around 3 p.m.
Comment 6-2 - Impacts to Bus Service:
Mitigation Measure TRA-1 requires that damaged road surfaces be returned to pre-construction conditions or better. We assume this includes bus stop facilities also.

Once the final pipeline route is determined, VTA would like to review it to determine which bus routes and bus stops will be impacted.

Comment 6-3 - VTA Contacts:
If construction involves cutting through a VTA PCC bus stop pavement pad, a Construction Access Permit will be required and the project should include this requirement in the Special Conditions of the contract. The contractor should be directed to contact Debbie Dionne, Permits and Utility Locating Services, at (408) 321-5824.

If temporary relocation of bus stops is needed, the contractor should contact Steve Newgren at (408) 952-4106 at least 72 hours in advance.

City/County Response:
Response 6-1:
Comment noted. The Traffic Control Plan will be made available for review by VTA when it becomes available. Notification requirements will be included in the Traffic Control Plan as appropriate. The construction schedule for the proposed project is discussed on page 14 of the Public Draft IS/MND. Construction would occur between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4 p.m. Monday through Friday on arterial and collection streets in order to maintain compliance with the City's Traffic Control Requirements. Construction other than on arterial and collection streets would occur between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m. Monday through Friday. Construction would occur between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Saturday for all construction areas. The City will consider limiting the construction hours on CMP facilities to 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. if deemed necessary and feasible.

Response 6-2:
Mitigation Measure TRA-1 includes bus stop facilities in "damaged road surfaces". The final pipeline route will be available for review by VTA.

Response 6-3:
Comment noted. The City acknowledges that a VTA Construction Access Permit may be required if construction involves cutting through a VTA PCC bus stop pavement pad.

The 11th bullet is added on page 25 of the Public Draft IS/MND as follows:
* Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority - Construction Access Permit if construction involves cutting through a VTA PCC bus stop pavement pad.
### Airborne Gymnastics Relocation
**1515 Walsh Avenue**

**Description:** Use permit for a gymnastics facility in conjunction with tenant improvements to an existing industrial warehouse facility

**VTA Comments:**

Comment 1 - Pedestrian Access to Transit:
As noted in Section XV of the Initial Study, several bus routes and shuttles operate in the study area, and the closest bus stop is located along Scott Boulevard, about 0.2 miles from the project site. The Initial Study and Transportation Impact analysis (TIA) report indicate that sidewalks/pedestrian facilities currently exist along the project frontage between Scott Boulevard and Lafayette Street. However, from the site plan in the Initial Study, it is not clear whether a sidewalk exists or will be retained directly on the project frontage on Walsh Street. If a sidewalk does not currently exist, the City may wish to consider requiring the project to construct a sidewalk to improve pedestrian access to transit from the project site.

Comment 2 - TIA - 4.5-2 - Project Conditions Intersection Level of Service Impacts and Mitigation - Central Expressway and Lafayette Street:
The TIA Report indicates that the proposed project trips would cause a significant impact at the intersection of Central Expressway/Lafayette Street for the project conditions. VTA supports the proposed fair share contribution towards the mitigation measure of the conversion of the HOV lane to a mixed flow lane as identified in the Countywide County Expressway Planning Study to improve this CMP intersection.

**City/County Response:**

Response 1:
There is an existing sidewalk along the project frontage along Walsh Avenue.

Response 2:
So noted.
### PROACTIVE QUARTERLY STATUS REPORT

#### GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</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>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>

(20+ Dwelling Units/Acre in the City of San Jose)
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: General Manager Authority to Execute Caltrans Cooperative Agreements
(Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program)

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute Cooperative Agreements with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), covering environmental, design, right of way, construction, landscaping, project close-out phases of Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program projects.

BACKGROUND:

The Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program (formerly referred to as the High Occupancy Toll Lanes Program) has been under development since 2003 when the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board of Directors’ Ad Hoc Financial Stability Committee requested a presentation from staff on High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes and their potential benefits and opportunities in Santa Clara County.

At its December 2008 meeting, the VTA Board of Directors approved the Silicon Valley Express Lanes Program for the implementation of toll operations within the High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes on Route 85, US 101 and 237/880 Interchange Direct Connector ramps.

Caltrans requires that sponsors of highway improvements enter into cooperative agreements with the State of California in order to establish roles and responsibilities and set parameters for fund reimbursement, if applicable. Separate agreements are typically executed to cover the project development, design and construction phases of projects.

VTA has executed many cooperative agreements with Caltrans over the past 12 years including
the 1996 Measure B Transportation Improvement Program and other projects funded through federal, State and local sources. VTA has generally brought forward recommendations for programmatic authorization for the General Manager for Board consideration versus individual project or phases of project authorization.

**DISCUSSION:**

The VTA staff recommendation would establish authority for the General Manager to execute agreements with Caltrans necessary to implement the Express Lane System within Santa Clara County. The agreements are negotiated with Caltrans separately for each project and phase and follow a statewide template established for State Highway development work performed by local agencies. VTA will propose agreement terms that generally specify that VTA will be responsible to perform all planning, environmental documentation, design and right of way and construction contract administration services necessary for the project. Caltrans will perform an oversight role with final approval of the Project Report, Environmental Document, Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) and Right of Way.

If federal or State funding is included in the project, additional terms are included in the agreements which specify reimbursement payment parameters for the funds from Caltrans, the fiscal agent, to VTA the project delivery agency.

Future authorizations for agreements with the California Highway Patrol for enforcement, Caltrans for operating and/or maintenance and the Bay Area Toll Authority for toll collections will be brought forward to the Board of Directors for consideration in early 2010.

The authorization covers Express Lane improvements on US Route 101, State Routes 85 and 237 and Interstate 880 Interchange within Santa Clara County.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

In order for VTA to perform the lead role for these projects, VTA is required to enter into agreements with Caltrans. If the Board would prefer that Caltrans perform as lead, VTA would still need to enter into an agreement to transfer project sponsor responsibility for the funding acquired and controlled by VTA to Caltrans or another public agency to perform the role as the project manager. A potential result would be a delay in project development and potentially a loss of funding if project delivery deadlines are missed.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct financial impact to VTA as a result of this action. However, the action is required in order to establish funding reimbursement agreements for the grants dedicated to projects in order to receive the funds.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP) considered this item on August 20, 2009. There was discussion parameters of the agreements and on the potential
funding arrangements with MTC on the Express Lanes projects.

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

Prepared by: Murali Ramanujam, Shanthi Ganji
Memo No. 2073
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: VTA Comments on CEQA Guidelines Amendments

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to submit a comment letter on the proposed CEQA Guidelines Amendments to the California Natural Resources Agency, as presented in Attachment C.

BACKGROUND:

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines provide guidance to agencies in assessing environmental impacts from projects. Senate Bill 97 requires the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop draft CEQA guidelines “for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions.” The Natural Resources Agency must certify and adopt new CEQA guidelines on or before January 1, 2010.

The CEQA Guidelines Amendments will affect many functions in the VTA work program, including the Congestion Management Program, multimodal planning (transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian), proactive development review, and environmental analysis. The CEQA checklist is used to help agencies assess whether or not a project might have an environmental impact; and while it is not mandatory to use the checklist it has evolved over the years as a primary tool for providing structure and guidance for initial environmental studies.

This review opportunity is the first in ten years to revise the transportation section of the checklist. During the public comments period, many agencies and individuals provided input to revise the checklist so that the CEQA transportation analysis adequately considers bicycle, pedestrian and transit modes. VTA staff sees this opportunity to comment on amendments to the checklist to be crucial and timely.
**DISCUSSION:**

The transportation section of the checklist has seven questions, and currently none pertain to pedestrian and bicycle mobility, transit operations or traffic safety. This has resulted in less than adequate attention being given to impacts to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit operations. A contributing factor is the existing checklist leads those preparing environmental documents to consider vehicular level of service as the only significance threshold.

Staff proposes submitting formal comments during the Natural Resource Agency’s comment period. A draft letter is presented in Attachment C. The major comments in the draft letter include adding: 1) a new preamble to Appendix G - Initial Study Checklist; 2) a new question on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in Section VII, Greenhouse Gas Emissions; and 3) changes and additions to the transportation checklist.

VTA brought this item to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in July and the members discussed both the Caltrans recommendations to revise the transportation checklist (presented in Attachment A) and the final recommendations that OPR sent to the Resources Agency (presented in Attachment B). The committees’ comments are described below.

**BPAC Comments**

The BPAC supports staff offering a formal comment letter to the California Natural Resources Agency. The Committee suggested adding some language to address “all modes of transportation including non-motorized travel”. The comment has been incorporated in the draft comment letter as shown in Attachment C.

**TAC Comments**

Member Dey commented that he would like to see the new question proposed by Caltrans pertaining to transit and bicycle and pedestrian modes be limited to just transit modes, since bicycle and pedestrian modes are captured in another new question. VTA staff agrees with this comment and this suggestion was incorporated into the VTA-proposed checklist questions presented in Attachment C.

Member Dey asked about the meaning and purpose of the following proposed new question by Caltrans:

> Will either the regional or site-specific multi-modal performance of the highway and/or street transportation facilities, in terms of structural, operational, or perception-based measures of effectiveness be affected?

In addition, member Witthaus commented that the term “perception” in this question is rather broad and may not be appropriately used by EIR preparers. Staff has researched the reasoning that Caltrans gave for their new question. Caltrans requested that this question be added in order to capture the “performance” of the transportation system in additional ways besides “capacity”. Caltrans wants to encourage the use of other facility performance measures; and quality of
service measures and to be consistent with the yet-to-be-proposed methodologies that may be in the 2010 Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Therefore this broad question is suggested to cover the anticipated multi-modal evaluations, using modal specific LOS performance measures that will be in the HCM as well as others developed by local agencies. If this question is confusing to TAC members, perhaps it would be appropriate to suggest that it be reworded; staff suggests the following, which has been incorporated in the draft comment letter:

Would the project: Affect the Will either the regional or site-specific multi-modal performance of the highway and/or street and/or rail and/or off road non-motorized trail transportation facilities, in terms of structural, operational, or perception-based measures of effectiveness (e.g. quality of service for non-motorized and transit modes) be affected?

The TAC asked that the item be brought back so that there would be more opportunity for Member Agencies and VTA to coordinate their respective comments which would make a stronger case to the Natural Resources Agency.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board may choose to modify one or all of the comments, or choose not to send a comment letter.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION /RECOMMENDATION**

The BPAC heard this item at their July and August meetings and recommended unanimously that the general manager send a letter, with one minor change to question (h) to address pedestrian and bicycle safety.

The TAC heard this item at their July meeting, and asked that staff return in August with a draft letter that they could all see and support for countywide consistency. Members Witthaus and Dey also asked for clarification on to question (g) proposed by Caltrans. At the August meeting, staff explained that question (g) was added by Caltrans to address issues of multimodal quality of service that will be addressed in the next edition of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), scheduled for 2010. Staff presented alternative wording for this question and the TAC proposed revisions. Also at the August meeting, Member Collen agreed with the BPAC suggestion and suggested proposed wording. The revised wording for these questions is presented in the attached letter along with the other proposed changes by VTA and/or Caltrans. The TAC unanimously supported sending this letter with the aforementioned revisions. The revisions are reflected in the updated letter in Attachment C.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION /RECOMMENDATION

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee heard this item on August 20, 2009 and unanimously approved staff’s recommendation.

Prepared by: Michelle DeRobertis
Memo No. 2163
February 2, 2009

Governor’s Office of Planning and Research
P.O. Box 3022
Sacramento, CA 95812-3044

Comments on Preliminary Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The California Department of Transportation (Department) first wishes to recognize all the hard work and careful thought that is clearly evident in the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Preliminary Draft CEQA Guideline Amendments for Greenhouse Gas Emissions dated January 8, 2009 (Draft Amendments). We want to thank OPR for the opportunity to provide comments at this early stage and we look forward to our continued involvement with OPR, the California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the Natural Resources Agency as the Draft Amendments proceed through the formal rulemaking process.

General Comments:

We commend OPR on its “less-is-more approach” to the Draft Amendments. In particular, we appreciate the recognition that the principles of CEQA do not need to be changed in order to effectively deal with greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Draft Amendments provide a solid foundation for analysis while clearly maintaining the discretion of the lead agency to determine the appropriate method of impact analysis, the significance of impacts and the appropriateness of mitigation measures. We also appreciate that OPR has approached the Draft Amendments by incorporating the changes into the body of the CEQA Guidelines; doing so does strengthen the point that GHG should be incorporated throughout the CEQA process and should be something more than an afterthought.

Section-by-Section Comments

15064. Determining the Significance of Environmental Effects Caused by a Project Comment: In subsection 15064(h)(3), we would like to see the addition of “statewide transportation plan.”
15064.4. Determining the Significance of Impacts from Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Comment: The Department again appreciates the flexibility that is given in this section. The factors that a lead agency should consider are concise and well articulated. While the Department has been doing quantitative assessments for many projects, we appreciate the ability to rely on other methodologies, including qualitative analysis, when the project and its setting warrant such an approach. We also believe the use of the 2020 targets in subsection (a)(1) is more appropriate than the 2050 targets given the many uncertainties we currently face and OPR’s stated intent to revisit the GHG provisions in the CEQA Guidelines as climate change science and policy change over time.

15093. Statement of Overriding Considerations

Comment: While we support the addition of subsection (d), we would like to state that we believe subsection (a) does already provide the means to consider regional and statewide benefits. Perhaps the content of subsection (d) could be incorporated into subsection (a) as clarification.

15125. Environmental Setting

Comment: We encourage OPR to maintain consistency between the plans listed in subsection (d) of this section and section 15064(h)(3) as well as section 15130(b)(1)(A) and 15130(d). Again, we would like to see “statewide transportation plan” in the text of this section.

15126.4. Consideration and Discussion of Mitigation Measures Proposed to Minimize Significant Effects.

Comment: We believe this section strikes an appropriate balance and the specific inclusion of purchasing carbon offsets provides us with another valuable means of protecting the environment while meeting other important public goals.

15130. Discussion of Cumulative Impacts

Comment: The Department would like to see recognition of the potential for a statewide inventory approach to cumulative impacts. Subsection (b)(1)(B) discusses projections based on local or regional plans; however, it does not discuss the potential to use statewide projections. It is widely recognized that climate change is a global issue; as such, provisions should be made available to deal with climate change on a statewide scale at the very least. Specifically, as was raised by one commenter at the January 26, 2009 workshop in Sacramento, it would be difficult, if not impossible, for lead agencies to track GHG emissions for past, present and future projects given the state of the science and the nature of GHG emissions. We would like to suggest that lead agencies could make use of statewide GHG projections contained in state level documents, such as CARB’s Scoping Plan or the Energy Commission’s GHG inventory.

15152. Tiering

Comment: Subsection (h)(7), again the Department would like to see the recognition that tiering could be done off of a statewide plan that adequately addresses GHG emissions.

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Appendix G Environmental Checklist Form

Comment: We hope that the preamble language on the checklist form becomes a permanent part of the form. We feel this language provides useful clarification regarding the intent and use of the checklist. We particularly wish to express our support of the statement regarding the fact that the questions “do not necessarily represent threshold of significance.”

To be consistent with the wording of other questions on the checklist, we suggest that for Section VII (a) the following text be deleted: “that may have a significant impact on the environment, based on any applicable threshold of significance.”

XVI. Transportation/Traffic. While we are aware that OPR has received many favorable comments with respect to the switch from level of service to vehicle miles traveled, we would like to express two concerns with the proposed change. First, it is our belief that while VMT is an important factor to consider when analyzing GHG, its use as the indicator for transportation-related GHG emissions is limited. The core of the analyses should remain whether GHG emissions increase or decrease with the project; we believe that congestion relief and decreases in vehicle hours delayed, as well as the fuels and the vehicles used are equally as important in the GHG analysis. The inclusion of question (a) is appropriate as one factor, but as a stand-alone question, we believe that it does not capture many of the important aspects of transportation performance and climate change. That said, we will continue to work actively with statewide, regional and local governments to better link transportation and land-use while addressing mobility or accessibility.

Second, we feel believe the checklist still needs a question which captures the performance of the transportation system. There are multiple important facility performance measures; however, there is only one quality-of-service stratification scheme in the Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), and that is level of service (LOS). The Highway Capacity Manual is considered the 'national directive' that we refer to for improvements or to define impacts to federal facilities; LOS is the primary unit to describe thresholds of change. We anticipate that a new HCM will be published in 2010; the new HCM will be substantially revised to address multi-modal evaluations, using modal specific LOS performance measures. Accordingly, we suggest the following question be added to the checklist:

Will either the regional or site-specific multi-modal performance of the highway and/or street transportation facilities, in terms of structural, operational, or perception-based measures of effectiveness, be affected?

We would also like to suggest the revisions of questions (c) and (d) to read:

Substantially decrease safety due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves, additional and/or inadequate intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g farm equipment)?

"Caltrans improves mobility across California"
Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks to vehicles, bicycles, or pedestrians?

Lastly, we would like to offer these additional questions for purposes of better addressing alternative modes of transportation:

In the Recreation section of the checklist:

Would the project reduce, sever, or eliminate recreational or multi-use trails, bike paths or equestrian trails?

In the Transportation/Traffic section of the checklist:

Reduce, sever, or eliminate pedestrian or bicycle circulation or access, or preclude future planned and approved bicycle or pedestrian circulation?

Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting or expanding public transit or non-motorized transportation?

Cause a degradation of the performance or availability of light or heavy rail for people or goods movement?

XVIII. Mandatory Findings of Significance. We would like to see subsection (a) changed to be consistent with Section 15065(a)(1). Specifically, we recommend that the word “substantially” be added in front of “reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.”

Again, the Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on the preliminary Draft Amendments. If the Department can be of any further assistance or provide any additional information please do not hesitate to contact Kelly Dunlap, Chief, Environmental Management Office, at (916) 651-8164.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

JAY NORVELL
Chief
Division of Environmental Analysis

“Caltrans improves mobility across California”
April 13, 2009

Honorable Mike Chrisman
California Secretary for Natural Resources
Natural Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street, Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Transmittal of the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s Proposed SB97 CEQA Guidelines Amendments to the Natural Resources Agency.

Dear Secretary Chrisman:

This packet contains the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) proposed amendments to the CEQA Guidelines (Proposed Amendments) to address analysis and mitigation of the potential effects of greenhouse gas emissions. OPR developed the Proposed Amendments pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21083.05, which states in part:

On or before July 1, 2009, the Office of Planning and Research shall prepare, develop, and transmit to the Resources Agency guidelines for the mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions or the effects of greenhouse gas emissions as required by this division, including, but not limited to, effects associated with transportation or energy consumption.

In developing the Proposed Amendments, OPR actively sought the input, advice, and assistance of numerous interested parties and stakeholder groups. Over the past year and a half, OPR has met with representatives of numerous agencies and organizations to discuss the perspectives of the business community, the environmental community, local governments, non-governmental organizations, state agencies, public health officials, CEQA practitioners and legal experts. In addition, OPR took advantage of numerous regional and statewide conferences to raise awareness about CEQA and Greenhouse Gas Emissions among diverse audiences and to seek their input.

After publishing a preliminary draft on January 8, 2009, OPR continued to conduct extensive public outreach, including two public workshops, to receive input on the proposed amendments. Both public workshops were well attended, drawing over two hundred participants representing various California business interests, environmental
organizations, local governments, attorneys and consultants. In addition to oral comments at its workshops, OPR also received over eighty written comment letters.

Some comments suggested additional amendments to the CEQA Guidelines. Other comments sought clarification on the proposed language in the amendments. OPR has incorporated those suggestions and clarifications to the extent possible. Some suggestions were not appropriate for inclusion, however, due to conflict with existing statutory authority and case law. The Proposed Amendments reflect OPR’s effort to consider all viewpoints in a manner consistent with CEQA.

Summary of OPR’s Proposed Amendments

Analysis of greenhouse gas emissions in a CEQA document presents unique challenges to lead agencies. Such analysis must be consistent with existing CEQA principles, however. Therefore, the Proposed Amendments suggest relatively modest changes to various portions of the existing CEQA Guidelines. Modifications address those issues where analysis of greenhouse gas emissions may differ in some respects from more traditional CEQA analysis. Other modifications are suggested to clarify existing law that may apply both to analysis of greenhouse gas emissions as well as more traditional CEQA analyses. Except where expressly stated to the contrary, OPR intends the Proposed Amendments to incorporate existing law. The incremental approach in the Proposed Amendments reflects Public Resources Code section 21083(f), which directs OPR to regularly review the Guidelines and propose amendments as necessary.

The Proposed Amendments recommend changes to or additions of fourteen sections of the existing Guidelines, as well as updates to Appendices F (Energy Conservation) and G (Environmental Checklist Form). A summary of the Proposed Amendments is below.

Determining Significance

A new section is proposed to assist lead agencies in determining the significance of the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions. (See section 15064.4.) Consistent with developing practice, this section urges lead agencies to quantify the greenhouse gas emissions of proposed projects where possible. In addition to quantification, this section recommends consideration of several other qualitative factors that may be used in the determination of significance.

This section evolved as a result of OPR’s public outreach process. For example, a sentence has been added to the beginning of section 15064.4 to incorporate the standards of determining significance in section 15064, and to reiterate that the determination of significance calls for the lead agency to exercise its judgment. Further, the phrase “associated with” in the preliminary draft was replaced by “resulting from” to conform to existing CEQA law that requires analysis only of impacts caused by the project. The change is also necessary to avoid an implication that a “life-cycle” analysis is required.
Descriptions of emissions were drafted to be more general to capture all relevant emissions resulting from a project and to avoid any suggestion that lead agencies should only consider emissions related to traffic and energy use, for example. Similarly, lead agencies are encouraged to consider the full range of project features that may increase or decrease greenhouse gas emissions as compared to the existing setting.

Regarding the use of thresholds, section 15064.4 confirms that if it chooses to rely on a threshold developed by some other entity, the lead agency must determine that an existing threshold is appropriate for the project.

Finally, some comments suggested that the California Air Resources Board’s Scoping Plan, by itself, provides sufficient CEQA analysis of greenhouse gas emissions, and that projects that are consistent with the Scoping Plan should not require further analysis. While specific regulations that will be developed to achieve the targets and goals set in the Scoping Plan might be used, consistent with the standards in existing section 15064(h)(3), in a cumulative impacts analysis, the Scoping Plan itself is not a regulatory instrument. Therefore, the Proposed Amendments have been revised to clarify that consistency with the Scoping Plan, by itself, is not a sufficient basis to determine that a project’s emissions of greenhouse gases is not cumulatively considerable.

Thresholds of Significance

A new subdivision to section 15064.7 is proposed to clarify that in developing thresholds of significance, a lead agency may appropriately look to thresholds developed by other public agencies, including the California Air Resources Board’s recommended CEQA Thresholds, or suggested by other experts, such as the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association, so long as any threshold chosen is supported by substantial evidence. (See section 15064.7(c).)

Statement of Overriding Considerations

A new subdivision was added to clarify that the benefits of a project that may be considered in a statement of overriding considerations may include not just local benefits, but also regional or statewide benefits. (See section 15093(d).) OPR does not intend the addition to section 15093 to encourage local versus regional considerations or to imply that regional considerations are more important than local considerations. Rather, a lead agency remains free to consider a broad range of factors in determining whether a project’s benefits override its adverse impacts.

Mitigation

A new subdivision was added to assist lead agencies in determining methods to mitigate the effects of greenhouse gas emissions. (See section 15126.4(c).) This section emphasizes that the general standards for mitigation in subdivision (a) of section 15126.4 apply to mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Language in this
subdivision intentionally refers to emissions generally to avoid any suggestion that a
lead agency need only mitigate for particular emissions, from energy and fossil fuel
consumption for example. The subdivision does direct lead agencies to Appendix F,
however, for mitigation measures that may reduce a project’s energy use.

Additionally, this new subdivision emphasizes compliance with a plan among the list of
potential mitigation measures to emphasize the advantages of programmatic planning.
However, to qualify as mitigation, specific measures from an existing plan must be
identified and incorporated into the project; general compliance with a plan, by itself, is
not mitigation. Finally, this subdivision reiterates that mitigation for planning level
decisions may include the development of specific measures to be implemented on a
project-by-project basis.

Cumulative Impacts

A new subdivision is proposed to emphasize that the effects of greenhouse gas
emissions are cumulative, and should be analyzed in the context of CEQA’s
requirements for cumulative impacts analysis. (See section 15130(f).) The new
subdivision has been revised from its preliminary draft in response to comments and to
focus on a project’s incremental contribution to an overall cumulative effect. The
revision also clarifies that a summary of projections approach may be used in an
analysis of greenhouse gas emissions.

Plans, Incorporation by Reference and Tiering

Given that impacts resulting from greenhouse gas emissions are cumulative in nature,
significant advantages may result from analyzing such impacts on a programmatic level.
If analyzed properly, later projects may then tier, incorporate by reference, or otherwise
rely on that programmatic analysis. Thus, several amendments were proposed to
identify plans that may provide some level of analysis of greenhouse gas emissions,
and to suggest how those plans may be used in later CEQA analyses. Changes to that
effect were recommended in sections 15064(h)(3) (determining the significance of
cumulative impacts), 15125 (environmental setting), 15130(b)(1)(B) (using a summary
of projections in a cumulative impacts analysis), 15130(d) (plans that may be used in a
cumulative impacts analysis), 15150 (incorporation by reference), 15152 (tiering), and
15183 (projects consistent with a community plan or zoning).

In response to public comments, the Proposed Amendments clarify which plans are
appropriate for specific uses throughout the Guidelines. For example, while regional
blueprint plans are appropriately discussed as part of the Environmental Baseline in
section 15125, such plans would not be appropriately considered in section
15064(h)(3), which permits a lead agency to determine that cumulative impacts are less
than significant due to compliance with certain plans.

Further, a new proposed section, 15183.5, will provide additional guidance on tiering of
greenhouse gas emissions analyses where environmental impact reports for plans
addressing greenhouse gas emissions have been prepared. That section will also describe the characteristics of greenhouse gas emissions reduction plans that may be used in a tiering context.

Definition

A definition of “greenhouse gas” was added in section 15364.5.

Energy Analysis

Appendix F was revised to clarify that EIRs must specifically consider a project’s energy use and efficiency potential. During its outreach efforts on the Proposed Amendments, OPR received some comments referring to the phrase “life-cycle analysis.” OPR finds, however, that the term is capable of different interpretations, and its usage in the Guidelines may potentially create confusion. Therefore, references to a “life-cycle analysis” in the existing Appendix F have been revised or eliminated for clarity.

Environmental Checklist

Questions relating to the effects of greenhouse gas emissions were added to the Appendix G Environmental Checklist. Other questions were revised to encourage consideration of forestry impacts and to clarify the proper focus of a traffic impacts analysis. OPR originally proposed deletion of level of service (LOS) references in the Checklist questions related to traffic and transportation. After considering public input, OPR recommends inclusion of revised questions in the Environmental Checklist that recognize the following: (a) the necessity of assessing traffic impacts on intersections, streets, highways and freeways, (b) a lead agency’s discretion to choose methodology, including LOS, to assess traffic impacts, (c) existing requirements in Congestion Management Programs, General Plans, ordinances, and elsewhere, and (d) traffic impacts include impacts to pedestrian, non-vehicular and mass-transit circulation.

Miscellaneous

Finally, several minor corrections and clarifications were added in sections 15065, 15086, and 15126.2.

Next Steps

This submittal to the Natural Resources Agency will be posted on the OPR website. The Natural Resources Agency will then begin a formal rulemaking process to certify and adopt the amendments as part of the state regulations implementing CEQA, in accordance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act (APA).

The Natural Resources Agency’s rulemaking process will include additional opportunities for public involvement, including comment periods and public hearings.
As required by the APA, the Resources Agency will respond to all public comments in writing before certifying and adopting the amendments.

The rulemaking process will be completed by January 1, 2010, as required by Public Resources Code section 21083.05(b). Names of interested parties on OPR's contact list for the SB 97 CEQA Guidelines process will automatically be placed on the Natural Resources Agency's contact list and will receive notices from the Natural Resources Agency regarding the 2009 CEQA rulemaking.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide further assistance.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Bryant
Director
XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

XIII XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?
Police protection?
Schools?
Parks?
Other public facilities?

XIV XV. RECREATION

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

ef) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?
August 20, 2009

Christopher Calfee, Special Counsel
ATTN: CEQA Guidelines
California Resources Agency
1017 L Street, #2223
Sacramento, CA 95814
Facsimile: (916) 653-8102
CEQA.Rulemaking@resources.ca.gov

ATTN: CEQA Guidelines Amendments

Dear Mr. Calfee:

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) appreciates this opportunity to comment on the CEQA guidelines, particularly the transportation checklist. VTA is the Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County as well as the transit operator; as such we are very committed to multimodal planning (transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian).

The existing transportation section of the checklist has no questions pertaining to pedestrian or bicycle mobility, transit operations or traffic safety. This has resulted in less than adequate attention being given to impacts to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit operations.

VTA staff supports many of the changes proposed by the OPR in the Preliminary Draft CEQA Guidelines Amendments. However, the amendments proposed by OPR do not contain new questions on impacts to nonmotorized or transit operations. We strongly support the recommended revisions to the transportation checklist as submitted by the State Department of Transportation in its letter dated February 2, 2009. Moreover, we have some slight wording modifications. In particular, VTA staff would like to recommend adding: 1) a new preamble to Appendix G - Initial Study Checklist; 2) a new question on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in Section VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions; and 3) changes to the transportation checklist.

1) New preamble to Appendix G - Initial Study Checklist

VTA supports OPR’s recommendation for the inclusion of the preamble to the initial study checklist.
2) **New question on Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in Section VII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

We strongly support Caltrans’ recommendation for the inclusion of a question regarding vehicle miles of travel (VMT). We think this question would be appropriate in Section VII - Greenhouse Gas Emissions since greenhouse gases such as CO2 are produced in direct proportion to vehicle miles traveled.

3) **Proposed Changes to CEQA Checklist, Section XVI. Transportation/Traffic**

We support the changes recommended by Caltrans. Please consider the following changes and additions to the Checklist, which were based on Caltrans’ letter and our analysis:

a) **Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

Exceed the capacity of the existing circulation system, based on an applicable measure of effectiveness (as designated in a general plan policy, ordinance, etc.), taking into account all modes of transportation including nonmotorized travel and all relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths, and mass transit?

b) **Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

c) **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in air traffic levels or a change in flight patterns or location that results in substantial safety risks to vehicles, bicycles or pedestrians?**

d) **Substantially increase hazards**

Substantially decrease traffic safety due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves, additional and/or inadequate dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

(e.g. due to adversely affecting sight distance, facilitating high speeds or by mixing incompatible uses, such as farm equipment)

e) **Result in inadequate emergency access?**

f) **Result in inadequate parking capacity?**

g-f) **Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding supporting or expanding public transit or non-motorized transportation alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?**
g) (Would the project) Affect the multi-modal performance of the highway and/or street and/or rail and/or off road nonmotorized trail transportation facilities, in terms of structural, operational, or perception-based measures of effectiveness (e.g. quality of service for nonmotorized and transit modes)?

h) (Would the project) Reduce, sever, or eliminate pedestrian or bicycle circulation or access, or preclude future planned and approved bicycle or pedestrian circulation?

i) (Would the project) Cause a degradation of the performance or availability of all transit including buses, light or heavy rail for people or goods movement?

In conclusion, we appreciate your consideration of incorporating our recommended changes in the CEQA Guidelines Amendments. Please feel free to contact myself or Michelle DeRobertis (408-321-5716) of my staff should you have any questions regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

John Ristow
Chief CMA Officer

cc  Ken McGuire Caltrans HQ
     Jay Norvell Caltrans HQ
     Beth Thomas Caltrans D4
     Ina Gerhard Caltrans D4
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Measure A Fund Exchange - Semi-Annual Update

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

State law guarantees Santa Clara County a formula share of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) over a six-year period. State law and regional policy make the VTA Board of Directors responsible for determining which eligible transportation projects will receive those funds.

The VTA Board of Directors, at its’ June 7, 2007, and December 13, 2007 meetings approved the exchange of STIP grant funds for Measure A funds and programmed STIP funds to Measure A projects in exchange for an equivalent amount of 2000 Measure A Sales Tax funds. The exchange of funds creates the Local Program Reserve (LPR) which allows the Board of Directors to use those funds to program to other transportation projects.

The Board approved the fund exchange for the following reasons stated in the memo:

• Accelerates Project Delivery and Reduces Administrative Costs: STIP funds come with substantial state requirements that impact schedule and cost of project delivery. The exchange of funds allows the Board to free the projects from the costly administrative burdens.

• Enables the VTA Board to manage Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) expenditures: By exchanging STIP funds, the VTA Board eliminates the need for Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to approve all STIP programming decisions after they are approved by the VTA Board. Further, it eliminates the CTC’s approval of all subsequent STIP fund allocations for all STIP funded projects.

A portion of the exchange funds will be used to pay interest to the Measure A program for fund advances. The initial amount is paid back when the CTC allocates the STIP funds to the Measure A projects and VTA draws the cash from the State. The interest will be calculated, and paid
from the LPR account when (1) all the STIP funds are drawn by the project and (2) all of the associated LPR funds are actually paid to projects. The interest rates will be calculated at that time as well, based on VTA's rates of return on its pooled investment accounts at the time that the advances were occurring.

**DISCUSSION:**

The progress of all the Exchange funded projects can be seen in Attachment A - Measure A Local Program Reserve Monitoring Report. As of July 15, 2009, $23,891,000 has been spent on various phases of the projects listed. Of note, the first three projects in the "Local Program Reserve Projects" table qualified for CMIA funds only because we were able to use exchange funds to advance these projects. CMIA funds allocated to each project were: $71.6 million (I-880 HOV Widening), $30 million (US 101 Improvements 280/680), and $84.93 million (US 101 Improvements SR 85).

All three of the County of Santa Clara's projects are in various stages and invoices have been remitted. The Alum Rock School District Area Traffic Calming project is completed, while the ITS Enhancements project completed the design phase and the Santa Teresa/Fitzgerald Intersection project has awarded a contract. Each project received exchange funds for project phases of Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) and Construction. The City of Gilroy’s Arroyo Camino project is already constructed and in service. Finally, the City of Milpitas has begun the Tasman East LRT landscaping project.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

On August 20, 2009 the Congestion Management Planning & Programming Committee commented and accepted the update to Measure A Fund Exchange Semi-Annual Report. The Committee members expressed a desire to have the Measure A Fund Exchange Procedures brought before them next month. This is a related, but separate agenda item to the Measure A Fund Exchange Semi-Annual Update which was discussed with the Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee On August 12, 2009.

Prepared By: Celeste Fiore
Memo No. 2194
## Attachment A - Measure A Local Program Reserve Monitoring Report

### STIP Measure A Projects Receiving STIP Funds ($107,980,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>STIP Funds</th>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Project描述</th>
<th>Program Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0476</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$57,540,000</td>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>Capitol Expressway LRT Extension</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0588</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$50,440,000</td>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>Airport People Mover</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $107,980,000

### Local Program Reserve Projects Receiving Measure A Funds ($107,980,000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LPRA Track #</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>LPR Funds Allocated By Board ($ in thousands)</th>
<th>Expend to Date</th>
<th>Project描述</th>
<th>Status Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LPRA001</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$23400</td>
<td>$3447</td>
<td>I-880 HOV Widening: SR-237 to US-101</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA002</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$12000</td>
<td>$4960</td>
<td>US 101 Improvements (280/680 to Tully)</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA003</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$17070</td>
<td>$3065</td>
<td>US 101 Improvements (85 to Embarcadero)</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA004</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Interchange</td>
<td>Prelim Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA005</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$4500</td>
<td>$2822</td>
<td>US 101/SR-25 Interchange</td>
<td>Environmental/PA&amp;ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA006</td>
<td>VTA/ACCMA</td>
<td>$8000</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-680 Sunol Grade HOV/HOT Lane</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA007</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$2500</td>
<td>$2495</td>
<td>SR-87 HOV North &amp; South - Cost Increase</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA008</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR-152/SR-156 Interchange - Cost Increase</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA009</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>$6725</td>
<td>$6725</td>
<td>Gilroy/Arroyo Circle/Arroyo Camino Improvements</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA010</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>$524</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathilda Ave Caltrain Bridge Reconstruction</td>
<td>Design 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA011</td>
<td>SCCounty</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>ITS Enhancements on Bascom Ave</td>
<td>Design 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA012</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>$2510</td>
<td></td>
<td>Butterfield Blvd Extension Project</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA013</td>
<td>SCCounty</td>
<td>$275</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>Santa Teresa/Fitzgerald Ave Intersection Signals</td>
<td>Contract Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA014</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td></td>
<td>Citywide Signal Upgrade Project Phase 2</td>
<td>Not initiated yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA015</td>
<td>SCCounty</td>
<td>$315</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>Alum Rock School District Area Traffic Calming</td>
<td>Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA016</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>$3725</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Ave Extension PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Environmental 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA017</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>$5076</td>
<td></td>
<td>Julian/St. James Downtown Couplet Conversion</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA018</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$3940</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-280 Soundwalls: Bird Ave to Los Gatos Crk</td>
<td>Not initiated yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA019</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$3860</td>
<td></td>
<td>I-680 Soundwalls: Capitol Xwy to Mueller Ave</td>
<td>Not initiated yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA020</td>
<td>VTA/SBCOG</td>
<td>$5000</td>
<td></td>
<td>SR-152 New Alignment</td>
<td>Pre-PA &amp; ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPRA021</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>$1800</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tasman East LRT Landscaping</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: $107,980,000 $23,892

PA&ED = Project Approval & Environmental Document
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-Based Transportation Plan - Milpitas

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) created the Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) program in 2002 to advance the findings of two reports completed in 2001 - *Lifeline Transportation Network Report* and the *Environmental Justice Report*. The Lifeline Report recommended community-based transportation planning as a way for residents of low-income communities to become part of the planning process in identifying transportation needs in their communities. MTC identified 25 “communities of concern” throughout the Bay Area to initiate Community-Based Transportation Plans. There are seven communities identified in Santa Clara County and to date, VTA has completed three of these plans: the Gilroy CBTP in July 2006, East San Jose CBTP in May 2009, and the Milpitas CBTP in August 2009.

The CBTP program is a collaborative process involving residents of low-income and minority communities, community-based organizations that provide services within these communities, transit operators, county congestion management agencies (CMAs), and MTC. Each planning process involves a significant community outreach component to encourage the direct participation of residents. The planning process results in a community-based transportation plan that identifies local transportation needs and proposes projects and programs in response. The final CBTP will explore funding opportunities and outline actions to implement solutions.
DISCUSSION:

VTA began the planning process for the Milpitas Community Based Transportation Plan in January 2009 by inviting representatives from organizations that serve the Milpitas community to participate in a Project Working Group (PWG). Representatives from the City of Milpitas, Santa Clara County, MTC, and VTA were invited to participate. The PWG guides the overall study and provides input on community outreach efforts. The PWG has met monthly since January to discuss study tasks and direct community outreach efforts. Some of the outreach efforts the PWG helped oversee were:

- **Project fact sheet/comment card** -- A project fact sheet and comment card was created to solicit feedback from the community. The Milpitas fact sheet provided important information about the project to the community as well as ways to participate in the study. The survey was one method of participation, and allowed residents to provide input on transportation needs in Milpitas. The fact sheet and comment cards were translated into English, Spanish, Chinese and Vietnamese.

- **Suggestion Boxes** -- Suggestion boxes were placed in several key locations in town to collect completed comment cards. These boxes were especially useful in popular destinations like the Milpitas Library in generating public interest in the comment cards.

- **Project Webpage** -- VTA created a project webpage on the VTA website that provided information about the study and the survey link.

- **Distribution of Milpitas fact sheet/comment card** -- VTA staff worked with community stakeholders to distribute over 5,000 copies of the Milpitas Fact sheet and comment card to Milpitas residents. VTA staff mailed over 2,500 surveys to SSA Welfare to Work recipients in Milpitas. VTA staff also distributed the fact sheet/comment cards during public meetings.

- **Focus Group Meetings** -- VTA with guidance from the PWG organized four focus group meetings which allowed a more in-depth conversation about transportation needs in Milpitas. The first focus group meeting was held at the Milpitas Teen and Youth Center on April 29th, and focused on transportation needs of youth. The second focus group meeting was held on May 6th with the Adult Education School and focused on the transportation needs of non-English speaking residents. The third focus group meeting was held on May 7th at Milpitas High School to discuss transportation barriers for students. The final focus group was a language-intensive meeting on May 12th to target transportation needs of seniors in the community.

In addition to these outreach materials and focus group meetings, VTA staff conducted several meetings with community stakeholders and the public to seek input on other transportation concerns that had yet to be identified. **Figure 1** provides a complete list of outreach events VTA staff held or attended as part of the outreach process:
### Figure 1. List of Outreach Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TYPE OF MEETING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kaiser Permanente</td>
<td>2/5/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Milpitas Library</td>
<td>2/5/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NOVA Works</td>
<td>3/5/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Barbara Lee Senior Center</td>
<td>2/9/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Barbara Lee Senior Center</td>
<td>5/12/2009</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Milpitas Adult Education Center</td>
<td>2/10/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Milpitas Adult Education Center</td>
<td>5/6/2009</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. India Community Center</td>
<td>5/22/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. BAPS Shri Swaminarayan Mandirs</td>
<td>2/19/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>5/2/2009</td>
<td>Community Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Milpitas Teen &amp; Youth Center</td>
<td>4/29/2009</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Milpitas Continuation School</td>
<td>2/10/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Milpitas High School</td>
<td>5/7/2009</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. City of Milpitas</td>
<td>3/17/2009</td>
<td>Open House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. City of Milpitas</td>
<td>4/2/2009</td>
<td>Public Meeting #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. City of Milpitas</td>
<td>5/28/2009</td>
<td>Public Meeting #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VTA staff has been working closely with the City of Milpitas, Santa Clara County Social Services, Outreach Inc. and other Project Working Group members since May to finalize the list of projects that would address transportation needs in Milpitas and be included in the final CBTP. The list of potential projects developed in response to the needs identified during the outreach process include pedestrian improvements with a focus on safety, lower transit fares, better bus stop amenities, more light rail/bus frequency, and community bus service. In addition, VTA staff took advantage of the extensive planning work the City of Milpitas has already done and incorporated those recommendations as part of the proposed projects.

The CBTP can be used by VTA, MTC, the City of Milpitas and other organizations for consideration in future planning, funding and implementation activities. One of the purposes of the final Milpitas CBTP is to identify projects that would be eligible for funding through the Lifeline Transportation Program, which is programmed by MTC. The Lifeline program is made up of State Transit Assistance (STA), Proposition 1B, and Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) funding sources, which supports projects such as: improved transit service and amenities, demand-response services, and auto based programs. The Santa Clara County Joint Lifeline Transportation Committee which administers Lifeline funding for the County will issue a call for projects sometime in 2009, depending on MTC’s schedule. VTA staff worked closely with the Project Working Group to finalize the Milpitas CBTP report and presented to the group the final draft of the plan in July 2009.

A draft copy of the Milpitas Community-based Transportation Plan is attached. The report will be presented to the Milpitas City Council and VTA Committees for input prior to final printing and distribution.
ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
The Committee for Transit Accessibility heard this item on August 12, 2009 and had the following comments regarding the proposed projects presented. Member Heatley commented that the proposed project to put restroom facilities at Great Mall Transit Center would be of most interest to this group. The transit center is a major hub and she supports the development of this project. Member Shah suggested that new routes with low ridership should be revisited after six months so that low performing routes do not continue to run. VTA staff agrees with this comment but also points out that new routes are given a year to mature and are once again revisited during the annual transit service plan update. Some members expressed concern about bus stop accessibility and Chair Morrow suggested that staff take a more systematic approach to evaluating bus stops.

The Technical Advisory Committee heard this item on August 13, 2009 and provided general comments on the study. Member Armendariz thanked VTA staff for a job well done with the community plan and added that this work was long overdue. He also appreciated staff’s efforts for bringing community buses to Milpitas since the city has long sought after community bus service and the much needed east-west access. He also commented on the impressive response rate for the surveys completed by the community.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:
The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee heard this item on August 20, 2009 and asked staff the following questions regarding the proposed Community Bus Service and funding availability through the Lifeline Transportation Program. Staff responded with details on the proposal and agreed that Lifeline funds may not be available anytime soon but the projects in the CBTP remain eligible for many other funding sources.

The Committee appreciated the quality of the outreach and planning effort by VTA staff and unanimously accepted the plan.

Prepared By: Aiko Cuenco
Memo No. 2091
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Executive Summary

History of Community-Based Transportation Planning

In 2001, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) completed the Lifeline Transportation Network Report and the Environmental Justice Report. Both reports identified the importance of a focused, community-based planning effort to address transportation needs of low-income communities throughout the Bay Area. Building on the findings of these reports, MTC initiated its Community-Based Transportation Planning Program in 2002. Through this effort, local public transit operators, transportation providers, community-based organizations, and county congestion management agencies (CMAs) identify transportation needs and generate detailed action plans at the local level.

The result of each planning process is a community-based transportation plan (CBTP) that identifies transportation needs and potential solutions. Each CBTP contains:

- A demographic analysis of the study area;
- Documented public outreach strategies and results;
- A list of community-prioritized transportation barriers;
- Potential strategies to address identified barriers;
- Potential funding sources; and
- Identified stakeholders committed to implementing elements of the plan, where applicable.

Milpitas Community-Based Transportation Plan

In January 2009, VTA initiated a CBTP focused on transportation needs of low-income communities in Milpitas, one of the areas selected in MTC’s Lifeline Transportation Report. Building on the MTC assessment, the Milpitas CBTP documents the efforts and results of the planning process. It describes the public outreach process used to compile community input, a listing of potential solutions, and a concerted action plan with possible funding sources for implementing transportation solutions.

Cooperation among local partners, both public and private, was crucial to the development of the Milpitas CBTP. Stakeholder agencies involved in the Milpitas CBTP process were: VTA, as lead agency; MTC, as funding partner; the County of Santa Clara; the City of Milpitas; the Barbara Lee Senior Center; Milpitas Teen & Youth Center; and OUTREACH, Inc.

CBTP Process

Representatives from these stakeholder agencies formed a Project Working Group to provide input throughout the CBTP process. The Project Working Group provided extensive input on public outreach efforts, the development of informational materials, and transportation challenges faced by Milpitas residents. The group also developed a fact sheet/comment card to be distributed during the public outreach period.
The development of this plan included a collaborative planning process that worked with the Milpitas community to identify key stakeholders to allow for a focused, efficient and effective community outreach program. Community participation was crucial to correctly identify transportation needs in the Milpitas community and work to develop solutions to those needs. The outreach program sought to create many options for community members to participate in the planning process and provide input on their transportation needs, such as:

- Participating in the Project Working Group
- Attending neighborhood meetings where VTA staff presented the project
- Attending a community event where the project was presented
- Participating in focus group meetings
- Responding to the Transportation Survey

The transportation issues that were of primary concern to community members were the following:

- Public transit service frequency
- Public transit service hours
- Amenities at bus stop waiting areas
- Affordability of transit
- Safety (both personal safety while waiting at transit stops and pedestrian safety at intersections)
- More information for public transit passengers

**Milpitas CBTP Transportation Proposals**

Following the public outreach period, the Project Working Group developed a list of proposed solutions to address the transportation needs identified through the Milpitas CBTP outreach process. The project development approach built on existing transportation plans and studies relevant to Milpitas as well as developed new ones in collaboration with the Project Working Group. **Table EX-1** lists the Milpitas CBTP proposals that were developed as possible solutions to transportation needs, which are described in more detail in Chapter 7.

Other identified issues which did not have a developed project or were not addressed in an existing plan are also documented in this report. These proposals serve as projects for future consideration subject to funding availability. These are listed in **Table EX-2**.
## Table EX-1 Milpitas Transportation Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit Services</strong></td>
<td>Milpitas Community Bus Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BART Extension to Santa Clara County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Light Rail Transit Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early Morning/Late Night Transit Needs Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation Amenities</strong></td>
<td>Milpitas Bus Stop Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule Information at Bus Stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enhanced Multi-Lingual Passenger Information (Printed Materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility Management Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Education Program for Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination with AC Transit Passes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycle and Pedestrian</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Ped Crossing Improvements at Great Mall Parkway at Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montague Expressway Sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street Streetscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ped Crossing Improvements at Great Mall Pkwy at Montague Expressway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td>New Bicycle Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto-Based Programs and</strong></td>
<td>Jump Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Projects</strong></td>
<td>Car Share Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Car – Vehicle Ownership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calaveras Blvd. Widening Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montague Expy/Great Mall Pkwy-Capitol Ave. Interchange Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dixon Landing Road Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dixon Landing Rd/Milpitas Blvd. Intersection Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Blvd. Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montague Expressway Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlo Street Ramp Conversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-680 Express Lane Proehct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-880 HOV Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demand-Responsive Services</strong></td>
<td>Senior Health Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Van Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give Kids a Lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer Driver Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table EX-2 Transportation Proposals for Future Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convert Express 180 to a Limited Stop Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlier/Later Service Hours on Key Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Shuttle Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Service to California Circle/Dixon Landing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott &amp; Calaveras Pedestrian Crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Bus Stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facilities at Great Mall Transit Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Route from San Jose to Milpitas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**About VTA**

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is an independent special district responsible for bus, light rail and paratransit operations; congestion management; specific highway improvement projects; and, countywide transportation planning. As such, VTA is both an accessible transit provider and multi-modal transportation planning organization involved with transit, highways and roadways, bikeways and pedestrian facilities.

VTA provides services to the 15 cities of Santa Clara County: Campbell, Cupertino, Gilroy, Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Los Gatos, Milpitas, Monte Sereno, Morgan Hill, Mountain View, Palo Alto, San Jose, Santa Clara, Saratoga and Sunnyvale.

VTA, as the designated Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County, was selected as lead agency in developing Community-Based Transportation Plans.
CHAPTER 1: Introduction

This chapter describes the purpose of the Milpitas Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP), and the local planning effort to develop the CBTP.

1.1 CBTP Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze specific transportation needs of low-income and minority communities in Milpitas. Low-income residents require safe, affordable, and reliable transportation services to meet daily needs, including access to work, education, medical facilities, and other life-enhancing services. The challenge for local agencies and jurisdictions is providing needed transportation options with responsible and efficient use of available funding and resources.

This study documents the specific needs of Milpitas low-income and minority residents, gathered through a public outreach process and other pre-existing plans and initiatives in the City of Milpitas. Milpitas residents and community-based organizations worked with local transportation providers to develop this CBTP. The Milpitas CBTP provides much of the information necessary to develop and implement relevant projects and services to improve transportation for residents in Milpitas.

Throughout this study, the term *lifeline* will be used to describe transportation services that connect communities of low-income residents to work sites, school locations, medical facilities, and locations where other vital services are provided.

1.2 Community-Based Transportation Planning

Following the passage of the federal welfare reform legislation, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area, has initiated a program to address transportation needs of low-income communities throughout the Bay Area. Through its Community-Based Transportation Planning Program, MTC unites community residents, local public transit operators and transportation providers, community-based organizations, and county congestion management agencies (CMAs) to design and implement transportation solutions at the local level.

The Community-Based Transportation Planning Program was launched in 2002 after MTC completed two reports in 2001: the *Lifeline Transportation Network Report* and the *Environmental Justice Report*. Both reports identified the importance of a focused, grassroots planning effort to identify transportation needs and detailed action plans.

The objectives of the program are to:

- Emphasize community participation in prioritizing transportation needs and identifying potential solutions;
- Foster collaboration between local residents, community-based organizations, transit operators, Congestion Management Agencies and MTC and;
- Expand community capacity by involving community-based organizations in the planning process.
The result of each planning process is a community-based transportation plan (CBTP) that identifies transportation needs and potential solutions. Each CBTP contains:
- A demographic analysis of the study area;
- Documented public outreach strategies and results;
- A list of identified transportation barriers;
- Potential strategies to address identified barriers;
- Potential funding sources; and
- Identified stakeholders committed to implementing elements of the plan, where applicable.

MTC adopted CBTP guidelines in 2002, which also identified 25 communities throughout the Bay Area (Figure I-1). Since the program’s inception, MTC and local agencies have partnered to produce transportation plans for many of these communities. MTC selected seven locations in Santa Clara County to complete CBTP. To date three plans have been completed: the City of Gilroy (2006), East San Jose (2008), and the City of Milpitas (2009). Figure I-2 is a map showing the completed CBTPs in Santa Clara County. Upcoming CBTP projects in Santa Clara County include Mountain View/Palo Alto, Alviso/Sunnyvale/Shoreline, Santa Clara, and South San Jose/Morgan Hill.
Insert Figure 1-1: MTC’s Communities of Concern
1.3 Local Planning Effort in Milpitas

The focus of the MTC program CBTP is an intensive community outreach process that actively involves the Milpitas community in the planning process and solicits their direct input on transportation needs as well as identifying solutions to address those needs.

The Milpitas CBTP documents the efforts and results of the six month planning and public involvement process. It describes the public outreach process used to garner community input, a listing of potential options to address community transportation needs, and an action plan that identifies possible funding sources for implementing transportation options. The plan also relies heavily on previous planning efforts either in process or recently completed by the City of Milpitas and VTA.
CHAPTER 2: Study Area Profile

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a description of the study area’s existing conditions including demographics, travel patterns and transit market.

Location

Milpitas is a diverse community located north of San Jose and south of Fremont along the east foothills of Santa Clara County (Figure 2-1). The study area consists of the entire city of Milpitas. See Figure 2-2 for a detailed map of the Milpitas Community-Based Transportation Plan study area.

Figure 2-1 Map of Santa Clara County
Figure 2-2 Milpitas CBTP Study Area Map
The Milpitas CBTP study area is composed of many new immigrants mostly from Asian countries. For the purposes of the CBTP Program, MTC has defined a community of concern as one in which at least 30 percent of households earn less than twice the federal poverty level. The 2009 federal poverty level for an average size household in Santa Clara County is $17,700. Official U.S. poverty thresholds do not vary geographically, so in a region such as the Bay Area where the cost of living is higher than the national average, the number of economically disadvantaged residents may be underrepresented by federally-defined poverty level statistics. To account for the high cost of living in the Bay Area, in MTC’s Transportation 2030 Equity Analysis Report (2004), MTC established the regional poverty level as double federal poverty level thresholds. Figure 2-3 shows that the Milpitas study area has pockets of poverty using MTC CBTP criteria.

**Figure 2-3 Milpitas’ Areas of Concern**

![Map showing Milpitas' Areas of Concern](image)

**Demographics**

**Population and Ethnicity**

According to 2005-07 US Census information, the total population in the City of Milpitas is 65,215. As Table 2-1 shows, 61 percent of the study area population is of Asian origins compared to 31 percent for Santa Clara County.
Table 2-1 Ethnic Composition of Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ Ethnicity</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black / African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaska Native</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2005-07 US Census

Language

As Table 2-2 shows, 43 percent of Milpitas residents speak an Asian or Pacific Island language, compared to 22 percent in Santa Clara County. The percentage of Spanish speakers in Milpitas is about half of those found in Santa Clara County.

Table 2-2 English Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Proficiency for Population Age 5 and up</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speak only English</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Spanish</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish _ English less than very well</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak other Indo-European</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indo-Eur _ English less than very well</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak Asian and Pacific Is.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API _ English less than very well</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2005-07 US Census

Age

As Table 2-3 shows, out of the total population, the largest age group is between 20 to 34 years in the Milpitas study area.

Table 2-3 Age Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Distribution</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 0 to 9 years</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 10 to 19 years</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 20 to 34 years</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population 35 to 44 years</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Population 45 to 54 | 15.7% | 14.8%
---|---|---
Total Population 55+ | 18.1% | 20.5%
*Source: 2005-07 US Census*

### Income and Poverty

As Table 2-4 shows, the median household income in the study area is $85,668 compared to $83,074 in Santa Clara County. The MTC poverty guideline of 200 percent federal poverty is shown as well. In Santa Clara County the average household size is 2.9 persons, which takes the 200 percent poverty threshold to about $35K for households in the county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2005-2007 Household Income Range</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>% of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or more</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income (dollars)</td>
<td>$85,668</td>
<td>$83,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Transportation

As Table 2-5 shows, 1.4 percent of the Milpitas study area population use public transportation to commute to work. The use of public transit for commuting to work is low compared with the 3.5 percent for Santa Clara County. Over 12 percent of Milpitas residents carpool to work, compared with just under 10 percent, in Santa Clara County as a whole. In addition, the majority of Milpitas residents drive alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commute to Work</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto – drive alone</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto – carpooled</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked from home</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean travel time to work (minutes)</td>
<td>21.3min</td>
<td>24min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existing Transportation Network
The following describes the existing transit, bicycle and pedestrian service and infrastructure in Milpitas.

Transit Services
On January 14, 2008 the VTA implemented new bus service in Santa Clara County as a result of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA). The COA was a two year in-depth effort to analyze VTA’s existing transit services, identify underserved markets and ultimately produce a new structure for bus service. The analysis was a survey of VTA bus and light rail passengers and a telephone survey of Santa Clara County households. As a result of the analysis, several key findings were made about each bus route in Milpitas:

Route 33 Tasman/1st – Great Mall/Main Transit Center
- This is not a high-performance route, 341 weekday boardings and averages slightly over 12 boardings per revenue hour.
- Route 33 also provides the only access to the McCarthy Ranch Shopping Center, where Wal-Mart is the major anchor store.

Route 46 Great Mall/Main – Washington/Escuela via Yellowstone
- This route generates 874 weekday boardings, but averages nearly 36 boardings per revenue hour, which is the second highest weekday bus productivity next to Route 22.
- The high school/middle school complex at Washington/Escuela generates nearly half of this route’s ridership.
- The relatively short length of this route, combined with the anchors at Great Mall and the Milpitas school complex contributes to its performance.

Route 47 Great Mall/Main – Washington/Escuela via Park Victoria
- This route carries slightly over 1,000 weekday boardings and averages nearly 30 boardings per revenue hour, seventh best weekday productivity for VTA bus services.
- The key generators for this route are Great Mall, the Milpitas commercial district on Calaveras, and the Milpitas school complex.
- The relatively short length of this route, combined with the generators it serves, contributes to its performance.

Route 66 Santa Teresa Hospital – Milpitas/Dixon
- Route 66 is one of VTA’s best-performing routes, generating over 5,100 weekday boardings and averaging over 31 boardings per revenue hour.

Figure 2-4 shows the existing transit service available in Milpitas after the COA implementation on January 2008.
Travel Destinations

Figure 2-5 shows that the majority of Milpitas residents are traveling within Milpitas. The rest are traveling from Milpitas to different cities in Santa Clara County as well as outside the County, which for the purposes of this map are divided into regions as shown in Figure 2-10. Both figures help to understand where Milpitas residents are traveling daily.

The two most popular travel destinations are destinations within Milpitas and neighboring areas of San Jose. The VTA Travel Demand Model, 2005 base year, generated trip numbers by taking into account land use data, including: jobs, employed residents, households, income, and population of age groups. Additional attributes are taken into account in the Travel Demand Model, including: free flow speeds, link length, capacity, headway, and transit schedule time, etc.
Figure 2-5 Milpitas Travel Destinations

Source: VTA Travel Demand Model, 2005 base year.

Figure 2-6 Milpitas CBTP Travel Regions

Source: VTA Travel Demand Model, 2005 base year.
Figure 2-7 shows daily travel within the City of Milpitas. The largest number of trips occurs in the north part of the city. Much less travel is occurring between sections of Milpitas.

**Figure 2-7 Milpitas Internal Travel Patterns**

Transit Market Analysis

Market Segmentation is the identification of groups of people -- or market segments -- that have similarities in characteristics or needs, who are likely to exhibit similar purchase behavior and/or responses to changes in the marketing mix. Public transit exists in a competitive environment where many potential customers have choices ranging from driving alone to telecommuting. Figure 2-8 shows the six different market segments that make up Santa Clara County.

**Figure 2-8 Santa Clara County Customer Market Segments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Type</th>
<th>Time Sensitivity</th>
<th>Transit Tolerance</th>
<th>Price Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Trippers</td>
<td>☢utilus</td>
<td>☢ultimo</td>
<td>☢urn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellow Movers</td>
<td>☢lius</td>
<td>☢inimum</td>
<td>☢imus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINKs &amp; MINKs</td>
<td>☢imus</td>
<td>☢imum</td>
<td>☢iurus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers &amp; Blazers</td>
<td>☢urus</td>
<td>☢urn</td>
<td>☢irus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young &amp; Restless</td>
<td>☢urus</td>
<td>☢urn</td>
<td>☢irus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers &amp; Shakers</td>
<td>☢urus</td>
<td>☢urn</td>
<td>☢irus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each market segment is classified in its own category with its own characteristics. These categories include: Transit Trippers, Mellow Movers, Young and Restless, and Movers and Shakers.

- **Transit Trippers** are likely to be high transit users, in households with no vehicles available, lower income, retired, unemployed, part-time employee, high school educated, and do not use English as primary language. Transit Trippers are the easiest market for public transit to capture. Transit Trippers tend to be very price sensitive and tolerant of transit, in addition they are not as time sensitive as other market segments.

- **Mellow Movers** are demographically similar to Transit Trippers but they are less price sensitive and less tolerant of transit.

- **Movers and Shakers** are likely to be low transit users, higher income, employed full-time, highly educated, and married. Movers and Shakers are the hardest and largest market segment for public transit to capture. Movers and Shakers tend to be extremely time sensitive while having a low tolerance of public transit and low sensitivity to prices.

- **Young and Restless** are demographically similar to the Movers and Shakers market segment but the Young and Restless tend to be a little more sensitive to prices.

Figure 2-9 shows the population of each customer type in Santa Clara County.

**Figure 2-9 Commuters by Customer Type**
The proportion of the population in Santa Clara County’s market segments is almost identical to that of the city of Milpitas. In Santa Clara County, 68 percent of the population is made up of the Young & Restless and Movers & Shakers, while in the City of Milpitas, these market segments, make up 67 percent of the population. In addition, 23 percent of the population in Milpitas and Santa Clara County are made up of Mellow Movers and Transit Trippers. In conclusion, the Milpitas market as a whole reflects that of Santa Clara County.

Figure 2-10 compares the transit profile of the county to that of Milpitas.

To measure how well transit will perform in a city or neighborhood, VTA uses an index of various market indicators such as land use mix and density, congestion, and the presence of amenable market segments. These factors are compiled into an index called the Transit Competitive Factor (TCF). Any TCF score above 100 demonstrates an area where transit can be a competitive travel choice.

When the City of Milpitas’ is broken up into three sections the market segmentation analysis shows that at the neighborhood level do not always reflect that of the County. For the purpose of this analysis the sections of Milpitas examined include: east of 680 freeway, south of Calaveras, and north of Calaveras.

- **East of 680 section** is characterized by 33 percent Mellow Movers and Transit Trippers, while 56 percent of the population is characterized by Young & Restless, and Movers & Shakers. The east of 680 section of Milpitas show a
market that is more apt to use transit and is larger than what is to be expected in the county and the city of Milpitas.

- **South of Calaveras** is characterized by 31 percent Transit Trippers and Mellow Movers, while 61 percent is characterized by Young & Restless, and Movers & Shakers. Like the east of 680 section of Milpitas, south of Calaveras show a population that is more likely to use transit as compared to the city of Milpitas and Santa Clara County.

- **North of Calaveras** is characterized by 22 percent Transit Trippers and Mellow Movers, while 69 percent is made up of Young & Restless, and Movers & Shakers segments. These statistics, north of Calaveras, fall in line with what is to be expected in the city of Milpitas and Santa Clara County.

In conclusion, individuals whose transportation origins are in Milpitas show a higher dependency on public transit in the areas east of the I-680 freeway and south of Calaveras. **Figure 2-15** shows a comparison of competitive transit origins in Milpitas.

**Figure 2-11 Transit Competitive Origins Comparison**

![Graph showing transit competitive origins comparison](image)

Milpitas has few transit competitive destinations. These transit competitive destinations include Great Mall, City Hall, and Calaveras Blvd (between 680 and 880 before the 237 freeway begins).

- **Great Mall and McCarthy Ranch** is made up of the same distribution of market segments, 24 percent Transit Trippers and Mellow Movers, and 66 percent Movers & Shakers, and Young & Restless. The key difference between these two destinations is that McCarthy Ranch has a transit competitiveness factor (TCF) of
34 and Great Mall has a TCF of 104. In addition, the number of trips being taken to McCarthy Ranch is significantly less than that of the Great Mall.

- **City Hall** was also examined and it has a TCF of 115, its market segments consists of 20 percent Transit Trippers and Mellow Movers, and 70 percent Movers & Shakers and Young & Restless. City Hall shows a competitive destination whose market is mostly made up of people who are particularly hard to reach as it pertains to using public transit.

- **Calaveras, west of City Hall**, has a TCF of 202 and the market is made up of 24 percent Mellow Movers and Transit Trippers, while 65 percent of the market is made up of Movers & Shakers and Young & Restless. The Calaveras destination shows a market that resembles the county and the city of Milpitas, but it leans towards a market that is easier for public transit to appeal to.

**Figure 2-12** compares transit competitive destinations, Great Mall and McCarthy Ranch, market profiles.

**Figure 2-12 Transit Competitive Destinations**

Milpitas’ existing transit network consists of four routes that circulate around the City and several routes that come from outside the city and terminate at the Great Mall transit center. The routes that circulate throughout Milpitas consist of the 33, 46, 47, and the 66. The existing transportation network covers the east of I-680 section of Milpitas with the 46 and 47 lines, while the 66 covers north and south of Calaveras. The 33 circulates around McCarthy Ranch terminating at the Great Mall. Using market analysis data one can see that the 33 is serving a market at McCarthy Ranch that is not transit competitive as a destination or an origin. In addition, bus service does not particularly serve the
The results of the market analysis show that those individuals from market segments who are more likely to use transit typically begin their trips south of Calaveras and/or east of I-680. Although, there are many transit competitive origins north of Calaveras, the market profile tends to favor a population that is less likely to use transit in the area. Using market analysis information, VTA can effectively improve existing service, create new meaningful service, and increase ridership, as VTA gets a better understanding of the people it serves.

**Figure 2-12** shows current transit routes in relation to competitive destinations and origins.

As the map above indicates, bus service covers the City of Milpitas well, with the exception of a few areas.
CHAPTER 3: Relevant Studies and Reports

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an overview of reports and studies that are relevant to the Milpitas Community-Based Transportation Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifeline Transit Network Report/Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td>December 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midtown Specific Plan</td>
<td>April 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td>June 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035</td>
<td>January 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Operations Analysis</td>
<td>January 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

2001 Lifeline Transit Network Report/2001 Regional Transportation Plan

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) as a piece of the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan, conducted a thorough analysis route-by-route basis of the Bay Area transit network to identify which public transit services, were most vital to disadvantaged neighborhoods. The final 2001 Lifeline Transit Network Report identified transit routes that are considered critical to low-income communities as those that:

- serve a neighborhood with a high concentration of CalWORKs households;
- provide service directly to areas with high concentrations of essential destinations;
- provide core trunkline service as identified by the transit operator; or
- provide a key regional link

The report also identified transportation gaps in low-income communities that prevent full access to the jobs and services, and recommended solutions to address these gaps.

The Community Based Transportation Planning Program was a recommendation of the Lifeline Transit Network Report as a means for communities to set priorities and evaluate options for filling local transportation gaps. MTC began the CBTP program in 2002, and
specified each CBTP planning process would be lead by the local CMA and would build on the Lifeline Transit Network Report to further identify transportation gaps in the identified communities.

Some of the key findings for Santa Clara County in the Lifeline Transit Network Report are:

- 12 of the 26 VTA Lifeline Transportation Network routes meet the hours of service objective on weekdays; 10 routes meet the objective on Saturdays, and 9 routes meet the objective on Sundays.

- VTA’s routes serve all areas in the county with either a large concentration of CalWORKs households or a concentration of essential destinations.

- Small clusters of low-income persons are scattered throughout the county.

- Santa Clara County has many concentrations of destinations including Downtown San Jose, Santa Clara, Sunnyvale, Mountain View, and Palo Alto. However, similar to San Mateo County, a mismatch exists between the location of low-income households and concentrations of destinations; most low-income households are in the eastern part of the county and essential destinations are in the western part of the Santa Clara Valley.

**City of Milpitas**

**Midtown Specific Plan**

With the adoption of the Midtown Specific Plan in March 2002, the City of Milpitas is experiencing substantial residential development activity along the S. Main Street and S. Abel Street corridors between Great Mall Parkway and Montague Expressway. The existing industrial and commercial land use sites were rezoned to Residential and Mixed-Use Land Uses with the adoption of the Midtown Specific Plan and landowners and developers are implementing the Plan. This development activity also introduces opportunities for the City to control and enhance the corridor.

The Midtown Specific Plan identifies specific corridors appropriate for Median Island and Streetscape enhancements to address aesthetics, safety and quality of life, but S. Main Street and S. Abel Street between Great Mall Parkway and Montague Expressway are not included on that list. Because of the high development activity in that corridor, the City of Milpitas commissioned the development of this Plan Line Study to identify the appropriate median island configurations and streetscape enhancements appropriate to help identify driveway locations and access control type for proposed developments and to beautify the corridor as redevelopment continues.
Transit Area Specific Plan

The Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan is a plan for the redevelopment of an approximately 437-acre area in the southern portion of the City that currently includes a number of industrial uses near the Great Mall shopping center. Based on City Council direction, the Draft Preferred Plan currently proposes redevelopment of this area with 7,109 dwelling units, 993,843 square feet of office space, 340 hotel rooms and 287,075 square feet of retail space centered around the proposed Milpitas BART station and the VTA Light Rail system.

Bikeway Master Plan

The Bikeway Master Plan consolidates all bicycle information developed by the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Commission (BPAC) and City staff including all policies previously adopted by the City Council into a single document for easy reference. The Master Plan highlights all of the bicycle improvement projects currently proposed throughout the city. These projects are mapped and described. The policies ensure that bicycle and pedestrian use and accommodations are considered in future construction projects.

This document serves as the basis for the guiding principles and implementing policies incorporated in the City's General Plan. This Bikeway Master Plan was recently updated to incorporate the changes related to the Midtown Specific Plan adopted in March 2002. Together with the Trails Master Plan an extensive network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities is to be created enhancing the livability and quality of life for our residential and business communities.
Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)

Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035
The Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035 is the countywide plan for transportation funding and service decisions for Santa Clara County for the next twenty years. The plan will include a prioritized list of transportation projects, as well as long-range strategic recommendations for land use and transportation policies. The City of Milpitas is considering the following projects to be included in VTP 2035:

Calaveras Boulevard Widening
The existing two bridges between Milpitas Blvd and Abel Street would be replaced with a six-lane bridge complete with 10’ sidewalks and 6’ bike lanes. Auxiliary lanes
between Abel Street and I-880 together with operational improvements at the Abel Street and Abbott Avenue intersections would be added to insure smooth transitions and continuous bike lanes.  
*Approximate cost = $70 million*

**Montague/Great Mall-Capital Avenue Urban Interchange**
This intersection has been operating at congested levels of service “F” since 1991. A grade separation of the Great Mall-Capitol through lanes over Montague Expressway would greatly enhance capacity and maintain compatibility with the existing elevated light rail structure and future BART. The resultant at-grade signalized intersection on Montague Expressway would accommodate a partial frontage road and left turn lanes.  
*Approximate cost = $60 million*

**Dixon/Milpitas Intersection Improvements**
An additional northbound left turn lane, a southbound right turn lane, and an eastbound right turn lane would be provided.  
*Approximate cost = $3 million ($105,000 available from Developer Fees)*

**Dixon Landing Road Widening**
This facility is currently primarily four lanes wide and serves as a secondary commute corridor between the I-680 and I-880 freeways. With completion of the Dixon Landing/1880 interchange reconstruction project, scheduled in early 2004, widening Dixon Landing Road between I-880 to Milpitas Blvd to six lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes would further reduce traffic congestion.  
*Approximate cost = $60 million*

**Comprehensive Operations Analysis**
The Comprehensive Operations Analysis was a 24 month process of data collection, planning, stakeholder input and community outreach to better understand the transportation needs of Santa Clara County residents. The primary objectives of the COA effort were to increase ridership while improving operating efficiency. The COA effort would be cost neutral but hopefully revenue positive, producing sustainable long-term fiscal benefits. The COA began in 2006 with an extensive data collection effort and ended with the successful implementation of new bus service on January 14, 2008. The extensive overhaul affected over 90 percent of the countywide bus system. The new service focuses on a core network of routes providing 15-minute or better all-day frequencies, enhanced Express Bus services, and new low-fare Community Bus routes. Milpitas falls within the core network, and many of the routes perform below standards. The COA developed a framework of the continual process of improving transit services in Santa Clara County. VTA developed a Transit Sustainability Policy as a piece of the
COA, and the TSP defines service standards as a basis of evaluation. VTA conducts an Annual Transit Service Plan, and will use the TSP to evaluate both the effectiveness of COA changes as well as future service changes.

**Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP)**

The Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP) was adopted by the VTA Board of Directors as the funding mechanism for countywide bicycle projects. When first adopted in 2000, roughly $31 million was set aside over a 10-year BEP period (FY 2000/1-2009/10). It was subsequently augmented, with the biggest changes in the BEP funding being the inclusion of MTC’s Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Program and the extension of the timeframe to be 25 years to be consistent with the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP). This action increased the BEP funds to approximately $99 million for the 2000-2030 period; as of FY 2007/08, $33 million has been programmed. This funding was primarily from four funding programs:

- Measure B Bicycle Funds, a one-time $12 million infusion;
- Transportation Fund for Clean Air 40% Program (TFCA 40%);
- Transportation Development Act Article 3 Pedestrian & Bicycle Program (TDA 3);
- Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program Funds (RBPP); MTC’s program composed of a dedicated portion of the Region’s Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds.

Each of these fund sources is governed by a separate set of programming criteria and policies that the VTA Board of Directors amended to guarantee the availability of funds for the BEP. The BEP project list is amended in coordination with the adoption of the revised VTP approximately every 3 years and incorporates new projects.

**Milpitas Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing**

This project will add a bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing over Montague Expressway, crossing the Union Pacific Railroad Tracks. The total cost for this project is $15 million with a BEP allocation of $2.4 million.
2009 VTA Annual Transit Service Plan

Annually, VTA has prepared a Service Management Plan to evaluate performance of the transit system and to provide proposed service change recommendations. This report, completed in July 2009, identifies many improvements for Milpitas transit. Ridership for line 66 has increased 15%-20% in 2008. Due to the increase in ridership line 66 would be modified to operate every fifteen minutes all day over the entire route on weekdays. Express 180 will continue on its existing routing, operating every 30 minutes all day on weekdays and hourly in the evenings until approx. 10:30 p.m. On weekends a new 7:42pm southbound trip would be added to Express 180. Lines 33, 46, 47 have characteristics of Community Bus routes that VTA operates in other areas. In addition, for most of the day, excluding school trips, ridership levels on lines 46 and 47 do not warrant the larger buses. As a result, a possible conversion to Community Bus service will be considered as the needs of Milpitas change.
CHAPTER 4: Community Outreach Approach

The Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) program is a collaborative planning process which emphasizes community participation in identifying local transportation needs, as well as potential solutions to address those needs. This chapter describes the public outreach approach developed to engage Milpitas residents in providing input on local transportation issues.

Outreach Strategy

The CBTP planning process involves a significant community outreach component to engage the direct participation of Milpitas residents. The success of the CBTP is dependent upon effective public outreach and close collaboration with local residents, community-based organizations and elected officials to develop a plan reflective of the community’s transportation needs.

The focus of the CBTP outreach process was to target key locations and demographic groups which represent the segments of the community most in need of transit services. With this in mind, the project team of staff, outreach consultants and project working group (PWG) members directed outreach efforts towards low-income residents, seniors, youth and students, and disabled persons. General feedback from the community was also encouraged with the use of specific outreach materials placed in central locations around town. Additionally, due to Milpitas’ unique demographic makeup of large minority groups (74% minority population) a concerted effort was made to involve non-English speaking residents as part of the outreach process.

The project team developed an outreach approach with the following goals in mind:  
1) create effective partnerships,  
2) develop accessible outreach materials,  
3) use creative marketing tools, and  
4) host engaging and informative outreach events.

With this approach, the project team sought to reach as many of the target audience as well as general community for public input. Public participation is crucial to a successful CBTP and as such, the project team provided many different options for community members to become involved in the planning process:

- Participate in the Project Working Group or as a project stakeholder
- Attend a community meeting where VTA staff was invited to present project information
- Attend a public meeting VTA staff hosted
- Participate in focus group meetings
- Complete the Comment Card
Partnerships

Participating as a stakeholder in the CBTP is one of the more direct ways to become involved in the planning process. The project team formed partnerships with community organizations that either represent or provide services to the target demographic groups. Since community participation is crucial to correctly identifying transportation issues residents are most concerned about, the project team relied on the organizations’ contacts and knowledge of the community to effectively conduct community outreach. There were two distinct groups which community organizations could fall under depending on their desired level of involvement: the project working group or stakeholder group. The project working group provided a more direct role in the study’s development while the stakeholders provided support and input as critical milestones were met.

Project Working Group

The VTA project team formed a Project Working Group to provide guidance on the community outreach efforts and input on the overall project. The Project Working Group was comprised of approximately 14 representatives from the VTA, City of Milpitas staff, County of Santa Clara, Social Services Agency and several community-based organizations providing services within the study area. Participation in the Project Working Group provided members with the opportunity to provide extensive input on public outreach efforts, the development of informational materials, as well as direct input on the challenges faced by walking, riding bicycles and using transit in and around Milpitas. Members also were encouraged to help distribute fact sheets/comment cards to the communities/people they represent and several also helped to organize briefings. The Project Working Group was composed of members from the following stakeholder agencies:

- VTA, lead agency
- MTC, funding partner
- City of Milpitas
- County of Santa Clara, Social Services Agency
- Milpitas Teen & Youth Center
- Milpitas Senior Center
- Outreach, Inc.

Stakeholders - Community-Based Organizations

The project team developed a list of stakeholders comprised of community-based organizations that serve a diverse cross-section of Milpitas residents. The CBOs either represented a key demographic group or served the low-income or minority population in the city. CBOs provided a significant amount of outreach support by helping the project team reach out to various members of the community. CBOs helped bridge the information gap between the project team and residents and encouraged participation throughout the outreach process. Many organizations also agreed to distribute comment cards as well as host suggestion boxes in their facilities to collect completed comment cards. Table 4.1 lists the organizations who participated in the CBTP and each organization’s level of involvement.
Table 4.1 List of Participating Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Hosted Focus Group</th>
<th>Public Meetings</th>
<th>Distributed Fact Sheet/Comment Card</th>
<th>Stakeholder Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas Library*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente*</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CalWORKS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Lee Senior Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas Adult Education Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras Hills Continuation School*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas High School*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Gardens Senior Living Apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAPS Shri Swaminarayan Mandirs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVA Works</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas Teen &amp; Youth Center</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas Economic Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Agency – Welfare to Work Recipients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVries – Milpitas Adult School Senior ESL Class</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Church in Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mall Shopping Center*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milpitas (City Hall)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drop-off location with Suggestion Box

**Outreach Materials**

The project group developed a comprehensive outreach strategy to identify the appropriate communication methods for achieving maximum project exposure. Since community participation is essential to a successful CBTP, the project team used various communication tools to inform the public of the Milpitas study:

- Collateral materials (fact sheet/comment cards, flyers, suggestion boxes, etc.)
- Media and web
- Public meetings
Outreach materials were developed to be as accessible to the public as possible. Whenever feasible, outreach materials were provided in other languages such as Spanish, Chinese and Vietnamese. Using Census data, the project team chose to translate materials in these languages to capture the non-English speaking residents in the community.

Staff worked closely with the project working group to identify key stakeholders and community-based organizations to contact for efficient dissemination of outreach materials to the target audience. With the different options for providing public input, community members were able to submit their transportation concerns and/or ideas by one of the following ways:

- Turn in a Fact Sheet/Comment Card to a project representative
- Drop off a comment card at a suggestion box
- Go on the project web page
- Attend a VTA-sponsored public meetings
- Participate in a VTA-sponsored focus group meeting
- Attend a community meeting
- Schedule a stakeholder meeting with a project representative
- Email project representative

Fact Sheet/Comment Card
A project fact sheet/comment card was created to provide an overview of the CBTP, help identify transportation needs and solicit feedback on the project. The fact sheet/comment card was provided in English, Spanish, Chinese and Vietnamese to reach the widest audience possible (Appendix B). Approximately 2,773 fact sheets/comment cards were mailed to Welfare to Work recipients with data provided by the Santa Clara County Social Service Agency. In addition, more than 5,000 fact sheets/comment cards were distributed via various outlets, including at focus groups, public meetings, CBO offices and on the project web page (Appendix C).

VTA staff also distributed the fact sheet/comment card at the Great Mall Shopping Center, Milpitas City Hall and the Milpitas Library in order to reach community members who may not had the opportunity to attend a focus group or public meeting. Residents were provided with several options to return the comment cards: by suggestion boxes placed around town, by mail or in person at any outreach event. Comment card responses were collected, analyzed and summarized by the survey team and are included in this report (Appendix D).

Suggestion Boxes
VTA staff placed several suggestion boxes around town to provide convenience for turning in completed comment cards. Milpitas Library and City Hall, as the two central locations in town, served as main drop-off locations. A couple of other suggestion boxes were rotated between several different locations throughout Milpitas to encourage residents from other parts of town to complete and return the comment cards. These locations included Kaiser Permanente hospital, Milpitas High School, and the Continuation School.
The suggestion boxes also featured a flyer in four languages (including English) to draw the attention of non-English speakers to the comment cards made available in Vietnamese, Chinese and Spanish.

![Suggestion box in Milpitas Library](image1)

![Suggestion box flyer translated in 4 languages](image2)

**Project Web Page**

An electronic version of the comment card as well as project information was made available via the project web page on VTA’s website ([http://www.vta.org/studies/milp_cbtp/index.html](http://www.vta.org/studies/milp_cbtp/index.html)). A flash banner on VTA’s website allowed web visitors to access the web page directly from the homepage. The flash banner publicized the CBTP web page which had important project information such as meeting dates, staff contacts, and project updates.

VTA utilizes a subscription-based system to alert those subscribed to a particular web page of new content. This feature was made available for the project web page which allowed interested persons to subscribe to receive email notices whenever the page became updated with new information.

![Transitional flash banner on VTA’s homepage: www.vta.org](image3)
Press Release

The project team recognizes the importance of using several different outlets for disseminating information. To ensure that project information and its public meetings were publicized to a wide audience – especially to reach those without access to the internet - the project team worked with several newspapers to bring the transportation study to the community’s attention.

Tri-City Voice of Fremont, Hayward, Milpitas, Newark, Sunol and Union City followed the study’s progress from beginning to end, writing three articles to publicize the two public meetings as well as a final article describing recommendations that came out of the outreach efforts. The Milpitas Post covered the project’s Open House meeting and presentation at a local neighborhood meeting in two separate articles. Complete versions of the newspaper articles are included in Appendix E.

Flyers

Public meeting flyers were created to publicize the three CBTP public meetings. Flyers were sent with email notices to CBOs to provide stakeholders the information and materials to publicize outreach event to their clients. CBOs participated by printing the flyers in-house, posting them in and around their facilities and making announcements to remind community members of the important meeting dates.

Outreach Events

The project team was involved in various types of outreach events to gather information from the community on transportation issues. The meetings ranged from informal one-on-one meetings with CBO contacts to more formal larger public meetings. Table 4.2 lists the different types of outreach events VTA sponsored or attended as part of the CBTP outreach process and Figure 4.1 show the outreach events by location. More detailed discussion on each type of meeting is presented below and comments received from these meetings are summarized in Chapter 5.
Table 4.2 List of Public Outreach Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kaiser Permanente</td>
<td>2/5/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Milpitas Library</td>
<td>2/5/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NOVA Works</td>
<td>3/5/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Barbara Lee Senior Center</td>
<td>2/9/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Barbara Lee Senior Center</td>
<td>5/12/2009</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Milpitas Adult Education Center</td>
<td>2/10/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Milpitas Adult Education Center</td>
<td>5/6/2009</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. India Community Center</td>
<td>5/22/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. BAPS Shri Swaminarayan Mandirs</td>
<td>2/19/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>5/2/2009</td>
<td>Community Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Milpitas Teen &amp; Youth Center</td>
<td>4/29/2009</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Milpitas Continuation School</td>
<td>2/10/2009</td>
<td>Stakeholder Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Milpitas High School</td>
<td>5/7/2009</td>
<td>Focus Group Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. City of Milpitas</td>
<td>3/17/2009</td>
<td>Open House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. City of Milpitas</td>
<td>4/2/2009</td>
<td>Public Meeting #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. City of Milpitas</td>
<td>5/28/2009</td>
<td>Public Meeting #2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Meetings

VTA staff conducted one-on-one preliminary meetings with community organizations in Milpitas to inform key stakeholders of the CBTP study. Stakeholder meetings were organized to build working relationships with the organizations and to gather support for public outreach efforts to be conducted in the community. Stakeholders were encouraged to distribute comment cards and/or host a suggestion box in their facility. From these stakeholder meetings, VTA staff gained insight into each organization’s mission and work in the community. Additionally, staff had the opportunity to conduct informal discussions with clients on what transportation issues they face in traveling to reach the services they need as well as general concerns traveling around town.
Community Meetings
VTA staff took advantage of several existing community meetings in Milpitas as another opportunity to present project information and solicit input. VTA attended a meeting with the Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association, a neighborhood group of local homeowners and residents, and the Milpitas Economic Development Commission, an advisory committee to Milpitas City Council, to update community members on the project’s preliminary findings as well as solicit their feedback on transportation issues in the community.

Public Meetings
The project team kicked off the public outreach process with an Open House on March 17, 2009. The Open House provided an opportunity for the community to learn about the transportation study and meet the project team. The meeting was conducted in the Milpitas Library as an informal open house which allowed attendees to informally view information on poster boards and ask questions of the project team. The poster boards were organized as an interactive exercise which asked attendees to place stickers on each board to indicate where and what transportation issues they are most concerned about. This provided everyone an opportunity to view all of the information presented on the poster boards, share their comments and become engaged in meaningful discussions with the project team.

The following public meeting on April 2nd summarized the transportation concerns identified from the outreach process in a presentation format. The public was invited to provide input on the issues gathered so far and to discuss additional transportation needs yet to be expressed in the comment cards and outreach events. At the final public meeting on May 28th, the project team presented project proposals that were developed to address the needs identified. The community was encouraged to stay involved in order to provide comments on the proposed projects presented and help the project team shape the final recommendations to incorporate into the report.

Focus Group Meetings
Focus group meetings were organized to gather input from community members to expand VTA’s understanding of transportation and transit needs. The focus group format allowed for more detailed discussion of issues, particularly gaps in the transportation network, issues related to youth, seniors and minority communities within Milpitas and potential solutions to address these needs and issues.

Four focus group meetings were held with participants identified through a collaborative process led by the Project Working Group. The Project Working Group also provided
input on the information that was most important to gather in the study, which helped to
direct the questions asked at the focus group meetings (Appendix F). The focus group
meetings were designed and organized with an understanding of different key
demographic groups with multi-lingual needs in the community.

The first focus group meeting was
directed toward the youth community
and was held at the Milpitas Teen
Center. The second and third meetings
were orientated toward community
members who do not speak English as
their first language. Adult ESL students
attended the meeting held at the Milpitas
Adult Education Center, and Mandarin-
speaking senior citizens attended the
meeting held at the Milpitas Senior
Center.
The final focus group was conducted
with high school students from Milpitas
High School. More details about these
meetings and the comments received are discussed in Chapter 5, and full summaries are
included in Appendix G.
CHAPTER 5: Community Outreach Findings

This chapter summarizes the comments received from the various public outreach events held in Milpitas during February through May 2009. Input received was used to develop a list of transportation proposals, which are further described in Chapter 6.

Outreach Findings

Comment Card Results

The comment card was an opportunity for Milpitas residents to provide direct input on their transportation needs and issues. From the 602 comment cards returned, the project team was able to extract some important findings about the Milpitas community. The first two questions on the comment cards revealed information about the respondent’s residential location and age. To get a better understanding of where respondents were traveling from, each respondent’s residential location was mapped (see Figure 5.2). Figure 5.2 shows that respondents are fairly distributed around the city with expected clustering in the residential portions of town. Additionally, the map shows that there are respondents from North San Jose, outside of the study area.

The number of respondents from each age group was also fairly evenly distributed. With the senior and youth population representing the high and low end of the spectrum respectively, there is a fair representation of each age group’s comments and concerns in the overall findings. Figure 5.1 below shows the age distribution of comment card respondents.

Figure 5.1 Age Distribution of Respondents

![Age Distribution of Comment Card Respondents](image)
A more detailed discussion on the rest of the comment card results is presented in the full summary report as **Appendix D**. The following lists some highlights of the findings gathered from the comment cards:

- The most common modes of transportation are bus, car and walking
- The top three destinations in town are the new library, stores and school
- 54.8% of respondents do not own a car
- The biggest transportation concerns identified by the respondents are: lack of transit services in their area, the high cost of fares, personal safety while walking or bicycling, and transit services during the late night or early morning hours (after 10pm or before 6am)
The following destinations have the highest percentage of respondents traveling to by bus (an average of 63% of respondents per destination): the church, hospital, parks and Senior Center

Respondents are less concerned about two transportation issues: school transportation and lack of bicycle and pedestrian facilities

Only 1% of respondents use the Light Rail – the least used mode of transportation in Milpitas

Cost and service frequency are the predominant concerns shared by all age groups

For respondents who do not own cars, costs and lack of transit service are an overwhelming concern – over 50% responses for each issue (percentages do not equal 100% because respondents can choose up to three top concerns)

Youth (age ≤16) are most concerned about costs and traffic congestion

Comments from Public Meetings

Three public meetings were organized to gather community input in the beginning, middle and end of the study. The Open House served as the kick-off meeting with the public to compile a list of preliminary concerns. The April 2nd public meeting presented the top transportation concerns gathered from the comment cards and outreach events to the public. Additional comments and suggestions were received up to the final public meeting wherein VTA staff presented transportation proposals for public input. The following is a summary of each public meeting.

Open House Public Meeting (March 17th, 2009): The Open House public meeting was held in the Milpitas Library. The library, one of the more popular destinations in town, regularly draws 2,600 people daily – mostly mothers, teens and seniors. The library was an ideal location to host a kick-off public meeting as it attracted not only expected attendees from previous stakeholder meetings but regular library patrons passing by.

Approximately 16 people attended the open house including an adult ESL class from DeVries Senior Housing. As described in the previous chapter, attendees were asked to place a total of five stickers on three poster boards which outlined transportation topics of concern and destinations most traveled to. The transportation issues attendees were most concerned about are: lack of transit service in their area, personal safety while biking and lack of bike lanes/paths. Top destinations most traveled to
include McCarthy Ranch, Ranch 99, Great Mall Shopping Center, City Hall and the light rail station.

**Public Meeting #2 (April 2, 2009):** The public meeting held at Milpitas City Hall was a combination of both open house and presentation format. The poster board exercise was repeated as the open house activity, followed by a staff presentation on the CBTP program and existing transit service in Milpitas.

Approximately 12 residents attended the public meeting. Among the top concerns discussed are lack of east-west connection and the desire for community buses in the community. A few members of Milpitas High School staff expressed concern for the high cost of fares for students and suggested outreach at various schools’ registration days to increase awareness for public transit.

**Public Meeting #3 (May 28th, 2009):** The final public meeting was conducted in Milpitas City Hall to present the transportation proposals developed in response to the comments received. Staff presented a summary of findings from the public outreach period as well as transportation proposals to potentially address the needs identified by the community. Proposed projects listed for future consideration include bus route modification, introduction of community buses and lower fares.

Approximately 13 residents attended the public meeting including members from BREATHE California, Milpitas High School, Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association and Tri-City Voice newspaper. The majority of the comments addressed the need for better information, increased safety and circulation improvements around the Escuela area.
Two student volunteers from Russell Middle School as part of the Youth for a Cool Earth Project did a presentation on suggested improvements around Russell Middle, Pomeroy Elementary and Milpitas High School. These suggestions included a How-to YouTube video on riding the bus, emergency phones and better waiting environment at bus stops near schools.

**Comments from Community Meetings**
The project team was invited to attend two regularly scheduled community meetings in Milpitas to do a presentation on the CBTP. Staff was able to build on these existing meetings by capturing a new audience to seek input on transportation needs.

**Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association (May 2, 2009):** Approximately 25 residents attended the Sunnyhills community breakfast to hear a presentation on the transportation plan and current bus service performance in Milpitas. Members expressed concern for improved bus shelters at Great Mall and Park Victoria/Landess, east-west connection, better route to Kaiser, and improved fare boxes to provide change. Additionally, the Association is a strong proponent for a pedestrian overcrossing at Yosemite and Curtis over the railroad tracks. In particular, the group advocates for implementing a personal rapid transit (PRT) system as a solution to overcome the pedestrian barrier.
**Economic Development Commission (May 11, 2009):** The Economic Development Commission is a committee composed of community members representing various business sectors such as restaurants, hotels, and technology companies in Milpitas. The 11-person committee advises the city on economic development and business issues.

The committee provided suggestions for improving transit access including tying the LIFT ZONE areas as part of the plan and introducing community buses in the community. The LIFT Zone program was initiated in 2009 and works with property owners/landlords to improve older, gentrifying residential neighborhoods. City departments including Building and Safety, Planning & Neighborhood Preservation assist with identifying locations and recommendations of improvements. The locations identified for improvements are the Adams/ Temple Area and South Main Street.

**Comments from Focus Group Meetings**

The project team organized a total of four focus group meetings with the goal of targeting key demographic groups in the community for input: the youth, adults and seniors. Two separate meetings were conducted with the young demographic group to gather transportation concerns from both high school students and the general youth. A variety of topics were covered during the meetings such as cost of fares, transit amenities, safety, and extended transit service which revealed key topics of concern. Below is a summary of concerns sorted by topic. To read a full summary of all the comments, see Appendix G.

**Milpitas Teen Center Focus Group (April 29, 2009):** The Milpitas Teen Center is a free drop-in program for teens ages 12-17. The center provides a safe, supervised place for teens to socialize, study and/or participate in weekly and monthly events. The youth participants were students from the teen center who relied on public transit, primarily bus, to get to their destinations.

Approximately 12 people participated in the focus group discussion. The majority of the comments addressed bus transit, specifically cost and reliability. The participants in particular suggested lowering fares for youth passes and increasing bus reliability. In addition, participants requested bus route schedules should be posted at bus stops.

**Milpitas Adult Education Center Focus Group (May 6, 2009):** The Milpitas Adult Education Center provides Adult English as a Second Language (ESL) classes for beginning, intermediate, and advanced level speakers. The majority of the students that participated were Mandarin speaking, but Hindi-speaking and Spanish-speaking students also participated. The participants were primarily from Milpitas, but several also commuted from Fremont.

Approximately 10 local adult ESL students participated. Participants rely on a variety modes of transportation, including car, bike, and bus, to travel to destinations within Milpitas. The majority of the comments addressed bus transit, specifically timeliness and routing. The participants in particular suggested direct routes to popular destinations and
increased bus reliability. In addition, participants requested bus route schedules be made available in multiple languages.

**Milpitas High School Focus Group (May 7, 2009):** The meeting was held at Milpitas High School with student aides and student representatives from the Associated Student Body (ASB). Participants ranged in grade levels with a majority of juniors and seniors represented.

Approximately 11 students participated. The majority of the comments addressed how participants travel to and from school. Most students choose to either drive or get driven to school; few walk and none bike. Students commented that buses took too long to leave campus, were crowded and required payment. However, if it would cost more to drive, many would switch to taking the bus. Other concerns regarding pedestrian issues also came up including needed crosswalks at Abbott and Calaveras, sidewalk on one side Jacklin Rd. and pedestrian crossing at California Circle/San Andreas over the railroad tracks.

**Senior Center Focus Group (May 12, 2009):** The meeting was held at the Milpitas Barbara Lee Senior Center, which is part of the City of Milpitas Recreation Services and offers members many programs and activities, such as classes and socials. Participants were primarily Mandarin speaking residents of Milpitas, with a few residents of San Jose, who rely on bus transit to get to most destinations within Milpitas.

Approximately 21 seniors participated. The majority of the comments addressed bus transit, specifically routes, cost and comfort. The participants in particular suggested lowering fares, providing a more direct route to City Hall, and providing more onboard information about stops. In addition, participants requested bus route schedules in Chinese and shelters at the bus stops.

**Summary of Comments**

The project team received comments on a variety of topics. Key issues included a lack of onboard information about upcoming bus stops, the cost of bus fares, need for improved reliability of transfers and changes in bus routes and schedules. Below is a summary of comments, sorted by topic. To read all comments, see meeting summaries in Appendix G.

(Note: “*” Indicates that several participants made the same basic comment.)

**Bus Stop Locations and Amenities**

Most of the participants were satisfied with the bus stop locations, however a few mentioned the need for bus stops in residential neighborhoods. Participants suggested that benches and shelters at bus stop locations should be provided. Additional amenities mentioned were water fountains, restrooms and lighting. Participants also noted more room for wheelchairs and bikes is needed.
The walking distance is long from the residential areas to the main roads with bus stops.

Bus stations, especially along Jacklin Rd. and Park Victoria, often have litter crowded around seats. Perhaps multilingual signs would alleviate the problem.

The stop sign between two signals on Calaveras Blvd is unnecessary.

The walking distance to the Pines bus stop is too long for those living in the far side of the neighborhood.

Many of the bus stops don’t have adequate shelters*
- Bus 66 1st stop after Dixon (Milpitas/Hillside) needs a bench and shelter; it’s the one behind the Senior Lodge
- Shelters are needed at stops on Calaveras and Park Victoria stops
- Larger shelters that include a space for wheelchairs is needed*

Need stations with bathrooms, water fountains, and shelters to protect from rain.

There is no toilet or water fountain at the Great Mall transit stop. This is very hard for seniors (and others).

Transparent walls in the bus stop shelters are needed for drivers to see passengers waiting to be picked up at bus stops.

Some bus stops are too dark at night and it feels unsafe.* In particular, the Rancho bus stop by Yellowstone

AC Transit – one line (217) moved the bus stop across street so now my stop is more difficult to reach.

Bus stops in Fremont, particularly at the 215/217 transfer near AutoMall/Fry’s Electronics, are too far away; passengers feel unsafe walking home at night.

Bus 70 @ Hostetter, requires a 20 minute walk catch bus stop back

The two bus stops on the 66 bus route northbound near St. Johns and the Auto center should be combined since they are so close together.

Montague bus stops are used infrequently on the 46 and 47.

Most bus stops are located near enough to destinations.

Some bus stops are overgrown by trees and impede bus driver’s ability to view passengers waiting to be picked up at the bus stop.

Improve the bus drop-out area at Milpitas High (do not block the bike lane).

---

**Bike Pedestrian/Facilities**

A few participants felt several crosswalks and roads in the community were dangerous to walk due to conflicts with automobiles. One participant noted broken concrete on sidewalks, which is dangerous for bicyclists and pedestrians.

- Sometimes the crosswalks on Jacklin and Yosemite Street don’t allow much time for pedestrians to cross. Pedestrians may be resistant to walk along Jacklin and Yosemite Street at night when cars can’t see them.
- Those with disabilities can’t cross the street quickly and rely on drivers to stop rather than stop lights.
- Fremont crosswalk on Mojave Drive is too dangerous to cross.
• Sidewalks (near Cedar Lawn Memorial Park and Golfland, as well as along Park Victoria, Milpitas Blvd., and Jacklin Rd.) are dangerous. Some are not maintained to address obstructions like surfacing tree roots. The bike lanes are either too narrow or non-existent, causing bicyclists to use the sidewalk.
• No bus to City Hall from library (walk) – now must walk across a windy overpass with cars, it’s dangerous walk
• A crosswalk is needed by the bus stop on Calaveras near the Youth Center
• It is dangerous for bicyclists to cross the train tracks north of Calaveras Blvd. and Industrial Way as well as the overcrossing at Calaveras Blvd. over Hwy I-880
• Need a pedestrian overcrossing at the train tracks (future BART extension) near Curtis Ave.
• Add bike lockers and racks at Escuela
• Add paved path on the south side of Russell School
• Install an elevated pedestrian/bike crossing at Yosemite and Curtis

**Bus Drivers**
Most participants agreed that bus drivers are typically friendly toward passengers, however drivers often pass bus stops without picking up passengers.

• Bus drivers are usually very kind
• One driver is nasty; would like some kind of onboard comment card to share these thoughts
• Occasionally bus drivers will not wait when they see passengers approaching the bus stop
• While waiting at bus stops, bus drivers have passed by without stopping, particularly at night*
• Occasionally bus drivers will leave the bus to take a break
• Some buses drivers don’t pull up close enough to the curb (need to pull close to curb)

**Bus Reliability**
Participants often experience difficulties with transfers due to unreliable bus arrival times. For the most part, participants noted travel time on the bus is fairly reliable.

• Bus transfers are the main cause of inconvenience and significantly lengthen a trip’s time. Timely and reliable bus transfers would improve trip times.
• Passengers who commute to Milpitas from San Jose often miss transfer buses (Route 47) because they get stuck in traffic (on Route 70). A direct line would be the optimal solution.
• Taking the bus and other transit to San Francisco is too unreliable to take the risk. Unreliable transfers make the transit ride to Fremont BART too long, whereas driving to BART is much more convenient.
• Currently, many students with heavy backpacks are inconvenienced because: 1) Route 46 bus often gets stuck in traffic, causing students to miss the 66 bus;
and 2) the bus leaves too soon after school ends. A trip that takes 15 minutes by car becomes an hour trip by bus.

- Twenty minutes between buses is too long*
- Sometimes bus doesn’t come when it’s expected
- Overall, the bus travel time is fairly consistent, although can be delayed depending on traffic
- Bus transfers seem to work pretty well
- The arrival time of busses at bus stops is unreliable, particularly in the morning when arriving for school
- More bus frequency on line 47 and 66 at City Hall and the library respectively
- Avoid bus congestion at schools through better scheduling

**Bus Service and Routes**

Many participants frequently used the bus to get to common destinations such as school, work and shopping centers. Participants commented on the need for east-west connectivity, more direct lines, and increased bus capacity, especially when the students are released from school.

- The bus is the most common mode of transportation to get to the Great Mall, work, school and other destinations
- Most trips taken on the bus are in close proximity
- Multiple bus trips are taken within a day
- Traveling to Ranch 99 requires transferring buses (Route 46 to Route 33 at the Great Mall) and takes about an hour. The inconvenience pushes passengers to choose other modes, like autos. The Route 33 would be taken more if the route was more direct and trips were faster
- An added bus route to Borders would be nice, as children go there to read
- A bus schedule that catered to student morning and afternoon commuting hours (7:30 AM and 4PM) would benefit many students and parents, particularly at Rancho Middle School on Yosemite. Especially because three schools and the library are all along Abel Street, increasing frequency or adding a direct line to Cedar Way (from the schools to residential areas) would help parents a lot. The timing, not the crowding, is most crucial.
- There is not enough bus capacity in the afternoon when students are leaving school
- Mainly from Downtown to the Great Mall (Route 66), getting onto buses with a bike can be very difficult
- Take bus to BART (runs ok, but want BART to San Jose)
- A direct line from Park Victoria to Jacklin would be helpful.
- An extension of the bus route to the Park Victoria side of Jacklin Rd would help. A passenger commented on the inconvenient 25-minute walk and uses a bicycle instead.
- An extension of Route 66 on the weekend service would help many community temple members who currently have to walk ½ mile from the last
transit stop. The bus service ends at 6PM, which is alright for the community temple members.

- Need for a direct route to San Jose downtown or Museum
- 51 to De Anza College – takes one hour from Cupertino, and there are no buses (51) on Sat/Sunday
- Bus 71, it seems to be one hour between buses on weekends
- Extend 46/47 one block north to the Senior apartments
- Need east-west connection to City Hall; a bus to City Hall from library*
- 47 comes every 30 minutes; ideally want 15 minute headway
- 47 stops at 8PM and this is sometimes difficult
- 46/47 to Washington doesn’t go to Dixon & Lion’s Supermarket
- The 68 was canceled, so now I don’t have straight trip and have to transfer
- Would like direct bus line from Lions Market to Ocean Market/ Adult Senior Center
- Consider using smaller buses more often for better service
- Depending on traffic the time to get from Milpitas High School to the Youth Center is approximately 10–15 minutes
- The 47 and 46 buses that travel on Arizona Street (near 7 eleven) should take a left rather than be required to go straight to the bus stop, which causes a delay
- Late night service needs to be expanded until 10 p.m. throughout the week to allow passengers to take the bus home after movies
- Additional bus service is needed on the weekend to get to destinations such as McCarthy Ranch
- The weekend/holiday schedules should be the same as the weekday schedule
- Often deterred from taking the 180 to the Great Mall as it takes too long
- Weekend transit use typically does not begin until 10:00/11:00 a.m.
- Would like there to be easy transit service to Newark and Union City for school and recreational events
- Would like AC Transit and VTA passes to be interchangeable
- An express bus that uses the freeway and eliminates the stops on Main and Abel would be helpful
- Need for more bike capacity on the buses
- Consider allowing food and drinks on the bus
- Trash cans should be located near the seats
- Takes an hour and a half for a disabled man to get home 5 blocks away from city hall. Issue of East/West access.
- Bring community bus service.
- Run the 33 up and down Calaveras blvd.
- Need an east/west transfer
- No rapid bus in Milpitas. Need rapid transit bus to Sunnyvale, Mt. View, etc.
- Have a community bus to Kaiser. Old route 77 that has been discontinued went to hospitals and schools.
- AC transit route 217 should work in conjunction with VTA
- Transfer 2 buses to get to San Jose
- Add VTA shuttle if K-3 buses are cut in the MUSD budget
- Add shuttle to pick up at Pines, Great Mall and Main Street
Light Rail Service and Routes
A few participants commented on the need for light rail service to reduce fare cost and expand service to more destinations in Downtown San Jose.

- The light rail costs too much money, yet the primary destinations are limited to CISCO Systems and Downtown San Jose. Light rail does not provide access to other popular destinations, such as shopping centers. Aside from its museums, Downtown San Jose does not have any attractions for parents and kids.
- Trains are now very crowded on weekdays and empty on weekends
- Having light rail access to Mountain View would be helpful
- Wait a long time at Dixon Road for the light rail

Cost
Participants at the focus group meetings expressed concern regarding the cost of bus fares. Participants noted the need for lower fares or discount programs, particularly for families and seniors.

- Traveling by bus can be more expensive than by car, especially since a bus transfer is often required during trips
- The monthly pass is definitely the most cost-effective
- Cost of bus fares for seniors is too high
- Lower fares for school kids
- Cost of bus fares for youth is too high
- Discount tickets are being sold at a discount at some housing facilities; how can we get this discount (appears to be EcoPass that is being offered to residents of some housing facilities)
- Where can people get tickets; why can’t others get the same discount
- The majority of youth buy monthly bus passes for travel to school and other social/recreational destinations
- A three-month bus pass for $70 would be a good idea as it is difficult to remember to buy a pass every month
- Consider family discount passes for families with multiple students
- Bring Spare the Air program back
- Offer free token for first ride

Transit Information and Signage
Many participants noted bus schedule information was not convenient to find and suggested the schedules be posted on bus stops. Information should also be translated in multiple languages, particularly Chinese. In addition, while riding the bus the upcoming stop should be announced either by the driver or a marquee.

- Finding and understanding particular bus maps are difficult, especially to people who have just moved to the area or are unfamiliar with the area*
- Potential first time riders are often deterred from riding the bus as they are confused by which bus to use to get to a particular location
Getting acclimated to the bus system helped improve passenger experience
- No names on bus stops, no announcement of stops (names, multilingual); need some way, such as a bus marquee, to announce each stop (sign in bus or announcement by driver)*
- Stop request sound is needed to the passengers know the request has successfully been made
- Bus schedules needs to be listed on the bus stop*
- Need information and tickets in Chinese, around at stores and other locations*
- Maps at schools, on buses, near bus stops, and at the library would be convenient*
- Maps need to be more user friendly by differentiating directions by color and color coding the schedule*
- Carrying a copy of the map on-hand is very helpful
- Bus schedules needs to be listed on the bus stop to eliminate the need to call for information on the next arrival time
- The internet (and cell phone) is often used to check the bus schedule before leaving for the destination*
- The Main and Cedar buses often confuse passengers (particularly those who speak another language) as they only look at the bus number
- Students need to be made aware of transit services they can use
- Promote transit on registration day at Milpitas High. Make transit free for that first day of school so that students will know how to use it. (increase ridership)

Other
A few participants also commented on driving conditions on local roads, obstacles to accessing adjacent neighborhoods and the proposed Milpitas PRT “Ferry”.
- It is difficult to go to the Ocean Supermarket as cars cannot u-turn on Park Victoria and Calaveras.
- Proposed Milpitas PRT “Ferry” at Yosemite/Curtis
  o “Fully one-half of Milpitas that lies south of Calaveras Blvd is bisected by railroad lines that force pedestrians and cyclists out of their way and onto the only available crossings – Calaveras and Montague Expressway.”
  o Walking next to huge trucks whisking by at 40 mph or faster is scary.
  o A steel-and-concrete POC is problematic due to required height of the crossing, physical constraints of the location, and cost.
CHAPTER 6: Development of Transportation Proposals

Based on the input received, a list of transportation proposals was developed to address the needs expressed by the community. This chapter explains the development of the transportation proposals presented below, which are further described in Chapter 7.

Transportation Needs

Transit Issues
A majority of the comments received via the comment cards and public meetings were focused on transit related improvements. As several of the same issues were repeated throughout the outreach process, the project team took note of the top transit concerns to develop probable solutions for. The main transit concerns expressed by the community are as follows:

- East-west travel is difficult as bus routes are oriented north-south;
- Inconvenient to have to travel south to go north to Fremont BART station;
- Cost of fare for transit is too high;
- Not enough late night/early morning service;
- Community buses are favored in lieu of running large buses during non-peak hours

The process for developing the transportation proposals began with the project team first examining the current bus service in Milpitas to determine which routes are performing up to service standards and which destinations are served or not served by the existing transit. An evaluation of the current bus schedule was also made to determine if there was room for potential new bus service opportunities. Based on staff analysis of the current bus routes and ridership performance in Milpitas, several key findings emerged:

- Lines 46 and 47 provide important service to Milpitas High School and meet ridership standards on weekdays;
- Line 66 provides core 15 minute, north/south service through Milpitas;
- Line 33 has substandard ridership weekdays, Saturday and Sunday but is the only bus service to McCarthy Ranch;
- Saturday and Sunday ridership on Lines 46 and 47 is substandard;
- Opportunities for community bus service: Lines 33, 46 and 47 exhibit operational and geographical characteristics typical of VTA’s Community Bus service

The project team took these findings into consideration when developing the proposals to ensure that the proposed improvements do not negatively impact high performing bus lines. See Appendix H for more details on the bus service analysis.
The project team developed a proposed new bus route that would address several of the top transit concerns. The project team recognized that improvements to the bus routes is the biggest concern shared by community members and as such, the proposal should be in the near- to mid-term timeframe. The proposed new bus route could be implemented as early as late 2009. Chapter 7 provides more discussion on this proposed new route.

**Congestion Issues**
Almost half of the comment card respondents are vehicle owners and have relayed concerns regarding congestion issues. The project team relied on existing City plans for guidance on which proposed traffic calming and roadway improvement projects already address the concerns shared by the community. The project team incorporated relevant City proposed roadway projects as part of the CBTP’s proposed project list.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Issues**
Non-motorized issues did not feature as prominently in the outreach results as the transit concerns. However, general issues regarding safety and access for bicyclists and pedestrians were noted. As before, the project team took advantage of the extensive planning work the City has done to build upon their efforts to develop the proposals for bicycle and pedestrian improvements. The City of Milpitas recently completed an update to their Bikeway Master Plan and the plan documents a host of proposed bikeway improvements to many of the city’s local roads and arterials. These are incorporated into the list of proposals.

**Milpitas Transportation Proposals**
The proposals the project team developed in response to the transportation issues received are presented as concepts in Table 6-1. The list of transportation proposals was later refined to include a final list of near- and mid-term proposals with potential funding sources.

The project team chose not to develop criteria for evaluating proposals due to the fact that each proposal on the final list addressed a community concern identified through public outreach. Each proposal was deemed relevant and important to the community therefore, the project team included all of the proposals in a master list grouped by category of concern rather than ranked by priority. The project list also includes a “wish list” for proposals which does not fit the near- to mid-term implementation timeline but is documented in the plan for future consideration when funding opportunities become available.
## Table 6-1 Transportation Proposal Concepts

### TRANSIT SERVICES
- Future Improvements to LRT system
- Early Morning/Late Night Transit Needs Assessment
- Increase Early Morning/Late Night Service Hours on Key Routes
- Community Bus Service
- Provide Bus Service on East-West Route
- Bus Service to California Circle (Milmont Area)

### TRANSPORTATION AMENITIES
- Improved Bus Stop Waiting Areas
- Transit Information at Bus Stops
- Transit Education Program for Middle and High School Students
- Enhanced Multi-Lingual Passenger Information (Printed Materials)
- Transit Fare Subsidy
- Coordination with AC Transit on Fares and Schedules

### BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN
- New Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
- Improved Safety

### TRAFFIC
- Improved Traffic Congestion on Major Arterials
- Traffic Calming
CHAPTER 7: Transportation Proposals

This chapter provides detail and definition on the list of proposals developed by the project team. The proposals were presented to the Project Working Group and general public for final comments before incorporation into the plan. Each proposal aims to address one or more specific transportation issues identified by the community. When considered as a whole, the list of transportation proposals comprises a complete, multimodal approach to address transportation concerns.

The project list is divided into two groups. The first list of 36 proposals are either identified in an existing plan and/or developed as projects for near-term implementation. The second group of 7 proposals list projects for future consideration. As new funding opportunities become available or as new planning efforts are undertaken, these projects should be considered for development. Although current budget constraints keep all projects from being pursued, the project team felt it was important to include this second group of proposals to document the entire range of transportation issues important to the community. These projects serve as the community’s “wish list” of transportation improvements for future consideration.

The proposals presented below are described with specific details including timeline, funding, etc. The first set of proposals is also listed in Table 7.1 and the second set in Table 7.2.

Proposed Projects

TRANSIT SERVICES

1) Milpitas Community Bus Service

Proposal Details
VTA proposes converting existing bus lines 46, 33 and 47 into Community Bus Service routes. Lines 33 and 47 would combine into a new line 47 as a Community Bus route providing East-West connection along Calaveras Avenue.

Community Need
This would address the community’s desire for Community Bus Service at a reduced fare in Milpitas, providing more access to destination points including McCarthy Ranch, Serra Center, Library, future Valley Medical Center, City Hall, Town Center, future Senior Center (August 2010), and Great Mall. Additionally, new Community Bus Service would lower fares for these routes and provide much needed East-West connection.
Estimated Costs
VTA estimates that this new Community Bus Service could be provided within the existing bus operating budget.

Implementation
Conversion to Community Bus Service is contingent on completion of the gas fueling installation project at VTA’s Cerone Division in January 2011. Route changes may occur as early as January 2010 for line 47 using standard buses until the Community Bus fueling is available in January 2011.

Figure 7.1 show the current bus service in Milpitas and Figure 7.2 show the proposed changes to Line 33 and Line 47. This latter figure also show the proposed change to Line 180, one of the proposals listed under the community’s “wish list” of future projects.
Figure 7-2 Proposed Changes to Milpitas Bus Service
2) BART to Milpitas, San Jose Santa, Clara Project

Proposal Details
Extend BART from Fremont to Santa Clara County with future stations in Milpitas, Santa Clara and San Jose.

Community Need
The community expressed desire for more frequent service and more direct routes from Milpitas to San Jose. Currently, existing transit service requires multiple transfers to travel between Milpitas and San Jose. With the extension of BART to Santa Clara County, more direct and frequent service is provided to residents wanting to travel outside of Milpitas.

Estimated Costs
It is estimated that this project would cost approximately $2.1 billion in 2008 dollars and approximately $2.76 billion in year of expenditure dollars. This latter figure accounts for inflation.

Implementation
This is a long-term project.

3) LRT Improvements

Proposal Details
Make future improvements to light rail service to increase the system’s speed and efficiency.

Community Need
This project would provide increased frequency and improved travel time to destinations outside of Milpitas like San Jose.

Estimated Costs
The costs are still to be determined.

Implementation
As part of VTA’s LRT system analysis, an assessment of the current LRT system is being done to improve the system’s efficiency. This is a mid-term project.
4) Early morning/Late Night Transit Needs Assessment

Proposal Details
To develop a study that would assess the need and demand for more late night/early morning transportation service.

Community Need
Community members during outreach expressed a need for more late night/early morning transit service.

Estimated Costs
It is estimated that the cost for a study to understand the late night/early morning transportation needs in Milpitas would be approximately $200,000.

Implementation
As a near-term project, VTA would like to secure funding in the next 3 years to implement this study and better understand the needs.

5) Library Bus Stop

Proposal Description
Provide bus service at the duck-out located in front of the library.

Community Need
Community members expressed desire to have a bus stop in front of the library for ease and convenience.

Estimated Costs
The costs are still to be determined.

Implementation
This is a near-term project.

6) Convert Express 180 to a Limited Stop Bus Route

Proposal Description
Convert Line 180 to a limited stop route adding stops in Milpitas on Jacklin Road at Escuela and on Main Street at the Library. Currently this route runs along I-680. The proposed new route would operate on Main Street up to Fremont BART every 30 minutes on weekdays.

Community Need
For the Milpitas community, Fremont BART is a major attractor. The existing bus service requires residents to travel south to Great Mall transit center in order to catch line 180 to go north to Fremont BART. With the proposed new route and service change,
residents are saved from having to travel south to go north. New stops on Jacklin Road and Main Street would provide the convenience and proximity to get to Fremont BART faster.

**Estimated Costs**
The costs are to be determined.

**Implementation**
This is a near-term project.

---

### TRANSPORTATION AMENITIES

#### 7) Milpitas Bus Stop Improvements

**Proposal Details**
Improve bus stop waiting areas with station amenities such as benches, shelters, lighting etc.

**Community Need**
Community members commented on the need for improved bus stops around town.

**Estimated Costs**
The costs are still to be determined.

**Implementation**
VTA will be seeking a contractor in 2009 for the Transit Shelter Advertising Program, where existing shelters will be replaced and new shelters added. This is seen as a mid-term project.

#### 8) Schedule Information at Bus Stops

**Proposal Details**
Provide bus schedule information specific to that stop for as many bus stops feasible.

**Community Need**
Access to bus stop information is one of the main concerns expressed in focus groups. This is especially helpful to those who miss a particular bus and do not have schedule information for the next one. Requested information includes posting service frequency, bus schedule and a map of stops along that route for that particular line.

**Estimated Costs**
The costs are still to be determined.
Implementation
VTA needs to evaluate the number and locations of bus stops where it is feasible to post schedule information. This project can be implemented in the near-term.

9) Enhanced Multi-Lingual Passenger Information (Printed Materials)

Proposal Details
Provide more printed information in other languages, particularly in Vietnamese, Spanish and Chinese depending on need.

Community Need
In outreach events such as focus group meetings, attendees repeatedly requested for more passenger information in other languages.

Estimated Costs
VTA estimates that it would cost approximately $200,000 to create additional printed materials for passengers in Vietnamese, Spanish and Chinese languages.

Implementation
This project is considered for the near-term and could be implemented in the next 3 years depending on funding.

10) Mobility Management Center

Proposal Details
This project would coordinate information and transportation resources serving transportation disadvantaged populations (e.g., persons with disabilities, older adults, etc.).

Community Need
The project would provide the community improved access to information and better coordination of transportation options. The project would be consistent with Federal United We Ride program guidelines.

Estimated Costs
Outreach and Escort, Inc. estimates that it would cost approximately $250,000-$300,000 annually to provide this service.

Implementation
Together We Ride – Mobility Management Center for Santa Clara County is established and currently operating through planning grants from Caltrans. However, project will need to secure operating funding from other sources in order to continue operations. There is currently no dedicated source of funds.
11) Transit Education Program for Schools

Proposal Details
Develop a school-based transit education program to teach new incoming students about transit services available. Ideally, the program would develop informational materials and events to teach students how to ride and utilize the system. Suggestions were also given for possible informational materials such as a YouTube How-to video to post on VTA’s website. It is envisioned that it would start as a pilot project and if successful, develop into long-term program.

Community Need
At outreach events geared towards students and youth, requests for VTA staff to provide tutorials or presentations to students on how to take transit came up repeatedly. Younger students especially have expressed that if they were taught how to ride the bus, they would be more likely to ride instead of getting driven.

Estimated Costs
The costs are still to be determined.

Implementation
This is a near-term project.

12) Coordination with AC Transit Passes

Proposal Details
VTA will become one of the Bay Area’s transit providers to use TransLink®, a smart card system which uses one card to pay for fares and transfers on any transit that accepts TransLink®.

Community Need
Community members requested VTA to coordinate with AC Transit to accept interchangeable passes that will make transferring between the two transit providers easier.

Estimated Costs
The costs are still to be determined.

Implementation
TransLink® is currently accepted on AC Transit, Dumbarton Express and Golden Gate Ferry & Transit. The TransLink system is being rolled out in phases to other transit agencies. Caltrain and BART are scheduled for the next trial phase and VTA and other agencies will soon follow. This is a mid-term project.
13) Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossings

Proposal Details
There are 4 pedestrian and bicycle overcrossings identified as part of the city’s Transit Area Specific Plan (TASP). The following bicycle and pedestrian overcrossings will tie in proposed high-density developments with existing VTA Light Rail stations along Great Mall Parkway and the future Milpitas BART Station:

1) Bicycle/Pedestrian bridge over Montague Expressway at Penitencia Creek
2) Bicycle/Pedestrian bridge over Montague Expressway at the future Milpitas BART station
3) At-grade bicycle/pedestrian bridge over BART retained cut at Piper Drive
4) Bicycle/Pedestrian bridge over Capitol Avenue connecting LRT to the future Milpitas BART station

Community Need
Improving bicycle and pedestrian access to the future BART station and Great Mall will provide safe and connective access to these destinations.

Estimated Costs
The City of Milpitas estimates that the two Montague bridges would cost approximately $9.0M each and the at-grade bridge at Piper would cost $1.5M. The costs for the Capitol Avenue bridge were assumed as part of the BART project so no cost assumptions were made.

Implementation
The proposed bicycle and pedestrian overcrossings range from near- to long-term projects.

PEDESTRIAN ONLY

14) Great Mall Parkway at Main Street

Proposal Details
This is a pedestrian crossing improvement project which includes pedestrian-scale street lights, new date palms, and ornamental paving.

Community Need
Provide pedestrian crossing improvements.
**Estimated Costs**
The costs are still to be determined.

**Implementation**
This is a near-term project.

**15) Montague Expressway Sidewalks**

**Proposal Details**
This project would fill in the missing sidewalk gaps along Montague Expressway:
- Both sides: three gaps to the west and east of McCarthy/O'Toole
- Both sides: three gaps between I-880 and McCandless/Trade Zone
- Both Sides: Trade Zone to Great Mall/Capitol Avenue
- North Side: east of Great Mall to east of Milpitas Blvd.
- South side: three gaps between Capitol Avenue & Pecten Ct.

**Community Need**
This would provide safety improvements for pedestrians.

**Estimated Costs**
The County of Santa Clara estimates this project would cost approximately $440,000 for the McCarthy/O’Toole sidewalks, $560,000 for the McCandless/Trade Zone sidewalks, $1,340,000 for both Great Mall/Capitol Avenue and Great Mall east of Milpitas Blvd. sidewalks, and $210,000 for the Capitol Avenue & Pecten Ct. sidewalks.

**Implementation**
This is a long-term project.

**16) Main Street Streetscape**

**Proposal Details**
This is a streetscape plan for North and South Main Street. On North Main Street, the streetscape is planned for Weller Lane and Carlo Street. On South Main Street, streetscape is planned between Montague Expressway and Great Mall Parkway with pedestrian/transit connectivity.

**Community Need**
Streetscape plan would provide a pleasant walking environment as well as serve as pedestrian buffers from traffic.

**Estimated Costs**
The City of Milpitas estimates this project cost $4,000,000 and $3,400,000 for the North and South Main Street streetscape plan respectively.
Implementation
The North Main Street streetscape plan is a near-term project and the South Main Street is a mid- to long-term project.

17) Great Mall Parkway at Montague Expressway

Proposal Details
This is a pedestrian crossing improvement project which includes pedestrian-scale street lights, new date palms, and ornamental paving.

Community Need
Provide pedestrian crossing improvements.

Estimated Costs
The costs are still to be determined.

Implementation
This is a near-term project.

BICYCLE ONLY

18) Bike to Work and School

Proposal Details
Distribution of free bikes to lower income adults and their children to improve their travel from home to work, school and transit connections.

Community Need
Low cost transportation alternative for short-trips, complements public transit system, and low environmental impact

Estimated Costs
County CalWorks estimates that it would cost approximately $80,000-$160,000 annually to provide this program

Implementation
This project is in the planning stages and is awaiting confirmation of funding.
19) Bicycle Facilities

Proposal Details
The proposed bicycle facilities will provide new bike paths, lanes and routes on many of the City’s arterial and neighborhood streets.

Community Need
Improvements to the city’s bicycle facilities will improve safety and connectivity for bicyclists.

Estimated Costs
The City of Milpitas estimates the total cost of constructing all of the recommended bicycle projects as described in Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan and as shown below is approximately $21 million (excludes recreational bicycle facilities).

Implementation
The list of bicycle projects range from near- to long-term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class I (Bike Paths)</th>
<th>Class II (Bike Lanes)</th>
<th>Class III Bike Routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calera Creek Trail</td>
<td>N. Abel Street</td>
<td>Arizona Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa Creek</td>
<td>S. Park Victoria</td>
<td>Calaveras Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho School</td>
<td>Jacklin Road</td>
<td>Temple Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Penitencia Creek</td>
<td>Dixon Road</td>
<td>Sequoia Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitencia Creek East Channel*</td>
<td>Kennedy Drive</td>
<td>Dempsey Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitencia Creek East Channel</td>
<td>McCarthy Boulevard</td>
<td>Montague Expressway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adobe Park Crossing</td>
<td>Serra Way</td>
<td>Yellowstone Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Expy (Piper)*</td>
<td>Marilynn Drive</td>
<td>S. Main Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Ave. (VTA LRT)*</td>
<td>S. Milpitas Boulevard</td>
<td>Tramway Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Mall (Future BART)*</td>
<td>Dixon Landing Interchange</td>
<td>Fallen Leaf Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alviso Adobe Crossing</td>
<td>Milpitas Blvd. Ext.</td>
<td>Midwick Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trade Zone Boulevard</td>
<td>Calaveras Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yosemite Drive</td>
<td>Redwood Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dixon Landing Road</td>
<td>Mt. Shasta Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Park Victoria</td>
<td>Barker Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bellew Drive</td>
<td>Starlite Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. Capitol Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Blvd. Ext.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transit Area Specific Plan Crossings
20) Jump Start

Proposal Details
The project provides low-or no-cost vehicle repair and maintenance services to ensure that Welfare-to-Work participants have safe and reliable transportation that can be used to travel to employment opportunities.

Community Need
The program increases the number of employment opportunities for the Welfare-to-Work participants by providing reliable transportation to work.

Estimated Costs
The County of Santa Clara estimates that it would cost approximately $400,000 annually to operate.

Implementation
This project is currently funded for a limited period, but there is no dedicated source of funds for continuation of the program.

21) Car Share Program

Proposal Details
The project is a short-term car rental program to support individuals returning to unsubsidized employment.

Community Need
Enables low income individuals to pursue training & employment opportunities that leads to transition from welfare to work and financial self-sufficiency.

Estimated Costs
The County of Santa Clara estimates that it would cost approximately $200,000-500,000 annually to operate.

Implementation
The project is currently in the planning stages and awaiting confirmation of funding.

22) My Car – Vehicle Ownership Program

Proposal Details
This project provides financial education, grants and/or guaranteed loans for the purchase of vehicles by low income families.
Community Need
Vehicle ownership solves the complex transportation needs of low income families with young children and increases employment opportunities.

Estimated Costs
The County of Santa Clara estimates that it would cost approximately $500,000+ annually to provide this program.

Implementation
The project is currently in the planning stages and awaiting confirmation of funding.

23) Calaveras Blvd. Widening Project

Proposal Details
This project would widen Calaveras Blvd. between Milpitas Blvd. and Abel St. to a six lane bridge with 10’ sidewalks and 6’ bike lanes with continuous bike lanes through I-880.

Community Need
The widening project will ease traffic congestion on this bridge and provide safe crossing for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Estimated Costs
The City of Milpitas estimates this project would cost approximately $70,000,000.

Implementation
This is a long-term project.

24) Montague Expy/Great Mall Parkway – Capitol Ave. Urban Interchange Project

Proposal Details
Montague/Great Mall-Capitol Ave. urban interchange would have a grade separation of the Great Mall-Capitol through lanes over Montague Expressway and would greatly enhance capacity and maintain compatibility with the existing elevated light rail structure and future BART.

Community Need
This project would reduce traffic congestion.

Estimated Costs
The City of Milpitas estimates this project would cost approximately $60,000,000.

Implementation
This is a long-term project.
25) Dixon Landing Road Widening

Proposal Details
This project would widen Dixon Landing Road from four to six travel lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes between North Milpitas Boulevard and Interstate 880.

Community Need
This project would reduce traffic congestion.

Estimated Costs
The City of Milpitas estimates this project would cost approximately $60,000,000.

Implementation
This is a long-term project.

26) Dixon Landing Rd/Milpitas Blvd. Intersection Improvements

Proposal Details
This facility is currently four lanes wide and serves as a secondary commute corridor between the I-680 and I-880 freeways. This project would construct an additional northbound left turn lane, a southbound right-turn lane and an addition of an eastbound left- and right-turn lane.

Community Need
This project would reduce traffic congestion.

Estimated Costs
The City of Milpitas estimates this project would cost approximately $3,000,000.

Implementation
This is a long-term project.

27) Milpitas Blvd. Extension

Proposal Details
The project would construct the Milpitas Boulevard extension from Montague Expressway to Capitol Avenue. This would be prior to the BART Station construction.

Community Need
This project addresses concerns regarding traffic congestion.
**Estimated Costs**
The City of Milpitas estimates this project would cost approximately $44,000,000.

**Implementation**
This is a long-term project.

### 28) Montague Expressway Widening

**Proposal Details**
This project would widen eight lanes from Mission College Boulevard (Santa Clara) to Park Victoria (Milpitas).

**Community Need**
This project would reduce traffic congestion.

**Estimated Costs**
The City of Milpitas estimates this project would cost approximately $38,500,000.

**Implementation**
This is a long-term project.

### 29) Carlo Street Ramp Conversion

**Proposal Details**
This project would convert the existing off-ramp from Main Street to Calaveras via Carlo Street to an on-ramp to Main Street.

**Community Need**
This ramp conversion increases safety and eliminates the dangerous turn for drivers.

**Estimated Costs**
The City of Milpitas estimates this project cost approximately $1,500,000.

**Implementation**
This project is currently under construction.

### 30) I-680 Express Lane Project

**Proposal Details**
This project would convert the existing carpool lane to an express lane or high-occupancy toll (HOT) lane from Highway 84 to Highway 237.

**Community Need**
This project would reduce traffic congestion.
Estimated Costs
The City of Milpitas estimates this project would cost approximately 40,000,000.

Implementation
This project is a near- to mid-term project.

31) I-880 HOV Project

Proposal Details
This project would add approximately 4.6 miles of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV or carpool) lane in both directions of I-880 between U.S. 101 and State Route 237 interchanges.

Community Need
This project would reduce traffic congestion.

Estimated Costs
The City of Milpitas estimates this project would cost approximately $95,000,000.

Implementation
This is a near- to mid-term project.

DEMAND-RESPONSIVE SERVICES

32) Senior Health Transportation

Proposal Details
This project provides door-to-door transportation and public transit fare subsidies for seniors 65 years of age and older to health-related and other destinations that support healthy and independent living. The project includes the acquisition of environmentally-friendly, energy efficient vehicles to support project’s operation.

Community Need
Provide transportation for older adults to destinations that support healthy and active living. Access to medical and other health care services will enable seniors to live healthy, active and more self-sufficient lives.

Estimated Costs
Outreach, Inc. estimates this service would cost approximately $350,000-600,000 annually to provide this service.

Implementation
This service is currently being provided by Outreach & Escort, Inc.’s STAR Program. Due to insufficient level of funding to address increased need, program is only provided for a limited time period. A dedicated source of funds is needed.
33) Neighborhood Van Service

Proposal Details
This project would provide a neighborhood van service operated by a local community-based organization that provides no-cost or low-cost transportation within “communities of concern.” The project includes the acquisition of environmentally-friendly, energy efficient vehicles to support project’s operation.

Community Need
The project would address concerns expressed during public outreach regarding the need for transportation for local trips such as shopping, medical, errands, and connections to public transit, etc. The project would also meet the needs of transportation-dependent populations who need to travel at times when public transit is not in service.

Estimated Costs
Outreach Inc. estimates that it would cost approximately $120,000 plus annually to provide this service.

Implementation
The project could be implemented in the near-term, but is dependent on funding. Currently funding sources are pending and there is no dedicated source of funds.

34) Give Kids a Lift

Proposal Details
This project would provide before and after-school transportation for children of CalWORKS participants and low-income families. The project includes the acquisition of environmentally-friendly, energy efficient vehicles to support project’s operation.

Community Need
Before and after-school Transportation Service would enable welfare to work/workforce development parents to pursue training and employment without having to worry about transportation needs of school-age children.

Estimated Costs
Outreach Inc. estimates that it would cost approximately $250,000-500,000 annually to provide this service.

Implementation
The project could be a near-term project as it is currently operating with limited funding but there are no dedicated funds for future operations.
35) Guaranteed Ride Program

Proposal Details
This project would provide a guaranteed ride home for Welfare-to-Work and low-income participants, when they are held at work or training; or when public transportation options are not available.

Community Need
The project would enable low-income individuals to pursue training and employment opportunities that help transition from welfare-to-work and create financial self-sufficiency.

Estimated Costs
Outreach Inc. estimates that it would cost $800,000 to $1,500,000 annually to provide the service.

Implementation
The program is currently funded for a limited period, does not have a dedicated source of funds.

36) Volunteer Driver Programs

Proposal Details
A volunteer driver program would complement existing public and non-profit transportation providers.

Community Need
Low-cost transportation would be provided by volunteer drivers. The program offers a significant savings in transportation costs by offering escorted transportation for frail elderly and other disadvantaged groups, and it is a more cost-effective transportation solution for short or frequent trips to nutrition sites, senior centers, etc.

Estimated Costs
It is estimated that it would cost approximately $120,000-250,000 annually for a nonprofit organization to provide this service.

Implementation
Existing programs are challenged by the high-cost of fuel, insurance, etc. Continuation of the program is dependent on funding.
Projects for Future Consideration: Community’s “Wish List”

1) Earlier/Later Service Hours on Key Routes

Proposal Description
After collecting data from the needs assessment, provide earlier morning/later evening service hours depending on need.

Community Need
Address transportation needs in the early morning/late evening travel periods when transit and other options may not be available.

2) Commuter Shuttle Programs

Proposal Description
Offer Commuter Shuttle Programs:

1) Midtown Specific/Transit Area Specific Plan Areas circling along Main Street and Abel Street to bring residents/employees from the Great Mall Transit Center to destinations along Main/Abel Streets such as the new library, medical center and Senior Center.

2) McCarthy Ranch business area from the Tasman Light Rail Station to the businesses in the McCarthy Ranch/Milpitas Business Park Area.

3) Milpitas Boulevard business shuttle from the Great Mall and/or BART station to locations in the Milpitas Blvd area, just east of future BART alignment and west of the I-680.

4) Hotel Shuttles from the Great Mall (or better service) service from the Great Mall Transit Center to the local hotels within Milpitas.

Community Need
Provide specialized service to accommodate major destinations in town.

3) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assistance

Proposal Description
Provide support for TDM planning within Santa Clara County such as promotion of bike to work day, ridesharing, and County specific needs.

Community Need
TDM planning will help support programs that promote alternative modes and specialized transportation needs in the community.
4) **Bus Service to California Circle/Dixon Landing**

**Proposal Description**
Consider bringing transit to this area if it develops into a viable source for ridership and when funding becomes available.

**Community Need**
Worship temples and churches are beginning to locate in this area generating demand for new bus service. Currently, there are no routes servicing this area.

5) **Abbott & Calaveras Pedestrian Crossing**

**Proposal Description**
Provide north/south crosswalks at Calaveras & Abbott intersection.

**Community Need**
It is difficult for pedestrians to cross this busy intersection as there are only crosswalks on two sides. Pedestrians must walk further to the next light to safely cross in the north/south direction.

6) **Restroom Facilities at Great Mall Transit Center**

**Proposal Description**
Provide restroom facilities near or at the Great Mall Transit Center.

**Community Need**
An overwhelming amount of comment card responses complained about the lack of restroom facilities at this transit center. This is an especially huge concern for many of the seniors who responded to the comment cards and attended the outreach meetings.

7) **Seasonal Passes**

**Proposal Description**
Offer passes (similar to VTA’s Summer Blast Pass, one pass valid for the summer months of June-Aug for unlimited rides) for each season. Seasonal passes or quarterly passes would provide convenience for those who have to continually purchase monthly passes.

**Community Need**
The proposed passes will enable transit riders to avoid purchasing monthly passes each month. This was a concern expressed in the youth and student focus groups because many students forget to purchase new passes when the month ends.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Community Need Addressed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
<th>Implementation Timeline</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified In Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSIT SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas Community Bus Service</td>
<td>Add more trips to serve Milpitas High School. Provides reduced fare and east-west route</td>
<td>Convert line 46 into Community Bus Route</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Combine 33 and 47 into Community Bus Route</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART to Milpitas, San Jose, Santa Clara Project</td>
<td>Need more direct service between San Jose and Milpitas</td>
<td>Extension of the BART system from Fremont to Santa Clara County</td>
<td>$2.76B</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Measure A, Measure B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT Improvements</td>
<td>Need more frequent service</td>
<td>Future improvements to make LRT faster and more efficient</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Mid- Term</td>
<td>Measure A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early morning/late night transit needs assessment</td>
<td>Need later night/earlier morning service</td>
<td>Evaluate how to accommodate late night/early morning service</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Bus Stop</td>
<td>Need a bus stop in front of the new library</td>
<td>Provide bus service at the duck-out located in front of the library</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert Line 180 to a Limited Stop Route</td>
<td>Faster and more convenient route for passengers traveling to Fremont BART</td>
<td>Convert Express 180 to a Limited Stop Route with added stops on Jacklin and Main</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSPORTATION AMENITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Community Need Addressed</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Estimated Costs</th>
<th>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified In Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stop Improvements</td>
<td>Need more amenities at bus stops</td>
<td>Install transit shelters, seating, waste receptacles, and signage at transit stops</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td>VTA and City Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule Information at Bus Stops</td>
<td>Improve trip planning</td>
<td>Provide name and schedule information at bus stops</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced Multi-Lingual Passenger Information (Printed Materials)</td>
<td>More passenger information in different languages</td>
<td>Expand printed VTA materials to include other languages such as Chinese, Vietnamese and Spanish depending on need</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Management Center</td>
<td>Information and coordination of transportation options.</td>
<td>Coordinate information and transportation resources serving transportation disadvantaged populations</td>
<td>$250,000 - $350,000 annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>JARC, STA, New Freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Education Program for Schools</td>
<td>Make students aware of transit services available and how to use them</td>
<td>Educational and informative materials/events to teach students how to utilize transit services</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Lifeline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit Passes</td>
<td>One pass valid for both VTA and AC Transit</td>
<td>Utilize TransLink’s smart card system</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ped Bridge over Montague Expy</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking or biking</td>
<td>Free standing bridge structure with elevators at each end. Could be constructed in conjunction with BART</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>Mid-Long Term</td>
<td>VTA Bicycle Expenditure Plan</td>
<td>Transit Area Specific Plan; VTA BEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over Montague along Penitencia Creek</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking or biking</td>
<td>Bridge with ramps at both ends which extend in or along the creek channel</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge over rail and BART line from Piper Montague to Great Mall</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking or biking</td>
<td>Bridge to cross the retained cut of the BART Line and the rail tracks</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Near-Mid Term</td>
<td>Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge from Montague Light Rail Station to future BART Station</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking or biking</td>
<td>Half-bridge over Capitol Avenue that connects the LRT and BART station.</td>
<td>Assumed as part of BART costs</td>
<td>Mid-Long term</td>
<td>Transit Area Specific Plan, VTA BART to Milpitas, San Jose, Santa Clara Project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PEDESTRIAN ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mall Parkway at Main Street</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossing improvements</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Expressway Sidewalks</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>Both sides: three gaps to the west and east of McCarthy/O'Toole</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Countywide Expressway Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>Both sides: three gaps between I-880 and McCandless/Trade Zone</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Countywide Expressway Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Expressway Sidewalks (continued)</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>Both Sides: Trade Zone to Great mall/Capitol Avenue</td>
<td>$1,340,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Countywide Expressway Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>North Side: east of Great Mall to east of Milpitas Blvd</td>
<td>*Cost part of Trade Zone to Great Mall/Capitol Ave sidewalks</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Countywide Expressway Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>South side: three gaps between Capitol Avenue &amp; Pecten Ct.</td>
<td>$210,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Countywide Expressway Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Main Street Streetscape</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>Streetscape plan between Weller Lane &amp; Carlo Street</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Midtown Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S Main Street Streetscape</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>Streetscape plan between Montague Expressway &amp; Great Mall Parkway with ped/transit connectivity</td>
<td>$3,400,000</td>
<td>Mid-Long Term</td>
<td>Midtown Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mall Parkway at Montague Expressway</td>
<td>Improve safety while walking</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossing improvements</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICYCLE ONLY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike to Work &amp; School</td>
<td>Low cost transportation alternative for short-trips</td>
<td>Distribution of free bikes to lower income adults and their children</td>
<td>$80,000 – $160,000</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Abel Street</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection. Near transit stops, public buildings, and parks</td>
<td>Class II bike lanes with bike detector symbols at signalized intersections</td>
<td>$67,764</td>
<td>Short- Mid Term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Ave.</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike routes from Manfred St. to Jacklin Rd.</td>
<td>$30,483</td>
<td>Short- Mid Term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Park Victoria Dr.</td>
<td>Vehicle Lane Reduction - Improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Reduce from four to two lanes in each direction with a center turn lane to allow for Class II bike lanes on either side of street</td>
<td>$124,946</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras Blvd.</td>
<td>Provide route arterial connection</td>
<td>Class III bike routes from S. Park Victoria to McCarthy Blvd.</td>
<td>$32,020</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Drive</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike routes from Yosemite Dr. to Kennedy Dr.</td>
<td>$26,897</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia Drive</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike routes from Yellowstone Ave. to Yosemite Dr.</td>
<td>$9,563</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dempsey Rd.</td>
<td>Provide route arterial connection</td>
<td>Class III bike route from S. Park Victoria Dr. to Montague Expy/Landess Ave.</td>
<td>$46,622</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Park Victoria Dr.</td>
<td>Provide route arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from Mt. Shasta Ave. to Yosemite Dr.</td>
<td>$28,410</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Expy</td>
<td>Provide route arterial connection</td>
<td>Class III bike route from city limits to Piedmont Rd.</td>
<td>$59,771</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calera Creek Trail</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from Milpitas Blvd. to I-680</td>
<td>$930,466</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellowstone Ave</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route from S. Park Victoria Dr. to Landess Ave.</td>
<td>$26,299</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa Creek</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from Hillview Dr. to City Limit</td>
<td>$1,486,807</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacklin Rd.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from I-680 SBR ramps to Evans Rd.</td>
<td>$21,477</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Main St.</td>
<td>Provide route arterial connection</td>
<td>Class III bike route from E. Curtis Ave. to W. Calaveras Blvd.</td>
<td>$16,138</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berryessa Creek</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from Milpitas Blvd. to Pedestrian bridge</td>
<td>$207,496</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Rd.</td>
<td>Vehicle Lane Reduction – Improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Narrow from four lanes down to one lane in each direction and add Class II bike lanes</td>
<td>$51,852</td>
<td>Short- Mid term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy Dr.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II lane from Evans Rd. to N. Park Victoria</td>
<td>$36,210</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tramway Dr.</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route from Milpitas Blvd. to Oliver Jones Trail</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosemite Dr.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from S. Park Victoria Dr. to Sinclair Frontage Rd.</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Landing Rd.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II lane from 880 ramp to Milpitas Blvd.</td>
<td>$35,570</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Ranch Rd.</td>
<td>Part of an approved project</td>
<td>Class II bike lane</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Penitencia Creek</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from Great Mall Pkwy to City Boundary</td>
<td>$757,160</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Penitencia Creek</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from San Andreas Dr. to N. Abel St.</td>
<td>$991,760</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fallen Leaf Dr.</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route from Starlite Dr. to W. Capitol Ave.</td>
<td>$13,430</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho School</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from Yosemite Park to Rancho School</td>
<td>$83,650</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwick Dr.</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route from N. Milpitas Blvd. to Arizona Ave.</td>
<td>$6,210</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras Blvd.</td>
<td>Provide route arterial connection</td>
<td>Class III bike route from I-880 ramp to Butler St.</td>
<td>$5,240</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellew Dr.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from McCarthy Blvd./Bellew Drive to Barber Ln.</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCarthy Blvd</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from SR 237 to W. Montague Expy</td>
<td>$123,560</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Penitencia Creek</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from N. McCarthy Blvd. to California Circle</td>
<td>$766,290</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serra Way</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from Calaveras Blvd to Main St.</td>
<td>$14,260</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Ave.</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route from Penitencia Creek to N. Abel St.</td>
<td>$3,380</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Shasta Ave.</td>
<td>Provide route arterial connection</td>
<td>Class III bike route from Dempsey Rd. to S. Park Victoria</td>
<td>$6,100</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker St.</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route from Marylinn Dr. to Rudyard Dr.</td>
<td>$3,820</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilynn Dr.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from Barker St. to Vasona St.</td>
<td>$17,200</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Milpitas Blvd.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from Yosemite Dr. to Transit Study Area</td>
<td>$50,290</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Landing Interchange</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from SB I-880 on-ramp to California Circle</td>
<td>$12,840</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas Blvd. Ext.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from Great Mall Crossing to Montague Expy</td>
<td>$22,170</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starlite Dr.</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route W. Capitol Ave. to Fallen Leaf Dr.</td>
<td>$12,630</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitencia Creek East Channel</td>
<td>Crossing Transit Area</td>
<td>Bicycle overcrossing to access future BART station</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitencia Creek East Channel</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from Montague Crossing to Lower Penitencia Creek</td>
<td>$202,020</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Zone Blvd.</td>
<td>Provides arterial connection</td>
<td>Class II bike lane from Montague Expy to City Boundary</td>
<td>$23,590</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. Capitol Ave</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route from Starlite Dr. to Fallen Leaf Dr.</td>
<td>$8,040</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas Blvd. Ext.</td>
<td>Provide Neighborhood Connection – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class III bike route from City Boundary to Great Mall Crossing</td>
<td>$7,490</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitencia Creek East Channel</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from Montague Crossing to Milpitas Blvd. extension</td>
<td>$123,120</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Mall</td>
<td>Crossing Transit Area</td>
<td>Bicycle overcrossing from Great Mall to Future BART station</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Great Mall</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from future BART tracks to Milpitas Blvd extension</td>
<td>$361,990</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alviso Adobe Park Crossing</td>
<td>Path Network – improve safety while biking</td>
<td>Class I bike path from Alviso Adobe Historic Parking Lot to Calaveras Rd.</td>
<td>$57,220</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Bikeway Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline Near (0-3 yrs), Mid (3-6 yrs), Long (6+ yrs)</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUTO-BASED PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jump Start</td>
<td>Increases the number of employment opportunities for W-T-W participants</td>
<td>Low/ No-cost vehicle repair and maintenance services to provide reliable transportation</td>
<td>$400,000 annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>JARC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Share Program</td>
<td>Enables low income individuals to pursue training &amp; employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Short-term car rental program to support individuals returning to unsubsidized employment</td>
<td>$200,000 - $500,000 annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Local Funds, JARC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Car - Vehicle Ownership Program</td>
<td>Vehicle ownership solves the complex transportation needs of low income families.</td>
<td>Project provides grants and/or guaranteed loans for the purchase of vehicles by low income families.</td>
<td>$500,000+ annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>Local Funds, JARC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras Blvd. Widening Project</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td>Multimodal project with additional travel lanes including sidewalks and bike lanes.</td>
<td>$70,000,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>VTP 2035, Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Expy/Great Mall Parkway-Capitol Avenue Urban Interchange Project</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td>Elevate Capitol Avenue-Great Mall Parkway over Montague Expressway.</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>VTP 2035, Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Landing Road Widening</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td>Widening Dixon Landing Road from four to six travel lanes.</td>
<td>$60,000,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>VTP 2035, Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon Landing Road/Milpitas Blvd Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td>Construction of an additional northbound left-turn lane, a southbound right-turn lane and addition of an eastbound left and right turn lane. The</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>VTP 2035, Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas Blvd. Extension</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td>Construction of Milpitas Blvd extension from Montague Expressway to Capitol Avenue</td>
<td>$44,000,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Transit Area Specific Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague Expressway Widening</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td>Widen to 8 lanes from Mission College Blvd (Santa Clara) to Park Victoria (Milpitas)</td>
<td>$38,500,000</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>VTP 2035, Transit Area Specific Plan, County Expressway Planning Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlo Street Ramp Conversion</td>
<td>Provide local connection and improve safety</td>
<td>Convert the existing off-ramp from Main Street to Calaveras via Carlo Street to an on-ramp to Main Street.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
<td>Near-Term (in construction)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Midtown Specific Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-680 Express Lane Project</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td>Convert existing carpool lane to an express lane (or HOT lane) from Hwy 84 to Hwy 237</td>
<td>$40,000,000</td>
<td>Near-Mid Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880 HOV Project</td>
<td>Reduce traffic congestion</td>
<td>Adds approx. 4.6 miles of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV or carpool) lane.</td>
<td>$95,000,000</td>
<td>Near-Mid Term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEMAND RESPONSIVE SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Transportation and Resources Program</strong></td>
<td>Transportation for older adults to destinations that support healthy and active living.</td>
<td>Door-to-door transportation and public transit fare subsidies for seniors 65 years of age and older.</td>
<td>$350,000 – $600,000 annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>STA, New Freedom, local funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Van Service</strong></td>
<td>Need for transportation for local trips such as grocery shopping, etc.</td>
<td>A neighborhood van service operated by a local CBO that provides no/low-cost transportation.</td>
<td>$120,000+ annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>STA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give Kids a Lift!</strong></td>
<td>Service would enable welfare to work parents to pursue training &amp; employment.</td>
<td>Before and after school transportation for children of CalWORKS participants and low-income families.</td>
<td>$250,000 – 500,000 annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>STA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guaranteed Ride Program</strong></td>
<td>Enables low income individuals to pursue training &amp; employment opportunities.</td>
<td>Guaranteed ride home for W-T-W participants &amp; low-income, when stranded at work or training; or when transit is not available.</td>
<td>$800,000 - $1,500,000 annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>JARC, STA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Community Need Addressed</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Estimated Costs</td>
<td>Implementation Timeline</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Identified In Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Driver Programs</td>
<td>Escorted transportation for frail elderly and other disadvantaged groups for short or frequent trips</td>
<td>Volunteer driver programs.</td>
<td>$120,000 - $250,000 annually</td>
<td>Near-Term</td>
<td>STA, New Freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.2. Proposals for Future Consideration (“Wish List”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Community Need Addressed</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earlier/Later Service Hours on Key Routes</td>
<td>Transit service during the early morning/late evening</td>
<td>Extend service hours for early morning/late night travel periods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Shuttle Program</td>
<td>Offer shuttle service to key destinations in town.</td>
<td>Midtown Specific/Transit Area Specific Plan Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>McCarthy Ranch business area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Milpitas Boulevard business shuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Assistance</td>
<td>TDM Planning for alternative modes and specialized transit services</td>
<td>Provide support for TDM planning within Santa Clara County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Service to California Circle/Dixon Landing</td>
<td>Need transit service to new worship and activity centers located in this area</td>
<td>Consider bringing bus service to this area if it develops into a viable source for ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbott &amp; Calaveras Pedestrian Xing</td>
<td>Need safe and convenient pedestrian crossing at this busy intersection</td>
<td>Provide north/south crosswalks at Calaveras &amp; Abbott intersection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facilities at Great Mall</td>
<td>Many community members especially seniors asked for restroom facilities at this transit center</td>
<td>Add restroom facilities at the Great Mall transit center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Passes</td>
<td>Convenient option for purchasing passes</td>
<td>Offer seasonal passes similar to VTA’s Summer Blast Pass for each season</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 8: Funding Sources & Opportunities

Funding for various forms of transportation is obtainable from federal, state, regional and local sources. Funds may be distributed either based on population and public transit ridership volumes or through a competitive process. This chapter contains information regarding funding sources that can be used to implement projects and programs recommended in this CBTP.

Public/Government Funding Sources

Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) through:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Milpitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• County of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligible CBTP Elements: Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements

BTA provides state funds for city and county projects that improve safety and convenience for bicycle commuters. During the Fiscal Year 2008-2009 funding cycle, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) provided $7.2 million for statewide bicycle projects, with a maximum of $1.8 million for each project applicant. This source is best suited for bicycle-related projects identified by the City of Milpitas, the County of Santa Clara, or VTA.

Projects and activities that are eligible for this funding source include:
• Bicycle path, lane or route construction and maintenance;
• Bicycle lockers;
• Bicycle racks on transit vehicles;
• Planning related to bicycle projects; and
• Bicycle-related safety education.

California Office of Safety Grants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>California Office of Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Eligible CBTP Elements: Pedestrian-Scale Lighting
Bicycle/Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements
The California Office of Safety Grants awards federal funding on a competitive basis to cities and counties. Evaluation criteria include potential traffic safety impact, collision statistics ranking, seriousness of identified problems and performance on previously received grants.

**Community Design and Transportation (CDT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBTP Elements: with potential eligibility (design phases only):</td>
<td>Bus Shelters/Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian-Scale Lighting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VTA developed the CDT Program to provide information, tools, and planning, technical and design assistance to VTA member agencies (the 15 cities and towns of Santa Clara County and the County of Santa Clara) to influence a proactive planning and development process. In conjunction with this program, VTA distributes grants on a competitive basis to fund planning activities and to assist member agencies with implementing the concepts, principles, practices, and actions outlined in VTA’s CDT Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use.

The CDT Planning Grants are intended to prepare projects for implementation by member agencies, and to compete for VTA Livable Communities and Pedestrian Program (capital) Grants, as well as MTC Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) grants.

Activities that are eligible for this funding source include:
- Policy planning activities to revise existing or create new policies, codes, ordinances, or enforceable design standards that encourage the design of pedestrian-friendly streets and well-designed developments along major transportation routes, downtowns, main streets, commercial areas, and stations; and
- Capital planning activities that integrate high-quality transit- and pedestrian-friendly designs of public streets, commercial areas or stations.

**Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) through:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible CBTP Elements:</th>
<th>Transit-Oriented Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Cost Auto Ownership Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Art Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Shelters/Amenities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 established CDBG as a replacement for a variety of federal urban renewal, housing and neighborhood development programs. CDBG was the first of the federal block grant programs. Government agencies and nonprofit organizations are eligible for funding. Target areas are low-income for these grants; therefore, most community development projects in this plan may be eligible for CDBG funding, including the proposals listed above.

### Federal Section 5303 Technical Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Federal Transit Administration (FTA) through:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eligible CBTP Elements: | Planning and technical assistance for transit-related proposals. |

FTA Section 5303 funds are used to support planning activities in metropolitan areas. These funds are distributed by MTC and are available to all transit operators within the Bay Area.

Projects and activities that are eligible for this funding source include:
- Development of short-range transit plans;
- Route restructuring studies; and
- Technical assistance for implementing technology upgrades and similar projects.

### Federal Section 5310 Capital Grants – Elderly and Disabled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Federal Transit Administration (FTA) through:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eligible CBTP Elements: | Subscription Transportation Services |

FTA funds capital grants through its Section 5310 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Program. Capital grants are provided for the purpose of assisting private non-profit corporations and, under certain circumstances, public agencies, in providing transportation services to meet the needs of seniors and persons with disabilities for whom public transit are unavailable, insufficient, or inappropriate. Through an annual application process, program grants are made for up to 80% of the total project cost. Applicants must have funds available to pay all operating and maintenance costs for the vehicles.
Projects and activities that are eligible for this funding source include:

- Purchase of paratransit vehicles; and
- Purchase of paratransit-related equipment.

### Hazard Elimination Safety Program (HES)

**Source:** California Department of Transportation through:

- City of Milpitas
- County of Santa Clara
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)

**Eligible CBTP Elements:** Pedestrian-Scale Lighting

HES provides funds for safety improvements on public roads, surface transportation facilities and pedestrian or bicycle trails. The goal of the program is to eliminate or reduce the number and/or the severity of accidents at locations selected for improvements. These funds are available for preliminary design and engineering, right-of-way acquisitions, and construction expenses. A 10% local match is required.

Projects and activities that are eligible for this funding source include safety projects on public roads and highways (signals, median barriers, guard rails, lighting)

### Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Program

**Source:** Federal Transit Administration (FTA) through:

- Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

**Eligible CBTP Elements:**

- Community Bus Services
- Shuttle Services
- Subscription Transportation Services
- Vanpool Program
- and-
- Promotional activities for:
  - Subsidized Transit Pass Program
  - Transportation-Related Information Services

JARC provides grants to communities for employment-related transportation needs. The primary beneficiaries of JARC grants are low-income families who would otherwise have difficulty getting to jobs and other necessary services, like childcare and training. JARC funds must be used to provide new services, not to plan or coordinate activities or to improve existing services. Projects must be integrated into or coordinated with the existing transportation system. This program cannot be used to purchase individual...
transit passes, construction of childcare centers and employment support services at transit stations, or vehicle purchases for private automobile ownership.

Funds are allocated on a discretionary basis with 60% to areas of over 200,000 population; 20% to areas of under 200,000 population, and 20% to non-urbanized areas. A 50% local match is required. $727 million has been authorized for use for fiscal years 2006 through 2009.

Two kinds of grants are available through the JARC program:

- Job Access Grants fund new transportation services for low-income workers or to provide transportation where none is available.

- Reverse Commute Grants fund projects that provide transportation to suburban jobs from urban, rural, and other suburban locations.

Projects and activities that are eligible for this funding source include:

- Those designed to transport low-income persons to work; and
- Those designed to move people to suburban job centers.

**Lifeline Transportation Program (Lifeline)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) through:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A partnership between the County of Santa Clara and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eligible CBTP Elements: | All recommended CBTP proposals |

Lifeline funds are for innovative and flexible projects that address transportation barriers of low-income and welfare-to-work residents of Santa Clara County. Transportation needs specific to elderly and disabled residents of low-income communities may also be considered. Funds may be used for capital or operating purposes for projects within Santa Clara County. If a project extends beyond the county, other funds may be required to implement that portion of the project or program.

Approximately $15.8 million is available for funding projects in Santa Clara County for the three-year funding cycle FY 2009-2011. A minimum 20% match is required for most projects. For projects receiving Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funds, at least 50% of the total project cost must be derived from funds other than the JARC program.

Projects must be developed through a collaborative, community-driven process, such as a welfare-to-work or community-based transportation planning processes. All of the projects recommended in this Milpitas CBTP are eligible to enter the competitive process for Lifeline funding.
Low-Income Flexible Transportation Program (LIFT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Eligible CBTP Elements:** | Shuttle Services  
| | Subscription Transportation Services |

MTC partnered with local transit and social services agencies to initiate the LIFT program, specifically in response to the challenge of improving transportation services for residents of low-income communities. Since the program’s beginning in 2000, 32 pilot projects have been funded to provide transportation services specifically tailored for the communities in which they operate.

LIFT projects are funded by Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funds, and State Transportation Assistance (STA) Regional Discretionary funds. Projects require a local or non-federal match, which was originally 50%. This requirement has been lowered in response to the economic downturn.

Older Americans Act (OAA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>County of Santa Clara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Eligible CBTP Elements:** | Shuttle Services  
| | Subscription Transportation Services |

The Older Americans Act (1965) created the federal Administration on Aging as well as authorized grants to states for community planning and services programs, research, demonstration and training projects in the field of aging. Later amendments to the Act added grants to Area Agencies on Aging for local needs identification, planning, and funding of services, including but not limited to nutrition programs in the community as well as for those who are homebound and services for low-income minority elders. A reauthorization in 2000 added the National Family Caregiver Support Program, to assist families in providing care for elder family members.

Although OAA funds are allocated to non-transportation needs, such as meals and nutrition programs and medical services, a local “champion” may be able to advocate for transportation-related funding with the County of Santa Clara.

Safe Routes to School (SR2S)

| Source: | California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) through:  
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| | City of Milpitas  
| | County of Santa Clara |
The goal of the SR2S program is to encourage school-age children to walk or bike to school. SR2S grants are intended to fund construction projects that improve the safety of students who walk or bike to school. Projects can include new sidewalks, sidewalk widening, sidewalk gap closures, curbs, gutters, and curb ramps. New pedestrian trails, paths and pedestrian over- and under-crossings are also eligible.

Funding for traffic-calming measures, traffic-control devices, and new bicycle facilities and bikeways is also available through this program. Costs related to public outreach and education activities for these improvements are also eligible, but limited to 10% of construction costs.

Sidewalk repair, pavement repair, rehabilitation of traffic lanes, and compensation for crossing guards are ineligible for funding through this program.

The amount of SR2S funds available for the program is determined by statutory formula. Based on Fiscal Year 2004-2005 federal safety fund levels, this program can expect a funding level of $24 million to $28 million for each of the next three years. The maximum reimbursement percentage for any SR2S project is 90%. The maximum amount of SR2S funds that will be allocated to any single project is $450,000. If the total cost for a project exceeds $500,000 ($450,000 reimbursable), a local match must be provided.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-or-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible CBTP Elements:</th>
<th>Community Bus Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shuttle Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vanpool Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subscription Transportation Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subsidized Transit Pass Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TFCA grant program is funded by a $4 surcharge on motor vehicles registered in the Bay Area. This generates approximately $20 million per year in revenue. TFCA’s goal is to implement the most cost-effective projects in the Bay Area that will decrease motor vehicle emissions, and therefore improve air quality.
The TFCA program is administered by the Management District (Air District). Public agencies within the Air District’s jurisdiction, such as cities, counties, school districts, transit districts, and regional and state agencies, can apply for TFCA program funds. Applicant can apply to either one of two types of TFCA grants:

- The Regional Fund comes from 60% of the revenue and is allocated directly by the Air District.
- The County Program Manager Fund constitutes the other 40% of revenues and is allocated by the Bay Area’s nine county Congestion Management Agencies. VTA manages the Air District’s TFCA County Program Manager Fund for Santa Clara County. Project sponsors apply directly to VTA on an annual basis for funding through the Program Manager Fund. The applications are reviewed and scored by a committee comprised of VTA staff and members of the Capital Improvement Program Subcommittee or their designees. The VTA Board of Directors then reviews the scored project list and approves programming of the funds, subject to approval by the Air District. Once approved, the project sponsors have two years to expend the funds allocated to their project.

Funds can be applied to a wide range of project types, including:
- Purchase or lease of clean fuel buses;
- Purchase of clean air vehicles;
- Shuttle and feeder bus service to train stations;
- Ridesharing programs to encourage carpool and transit use;
- Bicycle facility improvements such as bike lanes, bicycle racks, and lockers;
- Arterial management improvements to speed traffic flow on major arterials;
- Smart growth; and
- Transit information projects to enhance the availability of transit information.

### Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible CBTP Elements:</td>
<td>Community Park &amp; Ride Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bus Shelters/Amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrian-Scale Lighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-and-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycle, pedestrian, traffic-calming projects planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by the City of Milpitas and the County of Santa Clara.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TLC Program supports community-based transportation projects that bring new vibrancy to downtown areas, commercial cores, neighborhoods, and transit corridors, by enhancing their amenities and ambiance and making them places where people want to
live, work and visit. TLC provides funding for projects that are developed through an inclusive community planning effort, provide for a range of transportation choices, and support connectivity between transportation investments and land uses.

Capital projects are funded using regional Transportation Enhancements Activities funding from the federal Surface Transportation Program. Funding also comes from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program. Awards are made through a competitive grant process. Projects in their early or “conceptual” stages of development are eligible for TLC Planning Program grants of up to $75,000, which are awarded to help sponsors refine and elaborate promising project ideas. Projects with completed plans are eligible for TLC Capital Grants, which build the projects. Capital grants range from $750,000 to $2 million.

Projects and activities that are eligible for this funding source include bicycle, pedestrian, transit or other projects that enhance community vitality, including planning studies.

**Potential Future Government Funding Sources**

**California Environmental Protection Agency Environmental Justice (CalEPA/EJ)**

The CalEPA/EJ grant program is primarily used to seed planning activities that encourage livable communities. CalEPA/EJ grants assist local agencies to better integrate land use and transportation planning, to develop alternatives for addressing growth and to assess efficient infrastructure investments that meet community needs. These planning activities are expected to help leverage projects that foster sustainable economies, increase available affordable housing, improve housing/jobs balance, encourage transit oriented and mixed use development, expand transportation choices, reflect community values, and include non-traditional participation in transportation decision making.

CalEPA/EJ grant funded projects demonstrate the value of these new approaches locally, and provide best practices for statewide application. Funding is provided by 80% federal/state and 20% local match.

**Federal Section 5317 New Freedom Initiative**

Under the 2005 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation, the “New Freedom Initiative” provides grants to fund transit programs to integrate disabled persons into the workforce and daily community life. The program provides funding through a formula-based allocation depending on states’ and urbanized areas’ populations of persons with disabilities. Funds are to be used to provide public transit services and alternatives above and beyond ADA legislation, especially to assist disabled persons access job and employment related services. The funds may be used for capital expenses (at an 80% share) or operating expenses (at a 50% share).
It is expected that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) will provide more guidance on the details of this program, likely by mid-2006 or early 2007. FTA has indicated that the New Freedom funding program may be expanded to fund services that also assist seniors, individuals with low incomes, and/or the general public, if they primarily meet the needs of individuals with disabilities.¹

**MTC Transportation 2030 (T2030)**

Although no direct funding is provided from T2030, MTC’s regional transportation plan, projects must be included in the plan to be eligible for future funding allocations from MTC. T2030 does allocate funding to lifeline transportation projects, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and to the Transportation for Livable Communities Program.

**Valley Transportation Plan 2035 (VTP 2035)**

VTP 2035 is the long-range countywide transportation plan for Santa Clara County. VTA, in its role as the appointed Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County, is responsible for preparing and periodically updating the countywide transportation plan. The projects listed in VTP 2035 are submitted to MTC for inclusion in T2030, the regional transportation plan, making them eligible for funding allocations from MTC.

VTP 2035 identifies existing and future transportation-related needs, considers all travel modes, links land use and transportation planning and decision-making, and identifies what can be accomplished with the projected available funding for projects and programs. Projects and programs are organized into 10 categories:

- Highways
- Expressways
- Local Streets and County Roads
- Pavement Management
- Sound Mitigation
- Landscape Restoration & Graffiti Removal
- System Operations Management/Intelligent Transportation System
- Transit
- Bicycles
- Livable Communities and Pedestrians

VTP 2035 does not include schedules for project implementation and does not make assumptions regarding financing costs that may be needed to implement specific projects.

in specific years. Much like MTC’s T2030, VTP 2035 describes transportation projects that could be funded by local, regional, state, and federal funding sources.

**Private Foundations**

Private foundations offer opportunities to fund small, focused projects that provide a direct benefit to low-income communities. The following section lists some of the local private organizations that may provide additional funding for projects in this Gilroy CBTP. Other foundations not listed here may also make grants available to support transportation-related projects if they are consistent with their organizational goals.

**David & Lucile Packard Foundation**

The David & Lucile Packard Foundation has a long commitment to local areas of historical importance to the Packard family, including Santa Clara and Monterey Counties. Grants are available to community organizations in these local counties that advance the foundation’s goals. Though its Local Opportunities Grants, the foundation supports non-profits that directly serve residents by operating food banks and homeless services for families with children, after-school youth services, and family planning and adolescent reproductive health services. Many grants are also made to local organizations by three major program areas in Population; Conservation and Science; and Children, Families, and Communities. Proposals for general operating expenses are accepted.

**Contact:**
300 Second Street  
Los Altos, California 94022 USA  
(650) 948-7658  
inquiries@packard.org

**Nathan Cummings Foundation**

The Nathan Cummings Foundation is committed to democratic values and social justice, including fairness, diversity, and community. The foundation’s goal is to “build a socially and economically just society that values and protects the ecological balance for future generations; promotes humane health care; and fosters arts and culture that enriches communities.”

Of primary interest to the Nathan Cummings Foundation are issues of access to healthcare, community-inspired art projects, and projects and programs that promote environmental justice.

**Contact:**
475 Tenth Avenue, 14th Floor  
New York, NY 10018  
(212) 787-7300  
info@nathancummings.org
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation seeks to improve health and healthcare, including eliminating barriers to receiving quality healthcare and promoting physical environments that foster better health. The foundation supports training, education, research (excluding biomedical research), and projects that demonstrate the effective delivery of healthcare services. Past grant recipients include hospitals; medical, nursing, and public schools; hospices; professional associations; research organizations; state and local government agencies; and community groups.

Contact:
PO Box 2316
College Road East and Route 1
Princeton, NJ 08543-2316
(888) 631-9989

Santa Clara Valley Medical Center Foundation
The mission and focus of the VMC Foundation includes all of the services under the umbrella of the Santa Clara Valley Health & Hospital System. This foundation also conveys to the community and the private sector the diverse extensive medical services of the Health & Hospital System, its indispensable role in the community and its financial needs. All donations and grants received by the Foundation are used for equipment, patient care services and programs that do not duplicate or replace funds from Santa Clara County or other government entities.

Contact:
Santa Clara Valley Medical Center
751 South. Bascom Avenue
San Jose, CA 95128
(408) 885-5201

Surdna Foundation
Surdna Foundation makes grants in the areas of environment, community revitalization, effective citizenry, the arts and the nonprofit sector, with annual grant making of approximately $30 million. Specifically, the foundation supports programs that offer viable solutions to difficult systemic problems, as well as high quality, direct service programs. Its “Community Revitalization” program seeks to transform environments and enhance the quality of life in urban places, increase their ability to attract and retain a diversity of residents and employers, and ensure that urban policies and development promote social equity.

Contact:
330 Madison Ave., 30th Floor
New York, NY 10017
(212) 557-0010
questions@surdna.org
van Löben Sels/RembeRock Foundation

van Löben Sels/RembeRock Foundation is a social justice foundation that provides grant funding to community-based organizations serving Northern California. The Foundation maintains a focus on public interest law and social service programs that impact underserved and vulnerable populations. Current areas of public interest law that may be applicable to programs proposed in the Gilroy CBTP include: immigrant and newcomer legal rights; legal services for children; women’s reproductive rights and access to healthcare; and general support to legal service organizations in rural counties. On a selective basis the foundation will provide grants in the fields of health, mental health, substance abuse, job training, and the arts.

This organization provides grants for projects and programs that provide direct services to enhance fair treatment and equal access to the law, target underserved and at-risk populations, and enhance access to services.

Contact:
131 Steuart Street, Suite 301
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 512-0500
info@vlsrr.org

Zellerbach Family Foundation

The Zellerbach Family Foundation’s mission is “to be a catalyst for constructive social change by initiating and investing in efforts that strengthen families and communities.” Various grant making programs through this foundation support programs to increase local communities’ ability and capacity in decision-making processes that affect their communities. Of particular importance are mental health and child welfare service systems, immigrant-serving organizations, and promotion of increased resident participation in decision-making and community improvement efforts. The foundation recognizes that an informed and active citizenry is essential for building and sustaining vibrant communities that address the needs of all residents.

Contact:
120 Montgomery Street, Suite 1550
San Francisco, CA 94104
(415) 421.2629
info@zellerbachfamilyfoundation.org
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APPENDIX A

Transit Market Segmentation Analysis
Market Segmentation is the identification of groups of people -or market segments- that have similarities in characteristics or needs who are likely to exhibit similar purchase behavior and/or responses to changes in the marketing mix. Public transit exists in a competitive environment where many potential customers have choices ranging from driving alone to telecommuting. Delivery of new or improved transit service is critical to taking advantage of new market opportunities. Market research can be used effectively by managers to scan and evaluate opportunities that exist for increasing ridership, particularly by establishing a base of knowledge on local customers. There is an increased awareness that all current and potential transit users are not the same, and that satisfying their needs, preferences, and motivations requires a better understanding of who they are. Thus, transit system managers are learning that analysis of market segments can lead to an even higher degree of success while making the service design and promotion more cost efficient.

The following market analysis shows an in depth look of the Santa Clara County’s market segments, along with the transit competitiveness of different sections within the Milpitas study area. The analysis specifically takes into account the competitiveness of transit origins and destinations within the study area, giving a detailed look at what market segments make up each section.
## Six Santa Clara County Customer Segments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Type</th>
<th>Time Sensitivity</th>
<th>Transit Tolerance</th>
<th>Price Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Trippers</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellow Movers</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINKs &amp; MINKs</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boomers &amp; Blazers</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young &amp; Restless</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers &amp; Shakers</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
<td>⬜</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ⬜: Low
- ⬜: Medium
- ⬜: High

### Commuters by Customer Type (2005)

- Work Trip Commuters
- Transit Work Trip Commuters
- Total Adult Population

- Transit Trippers
- Mellow Movers
- LINKs & MINKs
- Boomers & Blazers
- Young & Restless
- Movers & Shakers

- Bar chart showing the number of commuters by customer type.
Transit Profile Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Type</th>
<th>Santa Clara County</th>
<th>Milpitas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Trippers</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mellow Movers</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young and Movers</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movers and Trippers</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit Trippers

1 Dot = 20 Adults

Morgan Hill and Gilroy
Market-Based Planning

Identify areas of Milpitas that are amenable to transit service and why

**Transportation Land Use Factors**
- Trip Intensity: Origin
- Trip Intensity: Destination
- Level of Congestion
- Parking Cost and Time

**Customer Types**
- Customer Types
- Transit Propensity

**Trip Purposes**
- Work/School
- Other

Transit Competitive Factor (TCF)
Bus Routes Serving Milpitas

Transit Competitive Origins Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Population</th>
<th>Transit Trippers</th>
<th>Mellow Movers</th>
<th>Young and</th>
<th>Movers and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of 680</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of 237</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of 237</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transit Competitive Origins Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>East of 680</th>
<th>North of 237</th>
<th>South of 237</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work/School</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit Competitive Origins-Midtown Residential

Transit Competitiveness Factor (TDF): 232
Total Person Trips Produced: 1920

Contribution to TCF from:
- Intensity at Origin: 113
- Intensity at Destination: 8
- Congestion: 3
- Parking Cost and Time: 19

Population Variables:
- Other than Customer Type: 79

By Customer Type:
- Percentage:
  - Transits Tripper: 12.9%
  - Walker: 13.5%
  - Biker: 13.9%
  - Person: 13.9%
  - Vehicle: 6.7%
  - Bus: 3.9%
  - Road and Rail: 29%
  - Other: 9.5%

By Trip Purpose:
- Percentage:
  - Work/School: 23.6%
  - Other: 23.4%
  - Work/School: 53.4%
  - Other: 23.4%
Summary of Key Findings

- Milpitas market profile is similar to Santa Clara County.

- A high percentage of the population is made up of Young and Restless, and Movers and Shakers market segments. These are the toughest market segments to capture.

- There are several transit competitive origins in Milpitas. The most competitive origins, include the Milpitas high area and the Midtown Residential Area.

- There are few transit competitive destinations in Milpitas. The most competitive destinations include, Great Mall and along Calaveras blvd near City Hall.
Summary of Key Findings Continued…

- Current service covers the competitive destinations well (Great Mall and City Hall/Calaveras).

- Current service covers most competitive origins, with exception of two areas.

- Transit is currently serving the non-competitive area of McCarthy Ranch.
  - Ridership per revenue hour on line 33 is 16 boardings during the weekdays, 7 boardings below VTA standards.

- Future redevelopment may change transit market conditions.
  - Serra Center  - Abel Housing Corridor
  - California Circle  - New Senior Center
APPENDIX C

Project Webpage
Milpitas Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP)

Help Us Improve Transportation in Milpitas!

Fill out a Feedback Form!

How would you improve the transportation in your community? We need your help to identify what kinds of transportation projects would help you get from your house to your job, school, stores, church, hospitals or other destinations.

For example:
- Making bus stops and shelters more reliable
- Making sidewalks and intersections safer
- Improving access to jobs, shopping and community facilities
- Adding bicycle or walking paths

Study Area Map
(Study Area Map text version)

Study Objective and Approach

The Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), along with the City of Milpitas and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, is working together with you and others in the community to develop a Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP). The resulting Milpitas CBTP will help the VTA and community identify future transportation improvements.

Get involved!

The success of the Milpitas CBTP depends on input from people in neighborhoods throughout Milpitas. We will be hosting focus groups and public meetings to identify concerns and solutions for community transportation in Milpitas.

The community is invited to:
- Attend a focus group or public meeting
- Fill out a feedback form
- Set up a briefing for your organization
- Call or e-mail and share your thoughts

Come to our public meetings:

Milpitas Community Based Transportation Plan Open House
Tuesday, March 17th, 6:00-7:30pm
Milpitas Library, Large Multipurpose Room
183 N. Main Street
April 2, 2009, 6:00pm
Milpitas Community Committee Conference Room
465 East Calaveras Blvd.
May 20th, 6:00pm
Milpitas Community Center, Rooms 7 & 8
457 East Calaveras Blvd.

Tell us what you think

VTA wants to know what you think! Help us improve transportation in Milpitas by completing a feedback form and returning it to drop-off boxes located inside the Milpitas Library or City Hall. You may also return the forms via US Mail.

Please return it no later than May 31, 2009.
Flash Banner on VTA’s homepage
APPENDIX D

Comment Card Results
Survey Methodology & Results

In an effort to gain a better understanding of the transportation needs of Milpitas residents, the Project Working Group sought to gather information from as many sources as possible. One part of the information gathering effort was the transportation comment card. The comment card was developed by the Project Working Group as a means for Milpitas community members to provide direct feedback on their transportation needs and travel patterns. The comment card was designed to focus on information gathering rather than statistical significance. The comment card featured six short questions, mostly multiple choice, including an open-ended general comments question. The survey was administered in two forms—a conventional paper-based version and an online version. The paper comment card was printed along with the project fact sheet, which served as a convenient way to inform residents about the project and also seek their input. Many comment cards included return postage, which allowed respondents to mail the survey back to VTA free of charge in addition, suggestion boxes were placed throughout the city to collect comment cards that did not have return postage. The link to the online comment card was posted on the project webpage which is on the main VTA website. The project webpage provided information about the Milpitas CBTP study and the link to the comment card was an opportunity to provide direct feedback on needs. Both the paper and the online comment cards were administered from February 2009 through May 2009. The bulk of the completed surveys were returned during the months of March-April but VTA staff continued to collect surveys through May to give respondents sufficient time to provide input.

Distribution

More than 6,000 comment cards were distributed throughout Milpitas. Of the 6,000 plus distributed comment cards 2,773 were mailed directly to Welfare to Work recipients. Surveys were distributed in English, Spanish, Chinese, and Vietnamese. VTA staff also distributed the fact sheet/comment card at the Great Mall Shopping Center, Milpitas City Hall and the Milpitas Library in order to reach community members who may not have the opportunity to attend a focus group or public meeting. These locations and several others served as drop-off locations with suggestion boxes to collect comment cards. Comment cards could also be returned via mail or in person at any of the focus group or public meetings. Comment card responses were collected, analyzed and summarized by the survey team and are included in this report.

Survey Response

The table below gives an overview of the survey distribution and the results. 602 valid surveys were returned from all distribution methods (excluding a few that were returned blank). Of the 602 completed surveys, many had valid comments in the general comments question, which gave the Project Working Group another valuable insight into the community’s needs. Though not statistically significant, an analysis of the results does provide a good insight into the needs of the community.
Full Results by Question

Question 3: Where are the three places you travel most in Milpitas? How do you get there…?

### Raw Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>WALK</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>BIKE</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORE</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR CENTER</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>423</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>WALK</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>BIKE</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORE</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR CENTER</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKS</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 4: Do you currently own (or lease) a vehicle…?

### Number of Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45.2%</td>
<td>54.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 5:** Select your top three transportation concerns…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Concerns</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of transit service in your area</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Late night/early morning Bus/LRT service</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal Safety while walking or biking</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Costs (fares, gas, etc)</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bus/light rail frequency</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reliability of public transit</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of available transportation information</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of pedestrian/bicycle facilities</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School transportation</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. No Concerns; transportation works well now</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Concerns</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of transit service in your area</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Late night/early morning Bus/LRT service</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal Safety while walking or biking</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Costs (fares, gas, etc)</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bus/light rail frequency</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reliability of public transit</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of available transportation information</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of pedestrian/bicycle facilities</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School transportation</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. No Concerns; transportation works well now</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teen Respondent Data**

**Question 3:** Where are the three places you travel most in Milpitas? How do you get there…?

**Teen Center/ MHS Raw Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOME</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>WALK</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>BIKE</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEEN CENTER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teen Center/MHS Raw Data Graph

![Teen Center/MHS Raw Data Graph]

### Teen Center/MHS Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>BUS</th>
<th>WALK</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>BIKE</th>
<th>LRT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORE</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEEN CENTER</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teen Center/MHS Percentage Graph

![Teen Center/MHS Percentage Graph]
**Question 5:** Select your top three transportation concerns…

**Teen Center/MHS Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Concerns</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of transit service in your area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Late night/early morning Bus/LRT service</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal Safety while walking or biking</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Costs (fares, gas, etc)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bus/light rail frequency</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reliability of public transit</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of available transportation information</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of pedestrian/bicycle facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School transportation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation Concern Response Graph**

**Transportation Concern Percentages (Adult and Teen Populations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Concerns</th>
<th>Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lack of transit service in your area</td>
<td>40.1% / 18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traffic Congestion</td>
<td>26.5% / 18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Late night/early morning Bus/LRT service</td>
<td>23.3% / 22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Personal Safety while walking or biking</td>
<td>27.9% / 11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Costs (fares, gas, etc)</td>
<td>48.4% / 36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bus/light rail frequency</td>
<td>30.2% / 29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reliability of public transit</td>
<td>17% / 27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lack of available transportation information</td>
<td>16.6% / 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lack of pedestrian/bicycle facilities</td>
<td>10.9% / 2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. School transportation</td>
<td>6.7% / 9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. No Concerns; transportation works well now</td>
<td>11.7% / X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adult Population  *Teen Center/MHS

44 total surveys from MHS and Youth Center
Comments

Question 6: Do you have any specific comments/suggestions on your community’s transportation needs?

The lists below shows the valid comments received from question 6, which allowed respondents an open-ended forum to provide any comments. The comments were organized by topic for manageability, and duplicate comments were combined. The duplicate comments are listed below only once, but the number in parenthesis indicates the total number of similar comments. The list is not ranked.

Route Changes/Additions
- Increase bus frequency (x35)
- Please use the duckout in front of the Library as bus stop (x3)
- Extend a bus route to BAPS Temple on California Circle (x26)
- Make bus routes and schedules more reliable (x11)
- Need a direct bus from Devries Place to McCarthy Ranch (x9)
- Need bus to Mission College and Kaiser Hospital - Santa Clara
- Provide transit to Silkh Temple at 1180 Cadillac ct (x13)

Station Improvements
- List stations at each bus stop (x10)
- Provide more information on bus route timing (x3)

Safety Concerns

Bike/Ped Improvements
- Need a restroom at Great Mall transit center (x32)

LRT Improvements

Planning
- Calaveras/237 traffic congestion (x3)

Fares
- Make fares more affordable (x32)
- Create Translink pass to use both AC Transit and VTA services (x9)
- Free to ride month for seniors and youth (x2)
- Offer a free day pass to promote VTA services
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Press Releases
MTC designates Milpitas as in-need community

Author: Ian Bauer
Article ID: 11690369
Date: February 12, 2009
Publication: Milpitas Post (CA)

Metropolitan Transportation Commission has designated Milpitas as a community in need. Under the MTC's Community Based Transportation Planning program, the transit agency recently approved a $30,000 grant to Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority to plan and gain community input toward improving Milpitas' transit options, possibly expanding bus and light rail service.

The Community-based Transportation Planning Program is considered a collaborative process.
VTA to hear views at breakfast

Saturday’s Milpitas Community Breakfast will afford residents an opportunity to tell the Valley Transportation Authority about issues concerning transportation in Milpitas. VTA staff will present information about bus route performance and travel origins and destinations in Milpitas at the monthly breakfast May 2 starting at 8 a.m. inside Sunnyhills United Methodist Church (Jones Hall), 355 Dixon Road. VTA representatives will also ask attendees questions about various transportation problems in the city. VTA is compiling a report that will be the basis for funding applications to finance improvements in Milpitas. City staff may also be on hand to present the draft Bikeways Master Plan.

The breakfast is jointly sponsored by the Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association and the Sunnyhills United Methodist Church. Breakfast is free (donations are requested). All residents are invited to attend and participate.

SPEAKING OF THE VTA

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority will hold a public meeting at Milpitas Public Library, 160 N. Main St., May 6 at 6 p.m. in Room B to review and obtain input regarding draft budgets for fiscal years 2010 and 2011. Details of the budgets can be found online at www.vta.org.
Improve public transportation

BY DUSTIN FINDLEY

Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), in partnership with the city of Milpitas and MTC, is conducting a study as part of a community plan to improve transportation in Milpitas.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the regional transportation agency for all 9 counties in the Bay Area, created a Community-Based Transportation Planning Program as a way to focus local planning efforts in low-income communities.

The goal of the planning process is to work with the community to identify transportation needs and possible solutions to address them. Milpitas has been designated as one of these communities and VTA is now conducting extensive community outreach to get public input on transportation concerns in the city.

MTC made recommendations for a targeted approach, focusing on specific groups within the city, but VTA decided to take a comprehensive look at the whole city of Milpitas, according to Aiko Cuenco, Transportation Planner for VTA.

“The biggest component to this study is our outreach efforts. We want to know what types of transportation improvements, anything from transit, bike, or pedestrian-related issues, people are most concerned about” said Cuenco.

While we will look to propose improvements for all modes (of transportation), due to anticipated transit demand expected in new redeveloped areas currently not served.

In between the public meetings they will hold focus groups to bring "targeted issues to a small group of people for feedback... to help guide the direction the study" Cuenco revealed.

When the outreach efforts have concluded, VTA will document their findings in a community plan. The community plan that emerges will include recommended solutions and a list of proposed projects to pursue for future funding opportunities.

“MTC gives priority for Lifeline funding to projects identified in community-based transportation plan” Cuenco said. So if Milpitas were to take on a project proposed in the community plan it could go to MTC for available funding.

For more information visit: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/cbtp or email aiko.cuenco@vta.org

Public transportation meeting
Thursday, April 2
6 p.m.
Milpitas City Hall
455 E. Calaveras Blvd., Milpitas
(408) 586-3000

Help Us Improve Transportation in Milpitas!
¡Ayúdenos a Mejorar el Transporte Urbano en Milpitas!
协助改善城市市内的交通服务！
Hãy Giúp Chúng TAI CÁI XÉP CHÍ...
VTA invites community to transportation meeting

SUBMITTED BY AIKO CUENCO

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is hosting a public meeting on Thursday, May 28 to discuss proposals for transportation improvements as part of the Milpitas Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) study.

The purpose of the public meeting is to provide residents an opportunity to hear a presentation and provide comments on the study’s outreach findings and proposed solutions.

VTA has been working with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), City of Milpitas, and various community-based organizations for several months to conduct local planning efforts in Milpitas to address transportation needs.

The goal of the planning process is a community plan that identifies local transportation needs, its potential solutions and an action plan with possible funding sources for implementing those solutions.

Extensive public outreach in Milpitas show bus related issues regarding frequency, reliability and cost of fares to be top concerns in the community.

The proposed transportation improvements to be presented at the public meeting aim to address these concerns with proposed bus route modifications as well as other transit improvements.

Milpitas residents are invited to attend the last public meeting scheduled for the Milpitas CBTP study and provide input on the proposed transportation improvements.

Community feedback received from the public outreach process as well as from the public meeting will be incorporated into the final report.

The plan is scheduled to be completed in July. For more information, contact Aiko Cuenco at aiko.cuenco@vta.org

Transportation Plan public meeting
Thursday, May 28
6 p.m.
Milpitas Community Center
457 East Calaveras Blvd., Milpitas
(408) 586-3210
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Focus Group Meeting Agenda & Questions
Milpitas Community Based Transportation Plan
Focus Group Format & Questions

PURPOSE

The purpose of the focus group meetings is to gather input from community members to expand VTA’s understanding of transportation and transit needs, particularly gaps in the transportation network, and issues Milpitas. Feedback from these meetings will be folded into VTA’s Community Base Transportation Plan.

PROCESS

Focus Group Meetings
After CirclePoint has reviewed the list of selected target community representatives and community members that have expressed interest in participating, we will contact these stakeholders by phone to invite to the focus groups. Our approach will be to conduct in-person meetings at a central location for the stakeholders. We will provide translation services at meetings as needed.

- **Community participants:** Focus will be on identifying and contacting people from a cross section of the Milpitas community that may not have had the opportunity to participate in the community open house events, or would like to provide further input. The primary objective is to gather input from the local community on transportation needs as well as potential solutions to address those needs. The meetings will also allow a forum for a discussion of potential bus route changes.

- **Project team participants:** Kevin Connolly and Aiko Cueno, VTA, Chris Colwick and/or Meghan Daniels with CirclePoint (one CirclePoint representative at each meeting), and one project translator as needed.

- **Length:** Focus groups are anticipated to last from one to two hours.

Documentation
CirclePoint will document each meeting following a consistent format and will submit a brief meeting summary within one week of the meeting. A final summary report will incorporate and consolidate the input from all meetings.

Materials for Meetings
- One page handout with project overview and contact information
- Map of service area (VTA to provide)
- Exhibit boards (those used for the Open House/Public Meetings)
AGENDA AND DISCUSSION GUIDELINES

Agenda

Welcome
- Introductions of participants
- Purpose of the focus group and relationship to other, similar meetings/planning efforts
- Agenda and time allotted
- Desired outcome of the meeting and how community input will be used

Overview
- Brief overview of the process/objectives of the Milpitas Community Based Transportation Plan
- VTA’s role in as the local transportation agency and key services
- What we’d like to know to help us in developing the Community Based Transportation Plan

Group Discussion

Close and Wrap Up

Discussion Guidelines

Below are suggested questions to help facilitate discussion, gather input on needs from community stakeholders, and help ensure some consistency among focus group meetings. We do not intend to necessarily ask all these questions at every meeting, but have provided a range to help prepare for different situations. The sub points are to help prompt discussion if that subject is of particular interest to participants.

Methods of Travel
- How did you get to this meeting today?
- If you don’t travel by bus or train, why not?
- How close or far away are most of the places you travel to from your home?
  - Very close (In your neighborhood)
  - Somewhat close (Outside your neighborhood but within Milpitas)
  - Far (Outside Milpitas – indicate where)
- We heard work, school, and library are the main places people travel to most in Milpitas. Do you find it difficult to get to these places by transit, car, bike, or walking? What would make it easier to travel to these locations?
- Are any other places you need to get to hard to reach? Why?
  - What would make it easier to get to these places?

- Are there any places you can’t get to at all now? Why?
  - What would make it possible for you to get to these places?

- When do you usually travel? Is it harder or easier to get to places during the week or on the weekend, or no difference? Does time of day or evening make a difference?

- If you or someone in your family has a disability does this affect your ability to get around?
  - What would make it easier or safer to travel?

**Safety/Comfort**

- Do you feel safe and comfortable when you travel? If not, why?
  - What would make you feel safer and more comfortable?

- Do you think the bus stops and other transit shelters are safe and comfortable?
  - What would make them better?
  - Is there a need to upgrade certain bus stop waiting areas from a sign to a bench or from a bench to a bus shelter? Which stops?

- Are the walking paths, sidewalks and bike trails safe and easy to travel on?
  - What would make them better?
  - Do you feel unsafe walking/biking on local streets? If so, which streets do you feel are unsafe?
  - Do you feel unsafe crossing certain intersections? If so, which intersections?

**Travel time/reliability**

- Can you accurately anticipate the length of time it will take you to get somewhere?
  - How often are you way off on your estimate?
  - Is there a typical reason it takes longer to get somewhere than you thought it would?
  - Are there locations in Milpitas that experience traffic congestion and should be addressed?

**Bike/Ped**

- Do you think there is a lack of bike facilities (bike lanes, paths, routes) in the city?
  - On what streets is there a great need for bike lanes?
Are there physical barriers (railroad tracks, creeks, freeways, fence, lack of sidewalk/path, etc.) that make it difficult to walk/bike from your house to your destination?
  - What would make it easier for you to travel when walking/biking?
  - Is there a need for pedestrian/bike crossings to help overcome these barriers? Where?

**Transit Accessibility**

- Is there a lack of transit service in your area? Where?
- Do you think there is a lack of east/west connection in the city?
  - On what streets or specific areas in town should there be east/west access?
- Do you find it difficult to travel by bus/light rail to retail shopping areas?
  - Transit service to which shopping area is more important to you: McCarthy Ranch or Lions Market?
  - Route 33 serving McCarthy Ranch has the lowest bus ridership of all bus routes in the city (below VTA standards). How would you feel if Route 33 was discontinued?
  - If discontinued, do you feel Route 33 should be re-routed to better serve other locations in Milpitas? What should Route 33 do instead?
- There are community centers (churches and temples) in North Milpitas currently not served by transit. What is the best service for this area?
- What are some ways we can improve connections to San Jose and Fremont BART?
  - What changes in bus routes do you feel would be helpful?
- What destinations do you travel to most require two or more bus transfers?
  - How can we reduce travel time and number of transfers to these locations?
- Late night/early morning service seems to be one of the main concerns in this community. Until what time should the buses run at night and beginning what time in the morning?
  - Which bus lines in particular requires extended service?
  - During weekdays or weekends?

**Cost**

- Does cost play a role in how you get around and where you can go?
  - Have you recently changed the way to get places due to cost?
  - What change have you made?
- High cost of transit is one of main concerns we heard.
  - What would help you get to your destination for less money?
Communication

- Do you think information about different ways to get around is accessible and easy to understand?
- Is there enough information in Spanish/Vietnamese/Chinese?
- Any suggestions on ways VTA could improve our information on transportation options?
- Are there any other groups/people in your community you would recommend we contact as part of this study?
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Full Summaries of Focus Group Meetings
On Wednesday, April 29 VTA hosted the first focus group meeting for the Milpitas CBTP. The meeting was held at the Milpitas Teen Center and approximately twelve local youth participated. Participants primarily rely on bus transit to get to most destinations within Milpitas. The majority of the comments addressed bus transit, specifically cost and reliability. The participants in particular suggested lowering fares for youth passes and increasing bus arrival reliability. In addition, participants requested bus route schedules should be posted at bus stops. Below is a summary of the comments heard. Comments are grouped by topic and are not a transcript.

**Bus Service and Routes**

- Depending on traffic the time to get from Milpitas High School to the Youth Center is approximately 10-15 minutes.
- The bus is the most common mode of transportation to get to the Great Mall, work, school and other destinations.
- Most trips taken on the bus are in close proximity.
- Multiple bus trips are taken within a day.
- There is not enough bus capacity in the afternoon when students are leaving school.
- The 47 and 46 buses that travel on Arizona Street (near 7 eleven) should take a left rather than be required to go straight to the bus stop, which causes a delay.
- Late night service needs to be expanded until 10 p.m., throughout the week to allow passengers to take the bus home after movies.
- Additional bus service is needed on the weekend to get to destinations such as McCarthy Ranch.
- The weekend/holiday schedules should be the same as the weekday schedule.
- Often deterred from taking the 180 to the Great Mall as it takes too long.
- Weekend transit use typically does not begin until 10:00/11:00 a.m.
- Would like there to be easy transit service to Newark and Union City for school and recreational events.
- Would like AC Transit and VTA passes to be interchangeable.
- An express bus that uses the freeway and eliminates the stops on Main and Abel would be helpful.
- Need for more bike capacity on the buses.
- Consider allowing food and drinks on the bus.
- Trash cans should be located near the seats.

**Bus Reliability**

- Overall, the bus travel time is fairly consistent, although can be delayed depending on traffic.
- Bus transfers seem to work pretty well.
- The arrival time of busses at bus stops is unreliable, particularly in the morning when arriving for school.
- Twenty minutes between buses is too long.
Cost
- Cost of bus fares for youth is too high
- The majority of youth buy monthly bus passes for travel to school and other social/recreational destinations
- A three-month bus pass for $70 would be a good idea as it is difficult to remember to buy a pass every month
- Consider family discount passes for families with multiple students

Bus Stop Locations and Amenities
- The walking distance to the Pines bus stop is too long for those living in the far side of the neighborhood
- Transparent walls in the bus stop shelters are needed for drivers to see passengers waiting to be picked up at bus stops
- The two bus stops on the 66 bus route northbound near St. Johns and the Auto center should be combined since they are so close together
- Most bus stops are located near enough to destinations
- The bus stop near the Youth Center needs to have a cross walk across Calaveras
- Some bus stops are overgrown by trees and impede bus driver’s ability to view passengers waiting to be picked up at the bus stop
- Montague bus stops are used infrequently on the 46 and 47
- Larger shelters are needed at bus stops
- Space for wheelchairs under bus shelters is needed
- Shelters are needed at stops on Calaveras and Park Victoria stops

Transit Information and Signage
- Bus schedules need to be listed on the bus stop to eliminate the need to call for information on the next arrival time
- The internet is often used to check the bus schedule before leaving for the destination
- Schedules are not posted at local schools
- Maps need to be more user friendly by differentiating directions by color and color coding the schedule
- Stop request sound is needed to the passengers know the request has successfully been made
- The bus marquee which announce time and next stop is helpful, but should also announce when the stop is requested
- Potential first time riders are often deterred from riding the bus as they are confused by which bus to use to get to a particular location

Bus Drivers
- Occasionally bus drivers will not wait when they see passengers approaching the bus stop
- While waiting at bus stops, bus drivers have passed by without stopping, particularly at night
- Lights at bus stops are needed so bus drivers can see passengers waiting to be picked up
• The Main and Cedar buses often confuse passengers (particularly those who speak another language) as they only look at the bus number
• Occasionally bus drivers will leave the bus to take a break

**Safety**
• Some bus stops are too dark at night and it feels unsafe. In particular, the Rancho bus stop by Yellowstone
• When the street lights turn off, the stops are too dark
On Wednesday, May 6, 2009, VTA hosted the second focus group meeting for the Milpitas CBTP. The meeting was held at the Milpitas Adult Education Center and approximately ten local adult ESL students participated. Participants rely on a variety modes of transportation, including car, bike, and bus, to travel to destinations within Milpitas. The majority of the comments addressed bus transit, specifically timeliness and routing. The participants in particular suggested direct routes to popular destinations and increased bus arrival reliability. In addition, participants requested bus route schedules should be posted in multiple languages. Below is a summary of the comments heard. Comments are grouped by topic and are not a transcript.

**Bus Service and Routes**

- Traveling to Ranch 99 requires transferring buses (Route 46 to Route 33 at the Great Mall) and takes about an hour. The inconvenience pushes passengers to choose other modes, like autos. The Route 33 would be taken more if the route was more direct and trips were faster.
- An added bus route to Borders would be nice, as children go there to read.
- A bus schedule that catered to student morning and afternoon commuting hours (7:30 AM and 4PM) would benefit many students and parents, particularly at Rancho Middle School on Yosemite. Especially because three schools and the library are all along Abel Street, increasing frequency or adding a direct line to Cedar Way (from the schools to residential areas) would help parents a lot. The timing, not the crowding, is most crucial.
- Mainly from Downtown to the Great Mall (Route 66), getting onto buses with a bike can be very difficult.
- A direct line from Park Victoria to Jacklin would be helpful.
- An extension of the bus route to the Park Victoria side of Jacklin Rd would help. A passenger commented on the inconvenient 25-minute walk and uses a bicycle instead.
- An extension of Route 66 on the weekend service would help many community temple members who currently have to walk ½ mile from the last transit stop. The bus service ends at 6PM, which is alright for the community temple members.

**Light Rail Service and Routes**

- The light rail has cost much money, yet the primary destinations are limited to CISCO Systems and Downtown San Jose. Light rail does not provide access to other popular destinations, such as shopping centers. Aside from its museums, Downtown San Jose does not have any attractions to parents and kids.
- Trains are now very crowded on weekdays and empty on weekends.
- Having light rail access to Mountain View would be helpful.
Bus Reliability
- Bus transfers are the main cause of inconvenience and significantly lengthen a trip’s time. Timely and reliable bus transfers would improve trip times.
- Passengers who commute to Milpitas from San Jose often miss transfer buses (Route 47) because they get stuck in traffic (on Route 70). A direct line would be the optimal solution.
- Taking the bus and other transit to San Francisco is too unreliable to take the risk. Unreliable transfers make the transit ride to Fremont BART too long, whereas driving to BART is much more convenient.
- Currently, many students with heavy backpacks are inconvenienced because: 1) Route 46 bus often gets stuck in traffic, causing students to miss the 66 bus; and 2) the bus leaves too soon after school ends. A trip that takes 15 minutes by car becomes an hour trip by bus.

Cost
- Traveling by bus can be more expensive than by car, especially since a bus transfer is often required during trips.
- The monthly pass is definitely the most cost-effective.

Bus Stop Locations and Amenities
- The walking distance is long from the residential areas to the main roads with bus stops.
- Bus stations, especially along Jacklin Rd. and Park Victoria, often have litter crowded around seats. Perhaps multilingual signs would alleviate the problem.
- No comment any underutilized bus stops, although a stop sign between two signals on Calaveras Blvd was commented to be unnecessary.

Transit Information and Signage
- Finding and understanding particular bus maps are difficult, especially to people who have just moved to the area or are unfamiliar with the area.
- Getting acclimated to the bus system helped improve passenger experience.
- Maps at schools, on buses, near bus stops, and at the library would be convenient.
- Carrying a copy of the map on-hand is very helpful.
- Passengers usually reference bus schedules before making a trip.

Bus Drivers
- Bus drivers are usually very kind.

Safety
- Sometimes the crosswalks on Jacklin and Yosemite Street don’t allow much time for pedestrians to cross. Pedestrians may be resistant to walk along Jacklin and Yosemite Street at night when cars can’t see them.
- Those with disabilities can’t cross the street quickly and rely on drivers to stop rather than stop lights.
- Fremont crosswalk on Mojave Drive is too dangerous to cross.
• Sidewalks (near Cedar Lawn Memorial Park and Golfland, as well as along Park Victoria, Milpitas Blvd., Jacklin Rd.) are dangerous. Some are not maintained to address obstructions like surfacing tree roots. The bike lanes are either too narrow or non-existent, causing bicyclists to use the sidewalk.
• Bus stops in Fremont, particularly at the 215/217 transfer near AutoMall/Fry’s Electronics, are too far away; passengers feel unsafe walking home at night.

Roads
• It is difficult to go to the Ocean Supermarket as cars cannot u-turn on Park Victoria and Calaveras.
On Thursday, May 7, VTA hosted an informal focus group meeting for the Milpitas CBTP. The meeting was held at Milpitas High School and approximately 14 students participated. Participants were student age from freshmen to senior classes, primarily non transit users. The majority of the comments addressed bus transit, specifically lack of information on how to use the transit system. The participants in particular suggested lowering fares, and providing more onboard information about stops. In addition, participants said buses were too crowded at bell times. Below is a summary of the comments heard. Comments are grouped by topic and are not a transcript.

**Transit**
- Sometimes one has to sit on the bus for 10 min before they leave. Once buses get full, should leave right away instead of sitting idle in front of school – causes congestion.
- Buses are too crowded
- California circle & San Andreas needs better transit access
- Buses: Have to pay, crowded during school and takes too long
- Prefer larger buses to community buses to have more personal space from other strangers
- Have bus go straight from Milpitas High to McCarthy Ranch
- Need a thru lane and drop-lane at the school to reduce congestion
- Buses look nice now. If buses were unattractive, wouldn’t ride

**Cost**
- If gas goes up they would consider taking transit more (most drive or get driven)

**Bike/Ped**
- Need a sidewalk on Serra Way
- On Jacklin there is a sidewalk on one side
- Crosswalk needed at Abbott & Calaveras (Walgreens)
- Need more sidewalks on Main St.
- Need a way to cross tracks at California Circle/San Andreas

**Main Destinations**
- Great Mall Shopping Center
- Home
- Library
On Tuesday, May 12, VTA hosted the third focus group meeting for the Milpitas CBTP. The meeting was held at the Milpitas Barbara Lee Senior Center and approximately 14 seniors participated. Participants were primarily Chinese speaking residents of Milpitas, with a few residents of San Jose, who rely on bus transit to get to most destinations within Milpitas. The majority of the comments addressed bus transit, specifically routes, cost and comfort. The participants in particular suggested lowering fares, providing a more direct route to City Hall, and providing more onboard information about stops. In addition, participants requested bus route schedules in Chinese and shelters at the bus stops. Below is a summary of the comments heard. Comments are grouped by topic and are not a transcript.

**Bus Service and Routes**
- Trash cans should be located near the seats
- No bus to City Hall from library (walk) - Walk across a windy overpass with cars, dangerous walk
- No direct route to San Jose downtown or Museum
- 51 to De Anza College – takes one hour from Cupertino, and there are no buses (51) on Sat/Sunday
- 71, it seems to be one hour between buses on weekends
- Extend 46/47 one block north to the Senior apartments
- Need east-west connection to City Hall
- 47 comes every 30 minutes; ideally want 15 minute headway
- 47 stops at 8PM and this is sometimes difficult
- 46/47 to Washington doesn’t go to Dixon & Lion’s Supermarket
- The 68 was canceled, so now I don’t have straight trip and have to transfer
- Would like direct bus line from Lions Market to Ocean Market/ Adult Senior Center
- Consider using smaller buses more often for better service

**Bus Reliability**
- Twenty minutes between buses is too long
- Sometimes bus doesn’t come when it’s expected
- Wait a long time at Dixon Road for the light rail
- Take bus to BART (runs ok, but want BART to San Jose)

**Cost**
- Cost of bus fares for seniors is too high
- Discount tickets are being sold at a discount at some housing facilities; how can we get this discount (appears to be EcoPass that is being offered to some residents, but not others)
• Where get tickets; why can’t others get the same discount

**Bus Stop Locations and Amenities**
• The walking distance to the Pines bus stop is too long for those living in the far side of the neighborhood
• 66, near Senior Center needs bench/shelter
• Many of the bus stops don’t have adequate shelters
• AC Transit – one line (217) was moved stop across street so now my stop is more difficult to reach
• There is no toilet or water fountain at the Great Mall transit stop. This is very hard for seniors (and others)
• 66 1st stop after Dixon (Milpitas/Hillside) needs a bench and shelter; it’s the one behind the Senior Lodge
• 70 @ Hostetter, need to walk 20 minutes catch bus stop back
• Need stations with bathrooms, water fountains, and shelters to protect from rain

**Transit Information and Signage**
• Bus schedules needs to be listed on the bus stop
• Potential first time riders are often deterred from riding the bus as they are confused by which bus to use to get to a particular location
• No names on bus stops, no announcement of stops (names, multilingual); need some way to announce each stop (sign in bus or announcement by driver)
• Need more route info in Chinese
• Need Info and Tickets in Chinese, around at stores and other locations

**Bus Drivers**
• While waiting at bus stops, bus drivers have passed by without stopping, particularly at night
• One driver is nasty; would like some kind of onboard comment card to share these thoughts

**Safety**
• Some buses drivers don’t pull up close enough to the curb (need to pull close to curb)
• No bus to City Hall from library (walk) - Walk through a windy overpass with cars, dangerous walk (also written under ‘Bus Services and Routes’)

*Summary of issues in the print-out:*
**Proposed Milpitas PRT “Ferry” at Yosemite/Curtis**
• “Fully one-half of Milpitas that lies south of Calaveras Blvd is bisected by railroad lines that force pedestrians and cyclists out of their way and onto the only available crossings – Calaveras and Montague Expressway.”
• Walking next to huge trucks whisking by at 40 mph or faster is scary.
• A steel-and-concrete POC is problematic due to required height of the crossing, physical constraints of the location, and cost.
APPENDIX H

Transit Performance Analysis
The following figure shows ridership in Milpitas by bus stop. Many stops get a high volume of riders.

Figure F-1:
Line 33: Great Mall – McCarthy Ranch
Serves McCarthy Ranch and Milpitas Square shopping areas.

Weekday
- Every 30 minutes
- 6:30 a.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Saturday
- Every 30 minutes
- 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Sunday
- Every 30 minutes
- 9 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.

The following figure shows weekday ridership for line 33 by trip.

Figure F-2: Line 33 - Weekday Riders By Trip
Line 46: Great Mall – North Milpitas via Yellowstone

Serves residential areas east of Hwy. 680, schools in North Milpitas

Weekday
- Every 30 minutes
- 5:30 a.m. to 8 p.m.

Saturday
- Every 60 minutes
- 8 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.

Sunday
- Every 60 minutes
- 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.

The following two figures show weekday ridership Northbound and Southbound for line 46.

Figure F-3: Line 46 - Northbound Weekday Riders By Trip
**Figure F-4:** Line 46 - Southbound Weekday Riders By Trip

Line 47: Great Mall – North Milpitas via Park Victoria

Serves Park Victoria, Calaveras Blvd., City Hall, and Schools in North Milpitas

Weekday
- Every 30 minutes
- 6 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Saturday
- Every 30 minutes
- 7 a.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Sunday
- Every 30 minutes
- 8 a.m. to 7 p.m.

The next two figures show weekday ridership Northbound and Southbound for line 47.
Figure F-5: Line 47 - Northbound Weekday Riders By Trip

Figure F-6: Line 47 - Southbound Weekday Riders By Trip
**Line 66: Kaiser San Jose – Milpitas/Dixon Road**

Serves schools in North Milpitas, downtown Milpitas, Great Mall, downtown San Jose and South San Jose.

**Weekday**
- Every 15 minutes
- 5 a.m. to 11:30 p.m.

**Saturday**
- Every 30 minutes
- 5:30 a.m. to 11:30 p.m.

**Sunday**
- Every 30 minutes
- 5:30 a.m. to 10:30 p.m.

The following two graphs show average ridership by time period, Northbound and Southbound, for line 66 in Milpitas.

**Figure F-7:** Line 66 - Northbound Weekday Riders per Trip by Time of Day
Figure F-8: Line 66 - Southbound Weekday Riders per Trip by Time of Day

The next graph shows the performance of weekday feeder routes, according to boardings per revenue hour.

Figure F-9: Weekday Feeder Performance
The weekend performance of feeder routes in Milpitas show a significant reduction in ridership on lines 46 and 47, while there is an increase in weekend ridership for line 33. Only on the weekend does line 33 meet or exceed VTA’s standard boardings per revenue hour. Milpitas’ transit performance is largely dependent on school age kids during the week which explains the dramatic reduction in ridership on the weekend for lines 46 and 47. The following two graphs show ridership performance for Saturday and Sunday for all feeder routes in Milpitas.

**Figure F-10:** Saturday Feeder Performance

**Figure F-11:** Sunday Feeder Performance
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors
THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns
FROM: Chief Engineering & Construction Officer, Mark S. Robinson
SUBJECT: Closed Circuit Television System - Guadalupe Light Rail Facility Contract Award

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Siemens Building Technology, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $643,894 to enhanced and expand the Closed Circuit Television system at the VTA Guadalupe Light Rail Facility. This contract will be 100% funded under the Department of Homeland Security Transit Security Grant Program (FY07-TSGP) and Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program.

BACKGROUND:

The Guadalupe Light Rail Facility is the base for VTA light rail operations and provides for vehicle maintenance and repair for the light rail fleet. VTA staff has identified the need for additional security measures to protect and monitor this critical facility by installing Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) equipment for site security.

Specifically, this contract will enhance and expand the existing video monitoring, recording and detection system within and around the Guadalupe Light Rail Facility. Cameras and equipment will be added to provide increased security for the parking lots, fences, entrances, parts storage and other important areas.
**DISCUSSION:**

The CCTV Guadalupe Light Rail Facility construction contract was advertised on June 5, 2009. Four bids were submitted on July 14, 2009 with the following results:

- Itech Inc. $ 499,700
- Siemens Building Tech, Inc. $ 643,894
- Henry Brothers Electronics, Inc. $ 727,054
- HSQ Technologies $ 865,160

Engineers Estimate $1,137,965

The lowest bidder, Itech Inc, was determined to be non-responsive because the contractor failed to acknowledge receipt of issued addenda and failed to list the sub-contractors who are proposed for work in excess of one-half percent of the bidder’s total. Therefore, Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid is approximately 43% under the Engineer’s Estimate. VTA staff has completed a bid analysis, has determined the bid to be fair and reasonable. The low bids are the result of the extremely competitive bidding environment in the current construction market. Staff recommends award to Siemens Building Technologies, Inc.

Construction is scheduled to begin in September 2009 with completion in January 2010.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize $643,894 for CCTV installation at Guadalupe Light Rail Facility. Appropriation for this project is included in the Adopted FY09 VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Capital Budget. The contract is funded with Federal Department of Homeland Security Transit Security Grant Program (FY07-TSGP) and FY08 Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

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

The state Office of Homeland Security requires compliance with all federal regulations, including a DBE participation goal. This contract was issued for advertising while VTA was administering a Race Neutral DBE participation program. In lieu of a specific percentage DBE goal being set, this contract is utilizing an anticipated Advisory DBE Participation Level program.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee considered this item at the August 20, 2009 meeting. The Committee inquired about the need for additional security measures at the Guadalupe Light Rail Facility. Staff responded that this project will focus on the perimeter security. Staff also noted that the Department of Homeland Security and the FTA have each identified light rail facilities as high risk areas in recent audits. This contract will address this identified risk.

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendation for this item and recommended that this item be placed on the Board of Directors’ Consent Agenda for the September 3rd meeting.

Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director
Memo No. 2108
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: Closed Circuit Television System - Light Rail Stations (Phase 4) Contract Award

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Siemens Building Technologies, Inc., the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $298,998 for the procurement and installation of Closed Circuit Television at Light Rail Stations (Phase 4). This contract is 100% funded under the Department of Homeland Security Transit Security Grant Program (FY07-TSGP) and Prop IB California Transit Security Grant Program.

BACKGROUND:

The current VTA light rail system includes Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) improvements at the Chynoweth, Santa Clara, Mountain View, Alum Rock, Great Mall and Hamilton light rail stations, the Eastridge Transit Center, and the San Jose Diridon light rail station and tunnel portals. Construction is underway to provide CCTV improvements at seven additional light rail stations along Tasman East and Guadalupe North Line, and on the Tasman East elevated light rail structure.

This contract will enhance and expand the CCTV video-on-demand program by adding CCTV at the Capitol, Blossom Hill, Snell, Cottle and Santa Teresa light rail stations along the Guadalupe South Line. The system will direct live video streams via a network from the light rail stations to the VTA Light Rail Operations Control Center (OCC) and the Protective Services Department. The CCTV video on demand system allows for 24/7 monitoring of stations as well as retrieval of data by date/time query.
DISCUSSION:

The CCTV at Light Rail Stations - Phase 4 construction contract was advertised on July 10, 2009. Bids were opened on August 10, 2009 with the following results:

- Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. $298,998
- Comtel System Technology, Inc. $321,107
- RFI $348,380
- Cupertino Electric $389,077
- HBE (Henry Bros. Electronics, Inc.) $403,862
- ITech Solution $456,860
- Engineer’s Estimate $821,657

Siemens Building Technologies, Inc. is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid is 64% under the Engineer's Estimate. VTA has completed a bid analysis and attributes the significant number of bidders and extremely aggressive pricing to the very competitive bidding environment that continues to exist in this region’s construction market. The contractor has a clear understanding of the work this contract entails. Staff recommends award to Siemens Building Technologies, Inc.

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

ALTERNATIVES:

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will allow for the installation of CCTV at five Guadalupe light rail stations. Appropriation for this project is included in the Adopted FY09 VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Capital Budget. The contract is funded with Federal Department of Homeland Security Transit Security Grant Program (FY07-TSGP) and FY08 Prop 1B California Transit Security Grant Program funds.

DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (DBE) PARTICIPATION:

The state Office of Homeland Security requires compliance with federal regulations, including a DBE participation goal. This contract was issued for advertising while VTA was administering a Race Neutral DBE participation program. In lieu of a specific percentage DBE goal being set, this contract is utilizing an anticipated Advisory DBE Participation Level program.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee considered this item at the August 20, 2009 meeting. The Committee inquired about VTA’s responsibility to provide a local match for the identified grant funds. Staff responded that since the Prop 1B funds serve as the match to the Homeland Security Grant contribution, a local match for this work is not required.

The Committee recognized the favorable bidding climate for this type of work and encouraged
staff to take advantage of this condition and maximize the amount of potential improvements. Staff reported that in order to utilize all of the available TSGP grant funds and the advantageous contracting environment, an additional construction package will be prepared with a scope large enough to utilize all of the potential grant funding. The goal with this additional contract is to complete the installation of CCTV for the Guadalupe light rail line. Staff plans to advertise this new contract by late 2009 and coordinate the additional work with the grant provider.

The Committee asked if unused grant money could be applied to other VTA projects. It was also asked if VTA could compete for unused security funds from other properties. Staff replied that the funds identified for VTA projects include certain security projects with specific delivery conditions. Regarding unused funding from other properties, the process for appropriation of grant funding within the region does not provide a real opportunity to compete for additional funding.

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee unanimously recommended the Board approve the staff recommendation for this item and recommended that this item be placed on the Board of Directors’ Consent Agenda for the September 3rd meeting.

Prepared by: Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director
Memo No. 2109
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Approval of an Addendum to the Labor Agreement Between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Division 265

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend that the Board of Directors formally adopt the addendum to the collective bargaining agreement negotiated between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Division 265.

BACKGROUND:

Due to substantial declines in revenue from sales tax and investment earnings, as well as the loss of State Transportation Assistance (STA) funding, staff presented to the Board a budget that included proposals to generate additional revenue and to reduce costs. At its regular meeting in June, the VTA Board of Directors unanimously adopted the recommended two year budget for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011.

The budget requires sacrifices from both riders and employees to bridge the funding gap in these difficult economic times, including increasing fares in October of 2009; utilizing Supplemental Federal Stimulus Funds for Preventive Maintenance in FY10; and advertising on light rail vehicles. Non-labor costs have been reduced significantly, such as travel, use of consultants, expenses related to telephone and communications, along with office expenses and data processing.

In addition to enhancing revenues and cutting non-labor costs, it has been necessary for employees, through their labor unions, to contribute to the cost savings effort. VTA staff has engaged with labor representatives from all four bargaining units, explaining that it would be...
necessary, in order to avoid or reduce layoffs and mitigate service reductions, for a reduction in payroll expenses and/or other labor expenses to achieve a balanced budget for FY10 and FY11.

Simultaneous negotiations of successor labor agreements with the Transportation Authority Architects and Engineers, IFPTE Local 21; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 101; and the Service Employee International Union, Local 521, began earlier this year. Each bargaining unit agreed to a labor cost savings approaches. The three Unions and non-represented employees have agreed to wage freezes and to participate in a Furlough Program that requires employees to take up to 12 days of unpaid leave per year.

**DISCUSSION:**

At the time a successor agreement was reached with the ATU in October of 2008, the depth and duration of the economic recession was not fully understood. The current agreement has an expiration date of February 11, 2011, and includes a 1.5% wage increase in June of 2009, a 1.5% increase in January of 2010, and a final increase of 1.5% in June of 2010. In light of increasingly declining revenues, in February of this year VTA initiated discussions with ATU and proposed to modify the current agreement to reduce ATU labor costs over the next two fiscal years.

The tentative agreement reached by VTA and ATU on August 17, 2009 was ratified by the ATU membership on August 27, 2009. During the course of negotiations the June 2009 increase took effect and therefore the tentative agreement calls for deferring the remaining two of the three wage increases. Deferring the wage increase for January 2010 and June 2010, and suspending the Attendance Incentive Program for two years, will result in a savings of $5,569,536. The savings, however, are insufficient to avoid a service modification, and as a consequence, ATU represented employees will be impacted by a layoff anticipated for January 2010.

The following is a summary of the proposed terms:

- Extend the term of the current collective bargaining agreement to February 10, 2013.

- Defer the 1.5% wage increase due in January 2010 and 1.5% increase due in June 2010 to June 2012.

- Should VTA receive operating revenues equal to the amount of $12.7 million in excess of the operations expenditure budget of $354.4 million for Fiscal Year 2010, VTA shall grant a 1.5% wage increase on the first pay period following the confirmation of the receipt of such funding. (This in effect creates a Fiscal Year 2010 revenue “trigger” of $367.1 million, which if met reinstates one of the two deferred wage increases.)

- Effective June 2012, employees shall pay 100% of any monthly premium amount in excess of the Kaiser family medical premium for active employees. Employees paying this amount are not subject to the $35 per month employee premium contribution.

- The incentive portion of the ATU Attendance Program (extra days off or cash) will be suspended effective January 1, 2010 through December 31, 2011. Resumption of the
program shall commence January 1, 2012.

- VTA agrees to reimburse ATU $5,000 toward the cost of the membership election related to this addendum.

- The use of on-board video cameras is for viewing incidents taking place on VTA vehicles or on VTA facilities. The data recorded on the video provides documented record of events, including accidents and/or incidents involving customers and employees. The video can be used to assist in the determination of alleged violations of rules, and/or personnel policies and procedures and/or relevant sections of the collective bargaining agreement by employees. For the purpose of establishing violations, management is limited to viewing the video 1 ½ hours before and 1 ½ hours after the time of the event.

- The labor savings resulting from this agreement will be applied to reduce the number of ATU employees otherwise required to be laid off and will not be used to hire administrative employees who otherwise would not be hired. However ATU recognizes VTA’s right to layoff additional employees beyond the number saved by this agreement if required by business needs.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

Failure to approve and adopt this addendum to the current labor agreement and thus not achieving the savings generated by the agreement may result in a more severe reduction in bus and rail service and a commensurate reduction in staffing. The Board may, as an alternative, direct staff to request the ATU to return to the negotiation table and continue negotiations. However, as the ATU is within a contract term, they may not be compelled to do so.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Deferring the wage increase from January 2010 and June 2010 to June 2012, and suspending the Attendance Incentive Program for two years, results in the cost savings estimated to be $5,569,536 million.

Prepared by: Robert L. Escobar  
Memo No. 2202
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Approval of an Addendum to the Labor Agreement Between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Division 265

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend the Board of Directors to formally adopt the addendum to the collective bargaining agreement negotiated between Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU), Division 265.

BACKGROUND:

Due to substantial declines in revenue from sales tax and investment earnings, as well as the loss of State Transportation Assistance (STA) funding, staff presented to the Board a budget that included proposals to generate additional revenue and to reduce costs. At its regular meeting in June, the VTA Board of Directors unanimously adopted the recommended two year budget for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011.

The budget requires sacrifices from both riders and employees to bridge the funding gap in these difficult economic times, including increasing fares in October of 2009; utilizing Supplemental Federal Stimulus Funds for Preventive Maintenance in FY10; and advertising on light rail vehicles. Non-labor costs have been reduced significantly, such as travel, use of consultants, expenses related to telephone and communications, along with office expenses and data processing.

In addition to enhancing revenues and cutting non-labor costs, it has been necessary for employees, through their labor unions, to contribute to the cost savings effort. VTA staff has engaged with labor representatives from all four bargaining units, explaining that it would be
necessary, in order to avoid or reduce layoffs and mitigate service reductions, for a reduction in payroll expenses and/or other labor expenses to achieve a balanced budget for FY10 and FY11.

Simultaneous negotiations of successor labor agreements with the Transportation Authority Architects and Engineers, IFPTE Local 21; the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 101; and the Service Employee International Union, Local 521, began earlier this year. Each bargaining unit agreed to a labor cost savings approaches. The three Unions and non-represented employees have agreed to wage freezes and to participate in a Furlough Program that requires employees to take up to 12 days of unpaid leave per year.

**DISCUSSION:**

At the time a successor agreement was reached with the ATU in October of 2008, the depth and duration of the economic recession was not fully understood. The current agreement has an expiration date of February 11, 2011, and includes a 1.5% wage increase in June of 2009, a 1.5% increase in January of 2010, and a final increase of 1.5% in June of 2010. In light of increasingly declining revenues, in February of this year, VTA initiated discussions with ATU and proposed to modify the current agreement to reduce ATU labor costs over the next two fiscal years.

Although a tentative agreement was reached on August 17, 2009, at the time this memorandum was issued a ratification vote by ATU membership had not yet occurred. The vote is scheduled to be held August 27. In the event of a successful ratification vote, an updated memorandum detailing the terms of the proposed amended contract will be distributed and the item considered for action at the September 3, 2009 Board meeting. In the event of a failed ratification vote, staff will brief the Board in Closed Session and discuss next steps, if any.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

NA

Prepared by: Robert L. Escobar
Memo No. 2202
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: Sales Tax Auditing & Recovery RFP

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

1) Authorize the General Manager to execute a five-year contract with MuniServices, LLC for the amount of $84,000 for quarterly sales tax reporting services plus fees contingent on additional sales tax revenue generated from transactions and use tax (sales tax) audit services; and,

2) Further authorize the General Manager to extend the contract for two additional one-year terms (for a maximum contract period of seven years) for the amount of $37,600 for quarterly sales tax reporting services plus fees contingent on additional sales tax revenue generated from transactions and use tax (sales tax) audit services; and,

3) Adopt a resolution for the State Board of Equalization that authorizes MuniServices LLC to examine sales and use tax records.

BACKGROUND:

Sales tax revenues are the largest revenue source that VTA receives on an annual basis, which support both operating and capital needs; therefore, it is imperative that we pursue opportunities to increase revenue whenever practicable and appropriate. Each year, VTA is at risk of not receiving 100% of the transactions and use tax revenue to which we are entitled due to taxpayer compliance and reporting errors. When businesses fail to report their transactions tax properly, it is distributed in error to other jurisdictions or not collected at all. The main reason errors occur is that many businesses are unsure of the definition of place of sale and the factors determining whether a transaction is subject to local sales and use tax versus transactions and use tax.
Although the State Board of Equalization (SBOE) has the responsibility of auditing taxpayer returns, they do not have sufficient staff to conduct ongoing comprehensive audits nor do they have any significant incentive to correct these types of misallocations or underreporting, leaving the primary responsibility for this effort to the jurisdictions.

MuniServices, LLC has been providing sales tax auditing (covering in excess of 200,000 seller’s permits on a quarterly basis) and reporting services to VTA since 2002. The amount of sales tax revenues that VTA has recovered as a result of their auditing services is $2.67 million through March 30, 2009. The contingent fees associated with these recoveries amount to $561,622, representing approximately a 375% return on investment. At the time that MuniServices was initially awarded their contract, they were the only known firm that offered auditing services for transaction and use tax receivers, such as VTA.

**DISCUSSION:**

VTA issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) on May 4, 2009. Responses for the Request for Proposals were received from:

- Accountants International
- HdL Companies
- MuniServices, LLC
- Robert Half International

All proposals received were considered and reviewed by a panel consisting of a Contracts Administrator, the Chief Financial Officer, a Fiscal Resources Manager, and a Sr. Financial Analyst. Each proposal was evaluated based on the following criteria:

- Qualification of the firm
- Staffing and project organization
- Demonstrated understanding of project requirements and potential problem areas
- Local firm preference
- Cost and price

The panel eliminated Accountants International and Robert Half International because, based on their written proposals, they did not meet minimum qualifications and did not demonstrate an understanding of the project requirements. The panel interviewed both MuniServices and HdL. Based on the results of the interviews, MuniServices ranked higher than HdL. MuniServices better demonstrated their understanding of the unique nuances of a district transaction based sales tax and had more experience related to auditing such tax receipts.

A few of the transportation agencies that use the services of MuniServices include Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority, Bay Area Rapid Transit District, Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, Orange County Transportation Authority, San Diego County Regional Transportation Commission and San Joaquin County Transportation Authority. Additionally, MuniServices also provides auditing services for ten cities within Santa Clara County. This provides MuniServices with an extensive inventory of all businesses within
the County, which contributes to the ability to find a greater number of errors and inconsistencies in taxpayer reporting.

Fees for work related to transaction and use tax auditing will be paid on a contingent basis at the rate of 20% (applying only to additional revenue received by VTA as a result of accounts identified and corrected by MuniServices). The contingent fee applies to all eligible prior quarters proceeding to and including the first quarter of correction for claims made resulting from the audits. If a correction is made that was a result of deficiency assessment audits, the contingent fee also applies to an additional six subsequent quarters. Deficiencies are most often from businesses not collecting and remitting the transaction and use tax to SBOE (versus errors in reporting or misallocation to other jurisdictions), particularly for internet related sales. The level of successful recoveries that will be accomplished by MuniServices is unknown, but based on historical recoveries staff anticipates the amount to be approximately $2.5 million over a five year time period, which would result in contingent fees of approximately $650,000. No contingent fees will be assessed on any successful recoveries received as a result of any errors found and reported to SBOE by VTA staff.

Fees for work related to comprehensive sales tax analysis reports, including extensive information related to sales tax collections by economic category (e.g. general retail, business to business, transportation, construction, etc.) and economic segment (e.g. department stores, office equipment, auto sales, building materials, etc.) are $84,000 for five years, and if extended, would be an amount not to exceed $37,650 for the two additional years. The cost of the first year of quarterly reports reflects a 28% reduction from current reporting fees.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could elect not to award this contract, however, this alternative is not recommended, as it would jeopardize the amount of sales tax revenue that may potentially be recovered and eliminate useful analysis related to the origins of VTA’s primary source of revenue used to support transit operating and capital programs.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

Director Casas asked how the estimate of $650,000 fee for auditing services was determined, requested confirmation that the 20% recovery fee was contingent on recovered revenues, if the 20% fee was standard, and if it applied to reporting fees. Ms. Koenig replied that the $650,000 was based on an estimated recovery of approximately $2.5 million over the next five years, based on historical experience and that the recovery fee was, in fact, only received if errors were found and corrected, and also stated the 20% was standard practice. Director Casas commented that the contingent fee provides a great deal of incentive to find errors, and followed up with an inquiry as to why this could not be accomplished in-house. Ms. Koenig explained that MuniServices has contracts with several of the cities within Santa Clara County as well as local agencies, such as BART. Because of these contracts MuniServices has access to a great deal of information on taxpayer accounts that VTA would not have access to. The ability to cross reference taxpayer accounts makes it easier to identify misallocations and increases the likelihood of finding misallocations. Ms. Koenig also clarified that VTA staff can locate some misallocations, and example which would be receipt of sales tax by a taxpayer on Measure A but
not the 1976 sales tax, and for these errors which are submitted and corrected by SBOE, MuniServices would not be paid a contingency fee.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action will authorize approximately $650,000 of contingent fees related to recovery of sales tax revenues over the next five years. Actual fees paid may be more or less depending on the identification of errors and successful recoveries from SBOE. This action also authorizes $84,000 for sales tax revenue analysis and reporting services over the next five years. Anticipated costs for the first two years of the contract are included in the adopted FY 2010 & FY 2011 VTA Transit Enterprise Operating & 2000 Measure A Budgets. Appropriation for subsequent years will be included in subsequent budgets.

Prepared by: Kimberly Koenig, Manager, Department of Finance
Memo No. 2011
Listing of Consultants
Sales Tax Auditing & Reporting Services

Firm

MuniServices, LLC
7335 North Palm Bluffs Avenue
Fresno, CA  93711
(559) 271-6800

Contact Information

Marc Herman
President
(559) 271-6830

Doug Jensen
Vice President, Client Services
(559) 271-6800

Jerry Peeler
Client Services Manager
(559) 287-7773

Janis Varney
Vice President, Cash Management
(800) 800-8181 ext 3011
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
AUTHORIZING EXAMINATION OF SALES AND USE TAX RECORDS

WHEREAS, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority ("Authority"), pursuant to its Ordinance No. TD-2, as amended by Ordinance No. TD-2.2, entered into a contract with the State Board of Equalization ("Board") to perform all functions incident to the administration and collection of local sales and use taxes; and

WHEREAS, the Authority, pursuant to its Ordinance No. 01.1, entered into an additional contract with the Board to perform all functions incident to the administration and collection of the 2000 Measure A local sales and use taxes; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority deems it desirable and necessary for authorized representatives to examine confidential sales and use tax records of the State Board of Equalization pertaining to sales and use taxes collected by the State Board of Equalization pursuant to those contracts; and

WHEREAS, Sections 7056 and 7056.5 of the California Revenue and Taxation Code set forth certain requirements and conditions for the disclosure of Board records, and establish criminal penalties for the unlawful disclosure of information contained in, or derived from, the sales and use tax records of the Board;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, as follows:

Section 1. The Chief Financial Officer, or other officer or employee of the Authority designated in writing by the General Manager to the Board, is hereby appointed to represent the Authority with authority to examine all of the sales and use tax records of the Board pertaining to sales and use taxes collected for the Authority by the Board pursuant to the contracts between the Authority and the Board. The information obtained by examination of Board records shall be used only for purposes related to the collection of Authority sales and use taxes by the Board pursuant to those contracts.

Section 2. The Chief Financial Officer, or other officer or employee of the Authority designated in writing by the General Manager to the Board, is hereby appointed to represent the Authority with the authority to examine those sales and use tax records of the Board, for purposes related to the following governmental functions of the Authority:

(a) Tracking
(b) Forecasting
(c) Detection of misallocations and deficiencies

Section 3. MuniServices Company is hereby designated to examine the sales and use tax records of the Board pertaining to transactions and use taxes collected for the Authority by the Board. The entity designated by this section meets all of the following conditions:
(a) has an existing contract with the Authority to examine those sales and use tax records;

(b) is required by that contract to disclose information contained in, or derived from, those sales and use tax records only to the officer or employee authorized under Section 1 or Section 2 of this resolution to examine the information.

(c) is prohibited by that contract from performing consulting services for a retailer during the term of that contract; and

(d) is prohibited by that contract from retaining the information contained in, or derived from those sales and use tax records, after that contract has expired.

Section 4. The information obtained by examination of Board records shall be used only for the purposes related to the collection of Authority sales and use taxes by the Board pursuant to the contracts between the Authority and the Board, and for the purposes designated in Section 2 hereof.

Section 5. This resolution supersedes all prior resolutions of the Board of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority adopted pursuant to subdivision (b) of Revenue and Taxation Code Section 7056.

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

AYES: Directors: __________________

NOES: Directors: __________________

ABSENT: Directors: __________________

Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

APPROVED AS TO FORM: ATTEST:

Kevin D. Allmand, General Counsel
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Implementing the Regional Transportation Plan: MTC’s Proposed Policies

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to submit comments on the MTC’s draft/proposed programs to distribute transportation funding under the recently adopted Regional Transportation Plan (T2035).

BACKGROUND:

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission adopted a new Regional Transportation Plan for the Bay Area on April 22, 2009. The plan, Transportation 2035 (T2035), outlines the general transportation policy and investment direction through the year 2035. The plan follows three main themes to establish transportation policy: Economy, Equity and Environment. Eight goals to carry out the plan emerge from the policy themes:

- Maintenance and Safety
- Reliability Efficient Freight Travel
- Security and Emergency Management
- Clean Air
- Climate Protection
- Equitable Access
- Livable Communities.

The next set of decisions facing the region and MTC is the development of the programs used to distribute transportation funding to meet the goals identified in the Plan. The programs identified in the plan include: Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI), Transit Capital & Road Rehabilitation, Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), Regional Bike program and the
Climate Change program.

The VTA Board of Directors previously approved policy positions on these programs as part of its 2009 Legislative Program. The purpose of this memorandum is to outline for the VTA Board MTC’s current proposals for implementing the programs over the next six years, related to funding levels and who will select projects for these programs.

**DISCUSSION:**

MTC is in the process of establishing the parameters of these programs designed to carry out the goals of the RTP. The funding for the programs derives mainly from the federal Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act - a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and to a lesser extent from State and regional funding sources. This memorandum focuses on the programs funded through the SAFETEA-LU and its upcoming six year re-authorization. The funding in question is only the discretionary sources - not the dedicated formula funds that flow directly to transit operators or local governments for transportation purposes such as gas tax subventions.

The core programs proposed by MTC include:

**Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI)**

*Program Objective/Description:* To improve the operations, safety and management of the Bay Area’s freeway system through the use of technology such as ramp meters, changeable message signs, traveler information systems and real time travel management technologies.

*RTP 25-year Funding Level:* $1.6 Billion

*6-Year Reauthorization Funding Level:* $222 Million

*MTC Proposed Program Structure:* MTC proposes to aggressively fund the deployment of technologies such as ramp metering, changeable message signs and real-time visual monitoring on the freeway to better manage vehicle flow, relieve congestion, and improve safety. This is a new core program in the RTP which emphasizes the relatively high cost-effectiveness of technology improvements on freeway performance.

*VTA Recommendation:* That MTC’s project prioritization process incorporate input from CMAs and that the proposed funding levels be determined based on the projects that can reasonably be delivered by Caltrans in the six-year time frame. Because of the questions of deliverability the amounts proposed by MTC may need to be adjusted downward.

**Transit Capital & Regional Streets and Road Rehabilitation (“Fix It First”)**

*Program Objective/Description:* Re-invest in the existing transportation system including transit, highways, local roads and pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

*RTP 25-year Funding Level:* Transit - $6.4 Billion, Roads - $7 Billion
**6-Year Reauthorization Funding Level**: Transit - $155 Million, Roads - $135 Million

**MTC Program Structure Proposal:**

- **Transit**: MTC will direct funding to transit vehicle replacements and rail rehabilitation projects based on each transit agency’s relative proportion of the 25-year regional transit capital replacement funding shortfall shown in the RTP. Specific projects will be nominated by the transit agencies.

- **Road**: MTC will divide funding between the counties based on the Regional Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Rehabilitation Formula that was developed by City and County representatives last year. The CMAs will be responsible for selecting the projects in each county, however MTC intends to require that the CMA’s use the LSR formula to determine the amount of funding provided to each individual city and/or county.

**MTC Funding Proposal**: MTC proposes to fund the first six years of transit capital replacement and roadway rehabilitation at a much lower level than their planned shares in the RTP.

**VTA Recommendation**: Adopt MTC’s programming structure as proposed. However, VTA staff strongly recommends that MTC increase Local Streets and Roads and Transit Capital funding levels to the planned percentages established in the RTP.

**Transportation For Livable Communities - (TLC)**

**Program Objective/Description**: To promote smart growth in the nine-county region, MTC established the TLC program in 1998 to provide incentives for cities and counties to support projects that strengthen the link between transportation and land use. Pedestrian- and transit-friendly developments are hallmarks of the program.

**RTP 25-Year Funding Level**: $2.2 Billion

**6-Year Reauthorization Funding Level**: $169 Million

**MTC Proposed Program Structure**: MTC proposes to move the program away from smaller scale streetscape, pedestrian and bicycles projects to one that emphasizes high impact large-scale projects that are related to land use developments. Projects would be required to be located within a planned or potential Priority Development Area (PDA). Types of uses could include density incentives such TOD funding, land banking/site assembly, and TDM incentives such as TOD parking, Translink, car share programs.

**MTC Program Funding Proposal**: Under the MTC proposal 2/3 of the funding would be programmed at the regional level by MTC which requires Santa Clara County projects to compete with the eight other counties for these funds. The remaining 1/3 of the funds would come to VTA to distribute through a competitive program available only to Santa Clara County agencies. VTA would use our existing CDT program to accomplish this program funding distribution.

**VTA Staff Recommendation**: As previously adopted in the 2009 Legislative Program, VTA staff
recommends that the programming structure be flipped to allow a minimum of 2/3 of the funds to be decided at the local level where VTA can work more closely with local agencies to develop and implement quality TOD projects. The nine counties in the Bay Area are at different stages in terms of pursuing TODs. Therefore, the program should be locally managed to meet the local needs of the community while implementing the objectives of the TLC program.

**Regional Bike Program**

*Program Objective/Description:* To promote walking and bicycling as viable, safe transportation choices for Bay Area residents.

*RTP 25-Year Funding Level:* $1 Billion

*6-Year Reauthorization Funding Level:* $42 Million

*MTC Proposed Program Structure:* MTC has not yet proposed changes. In the previous federal programming cycles MTC established two programming levels (regional and local) which required local agencies to prepare and submit two separate grant applications to compete for funding for bike projects. In addition, there is uncertainty regarding which local projects may be able to compete for regional funds since not all of VTA’s projects are in the Regional Bike Plan.

*VTA Staff Recommendation:* VTA staff recommends that the programming structure be simplified to have only programming for the bicycle program administered at the county level by CMAs. The benefit of this change will be that only one round of grant preparation is required of local agencies and decisions on local bike projects are made at the local level where knowledge of needs and priority of projects is best.

**Climate Initiatives**

*Program Objective/Description:* To combat global warming and help clean the Bay Area’s air. The program includes existing programs such as Safe Routes to Transit and Safe Routes to Schools and a new Climate Grants Program as yet to be determined.

*RTP 25-year funding level:* $400 Million

*6-Year Reauthorization funding level:* $68 Million

*MTC Program Structure Proposal:* No changes to current program elements have been proposed to date. The new Climate Grant Program has not yet been developed.

*MTC Program Funding Proposal:* The current MTC proposal would utilize a block grant process whereby a portion of the overall grant program funding would be apportioned to CMAs to determine project priority and programming. It is unclear at this date what percentage would be delegated down to CMAs and what percentage would stay at the regional level.

*VTA Staff Recommendation:* As previously adopted in the 2009 Legislative Program, VTA staff recommends that the programming structure be established to program 100% of the Safe Routes
to Transit and Safe Routes to Schools programs be delegated to CMAs within the block grant concept. As the Climate Grant program unfolds VTA staff recommends that at least a portion of the fund programming be delegated to the CMAs. VTA staff would also note that $68 Million is a significant amount of near-term funding to dedicate to an undefined program and recommends that the amount be reduced for the initial 6-year period.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board may adopt alternative recommendations.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC):
The TAC considered this item on August 13, 2009. The committee discussion focused on (1) regional efforts to increase funding for local streets and roads rehabilitation, (2) the ability of Caltrans and the rest of region to deliver the level of Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI) and Transportation Livable Communities (TLC) currently proposed by MTC as well as the actual effectiveness of those programs, and (3) gaining additional local control over, and flexibility with the implementation of regional programs.

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board adopt this item.

Policy Advisory Committee (PAC):
The PAC considered this item on August 13, 2009. The committee specifically discussed incorporating the "Fix It First", "Regional Policy/Local Implementation" and "Simplification" aspects of staffs proposal. The committee also discussed whether to recommend that MTC and Caltrans consider total travel time on both the freeways and the local street system before determining to install or activate ramp meters.

The Committee unanimously recommended the Board adopt this item with two minor amendments:
(1) Specify that 2/3's of TLC programming for the CMA's be the minimum desirable level and
(2) Recommend that the Board and other elected officials in Santa Clara County individually and collaboratively advocate VTA's policy positions to the MTC Commission.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

The Congestion Management Planning and Programming (CMPP) Committee considered and discussed this item at its' August 20, 2009 meeting. Committee members asked for and received from staff a general indication of other Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies' draft positions on MTC's proposals, particularly with regards to staff's "Fix-It-First" and "Regional Policy/Local Implementation" emphasis. One member inquired as to whether FPI had been implemented or tested elsewhere on a large scale, and also queried how Climate Change projects' impacts might be measured. Another member stated concerns that MTC's expanded TLC program eligibility might be duplicating existing real-estate market forces and suggested
refocusing that investment on "Fix-It-First".

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board adopt the staff recommendation for this item.

Prepared by: Marcella Rensi
Memo No. 2179
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief SVRT Program Officer, Carolyn M. Gonot

SUBJECT: Recommended Design Alternatives for SVRT

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the following project design features for inclusion in the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Recommended Project Description:

- Design Feature A: Dixon Landing Road Alignment
- Design Feature B: Curtis Avenue to Trade Zone Boulevard Alignment
- Design Feature C: Milpitas Station Transit Center
- Design Feature D: Berryessa Station
- Design Feature E: Berryessa Extension Yard
- Design Feature F: Tunnel Alignment near Coyote Creek

BACKGROUND:

The Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Extension Project (SVRT) requires funding from a variety of sources. In order to compete for federal funding on the construction of the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) system to Milpitas, San Jose and Santa Clara, the project sponsor is required to submit an Environmental Impact Statement. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was circulated March 13, 2009 and included a number of options for the BART alignment, systems facilities, and stations. Following the publication of the DEIS, additional design changes were identified and analyzed. These now need to be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The following staff recommendations are based on an analysis of key considerations for project elements such as system operations, construction, environmental, city/community acceptance, multi-modal access, right-of-way acquisition, cost and land-use.
DISCUSSION:

Following is a listing of the design changes recommended for submission with the FEIS. Attachment A provides detail on the specific features and the rationale for their selection. A presentation of the alignment, facility and design options will be made at the Board of Directors meeting.

Design Feature A: Dixon Landing Road Alignment
- BART Retained Cut Option - Staff Recommendation
- BART At Grade Option (full street closure)
- BART At Grade Option (partial street closure)

Design Feature B: Curtis Avenue to Trade Zone Boulevard Alignment
- Retained Cut Intermediate Option
- Retained Cut Long Option - Staff Recommendation

Design Feature C: Milpitas Station Transit Center
- East Bus Transit Center Option - Staff Recommendation
- West Bus Transit Center Option

Design Feature D: Berryessa Station
- Berryessa Station North Option - Staff Recommendation
- Berryessa Station South Option

Design Feature E: Berryessa Extension Yard
- No New Yard Option - Staff Recommendation
- Las Plumas Yard Option

Design Feature F: Tunnel Alignment near Coyote Creek
- Southern Offset Option
- Northern Offset Option - Staff Recommendation
- Santa Clara Street Option

FISCAL IMPACT:

Approval of these design options will further refine the cost estimates for the ultimate construction of this project. Appropriation for this design and environmental work is available in the FY10 Adopted 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. The SVRT Extension Project is funded by federal, state, and 2000 Measure A funds.

Prepared by: Kevin Kurimoto
Memo No. 2214
Dixon Landing Road Alignment
Design Feature A

Design Options

- **BART in Retained Cut Option** - The BART alignment would travel below grade in a retained cut under Dixon Landing Road. Dixon Landing Road would be supported above BART on a new roadway structure that would remain at grade. The total duration of the project would be approximately 30 months. Under this option, BART would be grade-separated from vehicular traffic. However, freight rail trains would continue to cross Dixon Landing Road at grade.

- **BART At Grade Option (full street closure)** - Dixon Landing Road would be reconstructed as a new roadway underpass with BART passing at grade over the roadway on a new bridge structure. An adjacent cross street to the west of the railroad ROW, Milmont Drive, would be lowered due to the slope of the underpass. Dixon Landing Road would be fully closed for 12 months, plus several weekend and night closures. The total duration of the project would be approximately 30 months. Under this option, both BART and freight rail trains would be grade-separated from vehicular traffic.

- **BART At Grade Option (partial street closure)** - The final configuration of this option is the same as the BART At Grade Option (full closure). However, under this option, Dixon Landing Road traffic would be restricted to one lane in each direction for 30 months. Total duration of the project would be approximately 48 months. Under this option, both BART and freight rail trains would be grade-separated from vehicular traffic.

**Staff Recommendation: BART in Retained Cut Option**

**Key Considerations**
The City of Milpitas has formally stated a preference for this design alternative. The project cannot absorb the current estimated additional cost of $15 to 20 million to implement the BART At Grade Option.

The following additional considerations were used to evaluate the options:

**Construction**

- This option has minimal impacts to local businesses during construction.
- The overall project duration time, including pre and post construction activities would be 30 months, with no full road closures except for night closures and two or three weekend closures.
Environmental

- This option has less construction impact on local traffic
- Both the BART in Retained Cut and BART At Grade options are discussed in the Federal FEIS. The BART At Grade Option was environmentally cleared under the State Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR).

City/Community Acceptance

- The City of Milpitas supports the BART in Retained Cut Option.
- The California Public Utilities Commission has formally submitted a letter to VTA as part of the DEIS process (letter enclosed).

Multi-modal Access

- Not applicable for this design option.

Right-of-Way Acquisition/Relocation

- Requires less right-of-way acquisition or easements for utility relocations and does not require re-grading of the Dixon Landing/Milmont intersection.

Cost

- The BART Retained Cut Option is estimated at $15 to 20 million less than the BART At Grade Option.
BART Retained Cut Option

BART At Grade Option
May 8, 2009

Tom Fitzwater
Federal Transit Administration
c/o VTA
3331 N 1st St, Building B
San Jose, CA 95112

Re: SCH# 2002022004 – Response to Notice of Completion of Project Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor

Dear Mr. Fitzwater:

The California Public Utilities Commission’s (Commission) Rail Crossing Engineering Section (RCES) offers the following comments on the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) Notice of Completion for the Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor (SVRT) project.

Commission Requirements and Policy

The Commission has jurisdiction over the safety of highway-rail crossings (crossings) in California. The Commission has exclusive power over the design, alteration, and closure of crossings, pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1201 et seq. Application to the Commission is required for construction of railroad across a public road (Commission Rule 3.9). The SVRT project is subject to a number of other rules and regulations involving the Commission. The design criteria of the proposed project will need to comply with Commission General Orders (GOs). The following GOs, among others, may be applicable:

GO 26-D (regulations governing clearances on railroads and street railroads with reference to side and overhead structures, parallel tracks, crossing of public roads, highways and streets)

GO 72-B (rules governing the construction and maintenance of crossings at grade of railroads with public streets, roads and highways)

GO 75-D (regulations governing standards for warning devices for at-grade highway-rail crossings)

GO 88-B (rules for altering public highway-rail crossings)

GO 143-B (safety rules and regulations light-rail transit)
GO 164-D (rules and regulations governing state safety oversight of rail fixed guideway system)

To review the General Orders, please visit our website at http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/transportation/crossings/crossingsgo.htm.

Specific Project Comments

1. Minimum clearances as required under GO 26-D must be maintained.

2. RCES supports grade separating the SVRT alignment from roadways, ensuring that no vehicles have access to the railroad tracks. RCES also supports grade separating the Union Pacific (UP) tracks adjacent to the SVRT alignment. The proposed project includes grade separations for the UP tracks at Warren Avenue and Kato Road. RCES believes that an additional grade separation should be added:

   There are two design options for the Dixon Landing Road at-grade highway-rail crossing in the City of Milpitas. The first option is to leave the UP tracks at-grade with Dixon Landing Road and lowering the SVRT alignment below the roadway. The second option is to lower Dixon Landing Road below both the UP and SVRT tracks. The CPUC highly recommends the second option of lowering the roadway below both the UP and SVRT tracks. There is currently a high level of vehicular and pedestrian traffic at this crossing, with the vehicles accessing Highway 880 and the pedestrians accessing a shopping plaza from the residential area east of the tracks. Constructing all of the railroad tracks at a separate elevation from the roadway eliminates all vehicular and pedestrian traffic over railroad tracks, resulting in improved safety.

3. Due to the potential safety impacts, leaving any of the railroad tracks that would be part of the proposed project, either SVRT’s or Union Pacific’s, at-grade with an at-grade highway-rail crossing upon completion of the project, would cause RCES to open an Order Instituting Investigation.

The Commission is a responsible agency under CEQA Section 15381 with regard to this project. As such, we greatly appreciate the opportunity to work with the FTA to improve public safety as it relates to crossings in the SVRT project. We request that RCES be kept informed of all developments associated with the SVRT project. Meetings should be arranged with the Commission’s RCES staff to discuss relevant safety issues and to conduct diagnostic reviews of any proposed and impacted crossing locations along the proposed alignment.

For questions regarding specific Commission oversight and crossings design, please contact me at (415) 703-3722 or by email at fko@cpuc.ca.gov.
Sincerely,

[Signature]

Felix Ko
Utilities Engineer
Public Utilities Commission
Consumer Protection and Safety Division
Rail Crossings Engineering Section
Curtis Avenue to Trade Zone Boulevard Alignment
Design Feature B

Design Options

- **Retained Cut Long Option** – The BART alignment would be in a long retained cut starting from south of Curtis Avenue, past the Great Mall, and ending south of Trade Zone Boulevard. BART would pass beneath a UPRR freight spur line, Montague Expressway, Capitol Avenue, and Trade Zone Boulevard, each of which would be supported above BART on new bridge and roadway structures. This configuration would allow for the reconstruction of an existing UPRR locomotive wye just north of its existing location. The locomotive wye allows freight trains to turn around and change direction. VTA is obligated by the Purchase and Sale Agreement with UPRR to maintain the current freight rail corridor’s operational functionality. Unless VTA can negotiate an alternative arrangement with UPRR, VTA is obligated to build the Retained Cut Long Option.

- **Retained Cut Intermediate Option** – The BART alignment would be similar to Retained Cut Long option, except that the retained cut would start approximately 700 feet later. BART would still pass under a UPRR freight spur line, Montague Expressway, Capitol Avenue, and Trade Zone Boulevard. This option shortens the length of the retained cut, but does not allow for the installation of a locomotive wye. This option does not preclude the locating of a wye or constructing similar trackway improvements to UPRR’s existing system in other locations that could allow UPRR to turn trains around. VTA is investigating these potential alternatives with UPRR. If an alternative can be identified that satisfies UPRR’s needs and is more cost effective for the project, it will be negotiated and recommended to the PAB at a later date.

**Staff Recommendation: Retained Cut Long Option** (but with continued negotiation with UPRR for more cost effective alternatives)

**Key Considerations**
VTA would prefer to construct the Retained Cut Intermediate Option. VTA under the current agreement with UPRR, is obligated to maintain freight rail facilities. VTA is currently working with UPRR to identify a solution that would not only satisfy the agreement, but would also meet the long-term objectives for the City of Milpitas and VTA.

The following additional considerations were used to evaluate the options:
Construction

- The Retained Cut Long Option requires approximately five months longer to construct. All other construction considerations remain neutral between the two options.

Environmental

- Environmental considerations are neutral between the two options. Impacts associated with the selected option will be mitigated.
- The Retained Cut Long Option was environmentally cleared under the State SEIR. Both options are discussed in the Federal FEIS.

City/Community Acceptance

- The City of Milpitas prefers the Retained Cut Intermediate option, since it would free up the land identified for the locomotive wye for future redevelopment. However, UPRR’s current operational functionality must be maintained per VTA’s agreement with UPRR. Therefore, the Retained Cut Long option must be chosen, unless an alternative arrangement can be negotiated with UPRR (VTA is currently exploring alternatives). Although the City of Milpitas has indicated a preference to relocate the wye, the city’s Transit Area Specific Plan assumes a reconstructed wye, just north of the current wye location.

Multi-modal Access

- The project configuration options presented here have no direct Multi-Modal Access implications.

Right-of-Way Acquisition/Relocation

- The Retained Cut Long Option would require additional ROW to construct the replacement locomotive wye, however the location designated in the current design is a vacant parcel and would require no relocations. However, this parcel has been approved for residential development by the City of Milpitas and all final impacts are contingent on the timing of development.

Cost

- The Retained Cut Long Option would cost approximately $20 million more to complete. The exact cost for the Retained Cut Intermediate option is unclear at this time since alternatives negotiations to relocate the wye have yet to be completed with UPRR. Any alternatives would have to result in a cost savings in order to be considered.
- The cost for the Retained Cut Long, including ROW cost, is already captured in the baseline project cost estimate.
Milpitas Station Transit Center  
Design Feature C

Design Options

- **East Bus Transit Center Option** – A bus transit center with kiss-and-ride facilities would be located on the east side of the station. A parking structure would also be located to the east of the station, north of the transit center and fronting Montague Expressway.

- **West Bus Transit Center Option** – A bus transit center with kiss-and-ride facilities would be located on the west side of the station and adjacent to surface parking and/or future transit facilities. As with the East Bus Transit Center Option, a parking structure would be located to the east of the station, fronting Montague Expressway.

**Staff Recommendation: East Bus Transit Center**

Key Considerations

Additional technical analysis developed more refined station options for the east and west transit center, at that time both options worked for bus operations and traffic circulation. However, due to the downturn in the development market, it is anticipated that the fees collected by the city from developers will not be adequate to build the remaining portion of the South Milpitas Blvd. extension. Further technical analysis has determined that parking demand and traffic associated with the project can be accommodated with a phased implementation of the South Milpitas Blvd. extension, while remaining consistent with the Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan. In addition, it has been determined that the east bus transit center option allows for significantly better bus and traffic site circulation while also providing for the best development opportunities.

The following additional considerations were used to evaluate the options:

**System Operations**

- Additional access planning has been conducted for all station campuses. VTA Bus Operations prefers this option for operational efficiencies.
- A longer distance is provided for buses to decelerate as they exit Montague Expressway and approach the transit center.

**Construction**

- Both options are neutral with respect to construction considerations.

**Environmental**

- Environmental considerations are neutral between the two options. Impacts associated with the selected option will be mitigated.
Both options are environmentally cleared under the State SEIR and both options are discussed in the Federal FEIS.

City/Community Acceptance

- The City of Milpitas prefers the West Bus Transit Center Option, based on their vision for the BART station area in the Milpitas Transit Area Specific Plan. However, for reasons stated above the West Bus Transit Center Option does not function efficiently for transit operations and vehicular access in the near-term as South Milpitas Blvd. is phased to completion between Montague Expwy. and Capitol Ave.

Multi-modal Access

- Transit center bus aisles are directed towards the station, providing a direct line of sight between the transit center and station entrance.
- Bus bays have been located curbside to the station to serve the highest demand routes, forecast to approach the station from the west on Montague Expressway, which improves BART to bus transfers.

Right-of-Way Acquisition/Relocation

- The Federal FEIS identifies the same footprint for both options.

Cost

- Both options neutral with respect to cost considerations.

Land-Use

- The East Bus Transit Center Option provides development opportunity for the corner parcel located at the intersection of Montague Expressway and Capitol Avenue.
Milpitas Station - East Bus Transit Center Option

Milpitas Station – West Bus Transit Center Option
Berryessa Station
Design Feature D

In response to comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and more detailed access planning analysis, some changes were incorporated into the Berryessa Station and surrounding campus to improve connectivity and consolidate transit facilities. There are now two Berryessa Station Options - North and South. Both of these options are within the previously identified station area footprint and have been presented to the public at recently held community meetings.

Design Options

- **Berryessa Station North Option** – The station and platform were shifted approximately 400 feet south along the rail alignment from the location shown in the DEIS; and the station campus was redesigned to better accommodate multimodal access. The station access road, Berryessa Station Way, was realigned to reduce impacts to the Flea Market, the transit center was redesigned for more efficient operations, and the parking garage was relocated to improve pedestrian access to the station.

- **Berryessa Station South Option** – Under this option, the station and platform were shifted approximately 1,300 feet to the southern end of the station area footprint, adjacent to Mabury Road. This option locates the station adjacent to the parking structure and relocates the transit center, creating a more compact station campus design.

**Staff Recommendation: Berryessa Station North Option**

**Key Considerations**

This option provides better access to both parking facilities, as well as future transit oriented development planned for the flea market property, while minimizing impacts to current flea market parking operations. VTA and the City of San Jose will continue to work together to refine the station campus.

The following additional considerations were used to evaluate the options:

**System Operations**

- All bus bays are located adjacent to the station platform, reducing bus/pedestrian conflict and resulting potential delays to buses.
- A bus-only lane provides a bypass for buses entering the station campus from Mabury Road.

**Construction**

- Both options are neutral with respect to construction considerations.
Environmental

- Environmental considerations are neutral between the two options. Impacts associated with the selected option will be mitigated.
- Any Flea Market vendor displacement and relocation activities would be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970.
- Neither option was environmentally cleared under the State SEIR. Both options are discussed in the Federal FEIS.

City/Community Acceptance

- VTA and the City of San Jose have conducted discussions regarding the relocation of the Berryessa Station within the station area footprint. Ongoing discussions regarding land-use and refinements to the station area will continue.

Multi-modal Access

- Berryessa Station Way, the station’s primary access road, solely serves station facilities, separating station traffic from adjacent uses.
- Provides a linear transit center adjacent to the station, improving passenger connectivity between bus and BART services, and reducing potential bus/pedestrian conflicts.
- Provides convenient access for future adjacent transit oriented development.

Right-of-Way Acquisition/Relocation

- Potentially reduces right-of-way acquisition costs if additional planned surface parking is not necessary to meet project needs, or if a shared parking scenario is considered.
- Reduces impacts to Flea Market operations and parking availability.
- A relocation plan will evaluate the potential impacts to Flea Market vendors. During implementation of the relocation plan best efforts will be made to minimize impacts to vendors.
- Most impacts to vendors will be due to construction and engineering needs to build the station area.

Cost

- Right-of-way acquisition costs are potentially reduced if additional planned surface parking is not necessary.
Berryessa Station North Option

Berryessa Station South Option
Berryessa Extension Yard  
Design Feature E

Design Options

- **No New Yard Option** – Under this option, maintenance and storage requirements of the BEP Alternative would be satisfied by expanding facilities at existing yards and shops within or in the vicinity of existing BART facilities. However, this option would include tail track, a high voltage sub-station, and a maintenance access point south of Mabury Road within the rail corridor or adjacent properties.

- **Las Plumas Yard Option** – Under this option, a 26-acre yard and shops facility would be located approximately 1,300 feet south of Mabury Road, extending to the Lower Sliver Creek, east of US 101. The facility would serve the maintenance and storage requirements of the BEP Alternative independent of existing yard and shops facilities within the core BART system.

**Staff Recommendation: No New Yard Option**

**Key Considerations**
This option provides greater operational efficiencies for BART, and reduces property acquisition and construction impacts in the Las Plumas area.

The following additional considerations were used to evaluate the options:

**Construction**

- Impacts within the community are eliminated as a result of this option.

**Environmental**

- The No New Yard Option would eliminate any noise concerns by the residential area located to the east of the Las Plumas Yard and across Lower Silver Creek. However, the projected noise levels do not exceed the FTA criteria. Additional environmental analysis including noise studies would be necessary to environmentally clear expansion of the Hayward Yard.

- Neither option was environmentally cleared under the State SEIR. Both options are discussed in the Federal FEIS.

**System Operations**

- The No New Yard Option offers greater operational efficiencies for facilities, equipment and personnel. Since the Hayward Yard is less than 10 miles from the beginning of the BEP Alternative, an expansion of this yard and shops facility could accommodate the BEP Alternative, and eliminate the need for an additional facility until the full SVRTP Alternative is built.

- The scale and size of the Las Plumas Yard Option does not functionally work well in the development of BART’s Strategic Maintenance Program.
City/Community Acceptance

• The City of San Jose does not support the interim Las Plumas yard and shops facility, as a new City fire station and County Household Hazardous Waste Receiving Facility have recently been built on the identified site.

Right-of-Way Acquisition/Relocation

• Impacts from property acquisition and business/residence relocation would be the result of the construction of a temporary facility that would be unnecessary once the Newhall Yard is in operation for the SVRT Alternative.

Cost

• BART staff and consultants are developing conceptual plans and cost estimates to increase Hayward Yard’s capacity to support the Berryessa Extension Project. BART and VTA will determine the cost sharing of the implementation.
No New Yard Option (Hayward Yard Improvements)

Las Plumas Yard Option
Tunnel Alignment near Coyote Creek  
Design Feature F

Design Options

- **Southern Offset Option** – Under this option, the tunnel alignment would begin to transition south from the East Santa Clara Street right-of-way near 22nd Street. The tunnel would pass Coyote Creek to the south and avoid the Coyote Creek/East Santa Clara Street bridge foundations. The alignment would transition back into the street right-of-way near 13th Street. The staff recommended site of the associated Tunnel Ventilation Structure, Auxiliary Power Substation, and Gap Breaker Station is located at the northwest corner of Santa Clara and 13th streets.

- **Northern Offset Option** - Under this option, the tunnel alignment would begin to transition north from the East Santa Clara Street right-of-way near 22nd Street. The tunnel would pass Coyote Creek to the north and avoid the Coyote Creek/East Santa Clara Street bridge foundations. The alignment would transition back into the street right-of-way near 13th Street. The staff recommended site of the associated Tunnel Ventilation Structure, Auxiliary Power Substation, and Gap Breaker Station is located at the northwest corner of Santa Clara and 13th streets.

- **Santa Clara Street Option** – Under this option, the tunnel alignment would remain under the East Santa Clara Street right-of-way. The tunnel would need to be deeper than the two offset options to pass directly under the Coyote Creek/East Santa Clara Street bridge foundations. The staff recommended site of the associated Tunnel Ventilation Structure, Auxiliary Power Substation, and Gap Breaker Station is located at the northwest corner of Santa Clara and 13th streets.

**Staff Recommendation: Northern Offset Option**

**Key Considerations**
This option reduces construction risks at the Coyote Creek Bridge, has been extensively vetted with the community, and requires fewer sub-surface easements than the Southern Offset Option.

The following additional considerations were used to evaluate the options:

**Construction**

- The Northern Offset Option reduces construction risks compared to the Santa Clara Street Option. Due to the Coyote Creek Bridge foundation, the tunnel construction would have to descend to a depth where soils are comprised of fine sandy materials, and create poor ground conditions not optimal for the Earth Balance Machine (EPBM) tunneling technology.
Environmental

- Environmental considerations are neutral between the two options. Impacts associated with the selected option will be mitigated.

- The Santa Clara Street Alignment was environmentally cleared under the State SEIR. All three options are discussed in the Federal FEIS.

City/Community Acceptance

- VTA conducted an extensive outreach program with the neighboring community on the issue of the Tunnel Alignment near Coyote Creek. This effort resulted in community support for the Northern Offset Option and ventilation structure location at Santa Clara and 13th streets.

- The San Jose City Council approved the Northern Offset Option on 12/11/2007.

Multi-modal Access

- Not applicable since all options concern tunnel construction and consideration of access to public transit facilities is not required.

Right-of-Way Acquisition/Relocation

- The Northern Offset Option requires fewer subsurface easements than the Southern Offset Option.

Cost

- The Northern Offset Option is more cost effective than the Santa Clara Street Option.
Tunnel Alignment near Coyote Creek
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:

The last month in Sacramento was dominated by persistent problems with the state budget. Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger and lawmakers initially adopted a spending plan for FY 2010 in February, but it quickly fell out of balance primarily because of plummeting tax revenues and the defeat of several budget-related measures on the May 19 special election ballot. The Governor and legislative leaders pitched various plans to bridge the ever-growing shortfall, but they remained at an impasse until the end of July, when they finally were able to come to an agreement on a package of more than 25 bills that they hope will erase the state’s FY 2010 deficit.

Against the backdrop of a severe economic recession that continues to choke off the state’s revenues, Gov. Schwarzenegger and the Legislature had to overcome deep misgivings about a wide spectrum of issues in order to get the budget deal done. The latest agreement capped a six-month period during which the Governor and lawmakers cut, in total, $60 billion in General Fund spending and wound up adopting a vastly slimmed-down $85 billion budget for FY 2010. Hundreds of thousands of people who rely on state government funding and services are likely to feel the effects. Roughly $16.1 billion of the newest budget “solutions” come by way of cuts, with education taking the biggest hit. The rest -- about $8 billion -- consists mostly of diversions of local government funding, borrowing, the selling-off of state assets, and accounting maneuvers.
The key elements of the package are as follows:

**Education:**
- Cuts $6.1 billion from K-12 schools and community colleges, some of which could be backfilled with federal economic stimulus money. At the same time, lawmakers committed the state to pay an extra $11.2 billion to schools when the economy rebounds as compensation for FY 2009 reductions and money owed for FY 2008.
- Authorizes school districts to reduce the number of instructional days by five per year through FY 2013.
- Cuts $2 billion from the University of California and California State University systems, again some of which may be offset with federal stimulus dollars.
- Increases enrollment fees at community colleges by $6 per unit.
- Increases student fees by 9.3 percent at the University of California system and 32 percent at California State University campuses.
- Rejects the Governor’s proposal to eliminate the Cal Grants Program.

**Health and Human Services:**
- Cuts $1.4 billion from Medi-Cal, the state’s health care program for low-income individuals and families. Of this amount, $1 billion is assumed to be covered by obtaining additional federal funds.
- Cuts $510 million from CalWORKs, the state’s welfare-to-work program. Also as part of the budget package, legislation was enacted to: (a) alter how long grant recipients could stay in the program; (b) tighten eligibility procedures; and (c) increase sanctions on those who fail to meet program requirements.
- Cuts $179 million from Healthy Families, a program that provides health insurance for 930,000 low-income children. Lawmakers are hoping that non-profit organizations, foundations and other groups will come forward and fill in some of the losses.
- Cuts $264 million from the In-Home Supportive Services Program for the elderly and disabled. In addition, the budget package makes various changes to the program to combat fraud, including requiring background checks for providers and fingerprinting for clients.
- Cuts $108 million from SSI/SSP grants for the elderly and disabled.
- Cuts $121 million from child welfare services and foster care programs.
- Cuts $164 million from mental health programs.
- Cuts $284 million from programs administered by the Department of Developmental Services.
- Requires the Departments of Health Care Services and Social Services to jointly develop a plan for centralizing eligibility determinations for Medi-Cal, CalWORKs and the Food Stamps Program at the state level. These functions currently are performed by counties.
- Eliminates the automatic cost-of-living adjustments for CalWORKs and SSI/SSP.

**Natural Resources and Environmental Protection:**
- Cuts $14 million from the Department of Parks and Recreation, which would result in the closure of roughly 100 state parks.
- Eliminates the Integrated Waste Management Board, which has been criticized by the
Governor and others as being a haven for termed-out legislators.

- Rejects the Governor’s proposal to generate $100 million in new revenues by allowing a limited expansion of oil drilling off the Santa Barbara Coast.
- Rejects the Governor’s proposal to impose a surcharge on property insurance policies to partially fund state emergency response activities.

**Corrections:**
- Includes $1.2 billion in “unallocated” cuts from the Department of Corrections. The specifics of these cuts will be worked out when lawmakers return to Sacramento in mid-August after their summer recess.

**General Government:**
- Achieves $1.3 billion in cost savings by retaining three unpaid furlough days per month through June 30, 2010, for state workers.
- Defers the June 2010 monthly paychecks for state employees by one day for a savings of close to $1 billion in FY 2010. In essence, this proposal shifts the cost to FY 2011.
- Rejects the Governor’s recommendation to cut state employee compensation by an additional 5 percent.
- Assumes $1 billion in revenues from the sale of part of the State Compensation Insurance Fund, a quasi-governmental agency that is California’s largest writer of workers’ compensation insurance.
- Authorizes the Department of General Services to sell all or a portion of the Orange County Fairgrounds, as well as to enter into sale/leaseback agreements for 11 other state-owned office buildings and properties.

**Local Governments:**
- Takes $2 billion in local government property tax revenues. Pursuant to Proposition 1A, these funds must be repaid to local governments with interest within three years. One of the budget trailer bills authorizes the creation of a joint powers authority to issue bonds backed by the state’s repayment obligation and to use the proceeds to replace the diverted property taxes.
- Takes $1.7 billion from local redevelopment agencies.
-Suspends the Williamson Act Program, which backfills property tax revenues that local governments forego when property owners agree to preserve land for agriculture or open space.
- Rejects a proposal to allow redevelopment agencies to extend their tax authority for 35-40 years if they agree to transfer 10 percent of their tax increment revenues to the state.

**Transportation:**
- Uses $562 million in unanticipated Public Transportation Account “spillover” revenues that are projected to accrue in FY 2010 to pay debt service on transportation bonds. These spillover dollars, which are over and above the February revenue forecast, have materialized because of higher gas prices.
- Redirects $225 million in Public Transportation Account revenues to the General Fund for transportation bond debt service. In the February budget, these funds were allocated to pay for home-to-school transportation in FY 2010.
• Rejects an earlier proposal to divert $1 billion in gas tax subventions for local streets/roads to the General Fund.
• Appropriates to cities and counties the remaining amount of bond funds authorized in Proposition 1B for local streets/roads.
• Delays the first and second quarter payments under Proposition 42 for local streets/roads to the third quarter (March 2010) of the fiscal year.
• Provides for a loan of $135 million from the State Highway Account to the General Fund to be repaid by June 30, 2013.
• Appropriates $134 million in Proposition 1A bond funds to the California High-Speed Rail Authority.
• Deletes prior language that would have required the High-Speed Rail Authority to study alignments other than the Caltrain Corridor for the San Jose-San Francisco segment of the state’s high-speed rail project.
• Suspends $4 million in local airport grants.

Revenues:
• Accelerates $1.7 billion in personal income tax revenues into FY 2010 by increasing withholdings from paychecks by 10 percent, effective October 2009.
• Accelerates $610 million in personal income and corporate tax revenues into FY 2010 by changing the amounts owed by taxpayers who make quarterly estimated payments.

Gov. Schwarzenegger and lawmakers came under immense pressure to get a budget deal done when the Controller’s Office began issuing IOUs on July 1 to pay contractors and others owed money from the state in order to prevent the General Fund from completely running out of cash. In addition, the state’s credit rating plunged, and the Treasurer’s Office warned that further delays in adopting a new budget for FY 2010 could exacerbate California’s economic difficulties by bringing state-funded infrastructure projects to a halt.

Prepared By: Kurt Evans, Government Affairs Manager
Memo No. 1850
# LEGISLATIVE HISTORY
## 2009 – 2010 State Legislative Session
### August 7, 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>
</table>
| **AB 112** (Beall)  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority: Local Streets/Roads Funding | 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. | 3/25/09      | Signed into Law: Chapter #81 | Sponsor      |
| **AB 116** (Beall)  
Contracts: Materials, Supplies and Equipment | 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). | 4/21/09      | Senate Floor                | Sponsor      |
| **AB 118** (Logue)  
Global Warming Solutions Act: Repeal | Repeals the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.                                                                                       | As Introduced| Assembly Natural Resources Committee |              |
| **AB 153** (Ma)  
California High-Speed Rail Authority | 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. | As Introduced| Senate Transportation and Housing Committee |              |
| **AB 231** (Huffman)  
Climate Protection Trust Fund | 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. | 6/26/09      | Senate Environmental Quality Committee |              |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 254 (Jeffries)</td>
<td>Emergency Vehicles: Payment of Tolls</td>
<td>6/26/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 266 (Carter)</td>
<td>Transportation Needs Assessment</td>
<td>4/20/09</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 277 (Ammiano)</td>
<td>Bay Area County Traffic and Transportation Funding Act</td>
<td>5/11/09</td>
<td>Vetoed by the Governor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 286 (Salas)</td>
<td>Vehicle Theft Crimes</td>
<td>6/23/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 289 (Galgiani)</td>
<td>CEQA Exemption: High-Speed Rail Grade Separations</td>
<td>4/14/09</td>
<td>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides an exemption from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for grade separation projects that are a component of the California high-speed rail system.</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 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>Senate Floor</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 or a commercial driver in the transportation 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>7/1/09</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><strong>AB 610</strong> (Caballero)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 619</strong> (Blumenfield)</td>
<td>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 cash flow 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 628</strong> (Block)</td>
<td>Pay-By-Plate Toll Collection</td>
<td>Authorizes a tolling authority to charge and collect tolls using digital images of license plates.</td>
<td>7/7/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 652</strong> (Skinner)</td>
<td>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>6/15/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor: Concurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 670</strong> (Berryhill)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 672</strong> (Bass)</td>
<td>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>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 726 (Nielsen)</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>AB 729 (Evans)</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>Senate Floor</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 732 (Jeffries)</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>AB 733 (Galgiani)</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>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 744 (Torrico) 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>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>AB 782 (Jeffries)</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>Senate Appropriations Committee</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>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 823</strong> (Hill) Smog Check: Vehicle Repair Assistance and Retirement Program</td>
<td>In the case when a motor vehicle fails a smog check inspection and is being retired from operation at a dismantler under contract with the Bureau of Automotive Repair, increases the amount of the payment that the Department of Consumer Affairs is required to make to the owner of the vehicle from $1,500 to $2,000. Authorizes the department to offer the vehicle owner a transit voucher in lieu of the $2,000 payment.</td>
<td>7/14/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **AB 878** (Caballero) Infrastructure Financing | Authorizes a local governmental agency to enter into an agreement with a private entity for financing for specified types of revenue-generating infrastructure projects. | 4/20/09 | Assembly Local Government Committee | 

| **AB 922** (Miller) Biodiesel Fuel Tax Exemption | Until June 30, 2014, exempts biomass-based diesel fuel produced in the state with California feedstock from the diesel fuel excise tax. | As Introduced | Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee | 

| **AB 949** (Logue) State-Local Partnership Program | Expands the definition of eligible local matching funds for purposes of the Proposition 1B State-Local Partnership Program to include: (a) developer fees; (b) mineral or resource extraction fees or taxes; and (c) local or regional fees or taxes solely dedicated to transportation improvements within a county or any part thereof by voter approval or by the county board of supervisors. | As Introduced | Assembly Transportation Committee | 

| **AB 1030** (Blumenfield) Caltrans: Renewable Energy Projects | 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. | 7/13/09 | Senate Energy, Utilities and Communications Committee | 

| **AB 1072** (Eng) Proposition 1B Transit Capital Program | 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. | 6/18/09 | Senate Appropriations Committee | Co-Sponsor |

<p>| <strong>AB 1091</strong> (Ruskin) Climate Change Adaptation Strategy | 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. | 5/6/09 | Assembly Appropriations Committee |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 1104</td>
<td>Off-Highway Motor Vehicles 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>
<tr>
<td>(Monning)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1135</td>
<td>Odometer Readings Requires California vehicle owners to report the current odometer reading of their vehicles at the time of vehicle registration.</td>
<td>4/13/09</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Skinner)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1158</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>6/25/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hayashi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1175</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>7/23/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Torlakson)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1186</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>6/24/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Blumenfield)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1192</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>4/20/09</td>
<td>Assembly Local Government Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Strickland)</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 1203</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Ma)&lt;br&gt;Proposition 1B: Transit Security Funding</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>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1321</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Eng)&lt;br&gt;Advance Infrastructure Mitigation Program</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>&lt;br&gt;(Evans)&lt;br&gt;State Bonds: Grant Agreements</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 programs by the Pooled Money Investment Board to address FY 2009 state budget cash-flow problems to do either of the following: (a) renegotiate the deadlines and timetables for deliverables within the grant agreement that many not be met because of the suspension in order to preserve the validity of the agreement; or (b) invalidate the grant agreement.</td>
<td>4/29/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1375</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Galgiani)&lt;br&gt;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><strong>AB 1404</strong>&lt;br&gt;(De Leon)&lt;br&gt;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>6/30/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1405</strong> (De Leon)</td>
<td>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 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 other air pollutants, diversification of clean energy sources, and improving energy efficiency; (b) minimize health impacts caused by climate change; (c) assist small businesses to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions; (d) reduce greenhouse gas emissions by the installation or replacement of equipment; (e) improvements to mass transit that reduce greenhouse gas emissions; (f) clean distributed electricity generation systems that reduce greenhouse gas emissions; (g) energy efficiency upgrades for schools, senior centers or low-income housing that reduce greenhouse gas emissions; or (h) emergency preparedness for extreme weather events caused by climate change. Requires CARB to adopt a methodology to identify the most impacted and disadvantaged communities by June 30, 2010.</td>
<td>7/23/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1431</strong> (Hill)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1464</strong> (Smyth)</td>
<td>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>Senate Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1500</strong> (Lieu)</td>
<td>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 Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AB 1502</strong> (Eng)</td>
<td>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>
</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 9 (Huffman)</td>
<td>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 Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 15 (Arambula)</td>
<td>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 Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 16 (Nestande)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR 14 (Niello)</td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## State Senate Bills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Senate Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 10</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Leno)&lt;br&gt;Local Vehicle Assessment</td>
<td>Authorizes counties and San Francisco to impose a voter-approved local vehicle assessment at a rate not to exceed 2 percent of the market value of each motor vehicle or trailer coach registered within their respective jurisdictions for general revenue purposes if: (a) the board of supervisors approves an ordinance to that effect by a two-thirds vote; and (b) the assessment is approved by a majority vote of the electorate. 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><strong>SB 31</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Pavley)&lt;br&gt;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><strong>SB 104</strong>&lt;br&gt;(Oropeza)&lt;br&gt;Global Warming Solutions Act: Definition of Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td>Subjects nitrogen trifluoride and any other gas designated as a greenhouse gas by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change to the regulatory framework established in the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. Requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt emission limits and reduction measures for a gas designated as a greenhouse gas by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change or by CARB within two years of the designation.</td>
<td>4/30/09</td>
<td>Assembly 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><strong>SB 124</strong></td>
<td>Codifies into state law administrative regulations adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) limiting the idling of school buses, transit buses and other commercial vehicles near schools. Specifically, requires the operators of school buses, school pupil activity buses, youth buses, and general public paratransit vehicles to turn off their engines when stopping at, or within 100 feet of, a school. Prohibits these operators from turning on the engine more than 30 seconds before beginning to depart from that location. Prohibits the engines of those vehicles from idling at a single location greater than 100 feet from a school for more than five consecutive minutes or for periods aggregating more than five minutes in any one hour. Requires the operators of all other transit buses and commercial motor vehicles to turn off their engines upon stopping at a school and not to turn the engine on more than 30 seconds before beginning to depart from the school. Prohibits these operators from causing or allowing a vehicle to idle at any location within 100 feet of, but not at, a school for more than five consecutive minutes or periods aggregating more than five minutes in any one hour. Requires motor carriers of school buses, school pupil activity buses, youth buses, general public paratransit vehicles, transit buses, and other commercial motor vehicles to ensure that their operators, upon initial employment and at least once per year thereafter, are informed of these requirements. Requires these motor carriers to review all complaints of non-compliance and to take remedial action as necessary. Requires motor carriers to keep records of these actions for at least three years and to make them available or accessible to enforcement personnel within three business days of request. Specifies certain exemptions from the bill’s idling restrictions.</td>
<td>4/30/09 Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 128</strong></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 Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **SB 205**  
(Hancock)  
Vehicle Registration Surcharges | 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. | 7/13/09 | Assembly Appropriations Committee | Support |
| **SB 295**  
(Dutton)  
Global Warming Solutions Act: Peer-Reviewed Study | 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. | 5/13/09 | Senate Environmental Quality Committee |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 391</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>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 406</td>
<td>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 and counties 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.</td>
<td>7/9/09</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 409</strong> (Ducheny) Department of Railroads</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>5/21/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 425</strong> (Simitian) 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>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 455</strong> (Lowenthal) 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>
<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 474</strong></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 project is under joint control of Caltrans and a local agency, requires both to concur with the finding before a contract may be awarded.</td>
<td>7/9/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 476</strong></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 485</strong></td>
<td>Enacts the State Highway Operation and Protection Program Emergency Funding Act. States the intent of the Legislature to provide adequate funding to meet the needs of the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) in FY 2010.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 518 (Lowenthal) Parking</td>
<td>Beginning January 1, 2011, prohibits state funds from being used, directly or indirectly, to subsidize the construction or operations of parking. Establishes a menu of parking policy reforms with a point score for each reform. By January 1, 2012, authorizes cities and counties within a region covered by a metropolitan planning organization (MPO) to adopt and implement measures from the menu that achieve a total score of at least 20 points. Includes reforms relating to the following as part of the menu: (a) eliminating or reducing minimum parking requirements and/or establishing maximum parking requirements in local zoning ordinances; (b) allowing greater development potential on existing parking lots; (c) requiring that parking costs be unbundled from rent costs in residential or commercial leases; (d) requiring that all new employment contracts charge the full cost of employer-provided parking; (e) requiring employers to offer public transit passes to employees on a pre-tax basis; (f) setting parking meter rates at market rate; (g) installing meters in areas with parking shortages; (h) establishing parking benefit districts to direct new revenues from meters or meter rate increases to the community from which they come; (i) allowing commuters to use surplus spaces in residential permit areas for a price; and (j) dedicating parking revenues to programs that reduce parking demand, including public transit, transportation demand management, and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to consider making a city or county that adopts and implements measures that exceed a total score of 20 points eligible to receive carbon reduction credits through its cap-and-trade program for those measures that exceed the 20-point threshold if the granting of those credits does not result in increasing the overall cap on emissions. Requires a city or county that adopts at least 50 points of reforms to receive a 5 percent scoring bonus for any state competitive loan or grant program related to housing, transportation or economic development, or that is funded by a general obligation bond approved by the voters on or after January 1, 2010. Allows any funding apportioned to cities or counties from the Highway Users Tax Account to be expended for implementing transportation demand management measures. Authorizes a local entity to dedicate any portion of the revenues collected from parking meter zones to parking benefit districts or programs that reduce parking demand, including public transit, transportation demand management, or bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements and promotion.</td>
<td>5/28/09</td>
<td>Senate Floor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 526 (Ashburn) Intercity Rail: Altamont Pass Extension</td>
<td>Requires Caltrans to enter into negotiations with the relevant operating freight and passenger commuter railroads for the purpose of developing a service plan and an operating agreement for the extension of at least one San Joaquin Corridor intercity passenger train using the Altamont Corridor to and from San Francisco.</td>
<td>4/2/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 527 (Kehoe) Bicycles</td>
<td>Prohibits a person from operating a bicycle on a highway if he or she is riding other than upon or astride a permanent and regular seat attached to the bicycle, unless the bicycle was designed by the manufacturer to be ridden without a seat.</td>
<td>5/6/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</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>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 535</strong> (Yee)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV Lanes: Low-Emission and Fuel-Efficient Vehicles</td>
<td>Unless pre-empted 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>7/6/09</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 555</strong> (Kehoe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>7/13/09</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 560</strong> (Ashburn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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><strong>SB 575</strong> (Steinberg)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>7/13/09</td>
<td>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 626</strong></td>
<td>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>Assembly Appropriations Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 632</strong></td>
<td>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>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, 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 transit 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 transit needs that are reasonable to meet.</td>
<td>7/14/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 721 (Steinberg) Climate Action Team</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>4/23/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 728 (Lowenthal) Parking Cash-Out Program</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>4/27/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Number/Author</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 783 (Asburn)</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail: Business Plan</td>
<td>7/2/09</td>
<td>Assembly Floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 3 (Wyland)</td>
<td>Proposition 42 Suspensions</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 5 (Hancock)</td>
<td>State Budget</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Rules Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to allow for General Fund appropriations in the state budget bill to be enacted by the Legislature with a majority vote.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA 10 (Ducheny)</td>
<td>Constitutional Amendments</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution regarding statewide initiative measures. Specifically, requires the Secretary of State’s Office to transmit a copy of an initiative measure certified for the ballot that would amend the constitution to both the Senate and Assembly no later than 176 days prior to the election at which the measure is to be considered by the electorate. Within 30 days, allows the Legislature to propose an amended form of the initiative measure by adopting a concurrent resolution. If the sponsors of the initiative measure accept the proposed amendments, requires the Legislature’s proposal to appear on the ballot in place of the certified initiative measure. If the amended form proposed by the Legislature is not accepted, requires information regarding the proposed amended form to be included in the ballot materials related to the initiative measure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (Ducheny)</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 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>6/23/09</td>
<td>Senate Appropriations Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2008 take effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Budget must be submitted by the Governor to the Legislature on or before this date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Last day to submit bill requests to the Legislative Counsel’s Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JULY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report bills introduced in the other house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summer Recess begins upon adjournment, provided that the budget bill has been enacted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>JANUARY 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>