BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, January 8, 2009

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

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

AGENDA

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. ADMINISTER OATHS OF OFFICE to newly appointed Board Members.

2. Roll Call

3. ADJOURN TO CLOSED SESSION

   A. Anticipated Litigation--Conference with Legal Counsel
      Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b)
      of Government Code Section 54956.9; (Three cases)

   B. Public Employee Performance Evaluation
      [Government Code Section 54957]
      Title: General Manager

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION

4. CLOSED SESSION REPORT

5. ORDERS OF THE DAY

6. AWARDS AND COMMENDATIONS

   A. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a Resolution of Commendation for Outgoing Board
      Member David Cortese.

   B. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a Resolution of Commendation for Assembly Member
      John Laird.

   C. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a Resolution of Commendation for Assembly Member
      Sally Lieber.

   D. Employees of the Month for December 2008 and January 2009.

7. REPORT FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER (Verbal Report)

8. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON (Verbal Report)

   Approve Appointments to Board Standing Committees for 2009.

9. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog
    Committee (CWC) Chairperson’s Report (Tebo)

CONSENT AGENDA

11. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting and Workshop Minutes of December 11, 2008.

12. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a Task Order Contract with Deloitte & Touche, LLP to provide Auditor General Services for a two year period in the amount of $350,000. Additionally authorize the General Manager to execute three additional one year contract options for $175,000 per year subject to approval by the Audit Committee.


14. ACTION ITEM - VTA Board of Directors acting as the Trustees of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust (Trust) review and receive the audited financial report for Fiscal Year 2008.

15. ACTION ITEM - Recommend that the Board of Directors ratify the nomination of Peter Skinner to the Citizens Advisory Committee representing the Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

16. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute contracts with seven (7) temporary employment agencies for three years, with two one-year options to extend, in an amount not to exceed $300,000 per year. The agencies are:

   • AppleOne Employment Services
   • CoreTechs, Inc.
   • CornerStone Staffing Solutions, Inc.
   • Global Infotech Corporation
   • Josephine’s Personnel Services, Inc.
   • Robert Half International, Inc.
   • Venturi Staffing Partners, Inc.

17. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to extend the contract with Hayden J. Lee Consultants, Inc. (HIL Consultants) to perform Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) certification services, contract monitoring, progress reports and compliance services associated with DBE/SBE participation on VTA contracts for an additional 12 months in an amount not to exceed $191,040, for a new total contract total of $940,040.

18. ACTION ITEM - Authorize the General Manager to execute a cooperative agreement with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) for contributions of: 1) up to $11.6 million of Measure A funds for Santa Clara Station and San Jose Diridon Station improvements; and 2) up to $600,000 of Measure A funds for Caltrain capital planning efforts.
19. **ACTION ITEM** - Approve the contribution of State Local Partnership Program of $8 million and its funding match from 2000 Measure A Program of $8 million for the BART Warm Springs Extension project.

20. **ACTION ITEM** - Reaffirm the Board’s commitment to the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor project (BART to Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara); and approve a funding plan (Exhibits C and D) for the federal New Starts Candidate project as an assurance for the BART Warm Springs Extension project.


22. **ACTION ITEM** - Adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to execute fund transfer agreements with the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for four fiscal years from 2009 to 2012 for the State Transportation Improvement Program Planning, Programming and Monitoring Program.

23. **ACTION ITEM** - Adopt the revised Bicycle Expenditure Plan Evaluation Criteria as described in Attachment D.


25. **ACTION ITEM** - Recommend that the Board of Directors direct staff to follow the multi-modal design approach on all future roadway improvement projects as feasible, including projects within the State right of way.

26. **ACTION ITEM** - Direct staff to conduct a Bike Sharing Pilot program as described in the recommendations outlined in the attached memorandum.

27. **ACTION ITEM** - Endorse the Santa Clara County Countywide Expressway Study.

28. **ACTION ITEM** - Authorize the General Manager to execute a Utility Relocation Agreement with Alameda County Transportation Authority and the City of Fremont for the purpose of relocating conflicting utilities for the Mission Warren Truck Rail Program. The utility relocation agreement will be for $24.3M, of which VTA’s share is not to exceed $7.8M.

29. **ACTION ITEM** - Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Gordon N. Ball, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $15,242,004 for the construction of the Berryessa Creek Crossing, Abel Street Seismic Retrofit, and UPRR Railroad Relocation.

30. **ACTION ITEM** - Adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to submit and execute grant applications and agreements, certifications, assurances, and other documents as necessary to receive $1,517,185 from the U. S. Department of Homeland Security's FY2007 Transit Security Program (Base).
31. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to submit and execute grant applications and agreements, certifications, assurances, and other documents as necessary to receive $949,079 from the U. S. Department of Homeland Security's FY2007 Transit Security Program (Supplemental).

32. ACTION ITEM - Augment the total value of contracts permitted under the previously approved Transportation Planning and Mass Transit Studies on-call list from $6,000,000 to $7,000,000.

33. ACTION ITEM - Approve the 2009 Board of Directors Meeting Schedule.

34. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive information on the Facilities Program - Inaugural Semi-Annual Progress Report.

35. INFORMATION ITEM - Review the annual RIDE Task Force Update.

36. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive information on January 2009 Transit Service Changes.

37. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive information on 2009 Annual Transit Service Plan.

38. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive the VTP Highway Program Semi-Annual Report.

REGULAR AGENDA

39. ACTION ITEM -

1. Adopt the Initial Project Report for Regional Measure 2 (RM2) funds for the Real-Time Information Project (attached as Exhibit A);

2. Adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to execute and submit an allocation request for the RM2 funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the Real-Time Information Project, (attached as Exhibit B) in the amount of $2,530,000; and

3. Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with ACS Inc., (Affiliated Computer Services) to build the Real-Time System in an amount not to exceed a total of $5,100,000.

41. ACTION ITEM - Approve the Valley Transportation Plan 2035 (VTP 2035) as Santa Clara County’s long-range countywide transportation plan.

OTHER ITEMS

42. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

43. MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE HISTORY MATRIX

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

45. 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)

46. 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

47. REPORTS FROM VTA POLICY ADVISORY BOARDS (PABs)
   A. Vasona Light Rail PAB (No Meeting Scheduled)
   B. Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor & BART Warm Springs Extension PAB
   C. Downtown East Valley PAB
   D. Highway PAB South (No Meeting Scheduled)
   E. I-680 Sunol SMART Carpool Lane Policy Advisory Committee
48. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

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

49. ANNOUNCEMENTS

50. ADJOURN
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: Resolution of Commendation for Assembly Member John Laird

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

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a Resolution of Commendation for Assembly Member John Laird.

BACKGROUND:

Because of term limits, Assembly Member Laird is leaving the California State Assembly this year after six years of service. As a member of Santa Clara County’s legislative delegation, Assembly Member Laird demonstrated a strong commitment to improving transportation in the region. His expertise and leadership will be greatly missed.

DISCUSSION:

It is fitting for the Board of Directors to honor Assembly Member Laird with a Resolution of Commendation for his years of outstanding service and many achievements as a member of the Assembly.

ALTERNATIVES:

Because of his efforts in transportation during his legislative career, we believe Assembly Member Laird is deserving of this honor.
FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact associated with this recommendation.

Prepared by: Kurt Evans
RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
GIVING SPECIAL TRIBUTE, DUE HONOR AND RECOGNITION TO
ASSEMBLY MEMBER JOHN LAIRD

WHEREAS, John Laird is leaving the California State Assembly after six years of distinguished public service; and

WHEREAS, John Laird was first elected to the Assembly in 2002, and most recently served as chairman of the Budget Committee; and as an influential member of the Labor and Employment, Judiciary, and Natural Resources Committees; and

WHEREAS, prior to being elected to the Assembly, John Laird served as a member of the Santa Cruz City Council and the Cabrillo College Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, while serving as the chairman of the Assembly Budget Committee, John Laird gained a reputation as being one of the Legislature’s foremost experts on state finances, was a key player during the state’s annual budget negotiations, was a strong proponent of investing in California’s future, and was a critic of both excessive state borrowing and the two-thirds voting requirement to enact an annual budget.

WHEREAS, while serving in the Assembly, John Laird authored and enacted a number of important bills relating to transportation on behalf of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, including legislation allowing VTA to utilize yield-to-buses signs on our vehicles to improve the efficiency of our transit service, and helping VTA and other local governments to convert their facilities to renewable energy; and

WHEREAS, throughout his career in the Assembly, John Laird successfully advocated for state funding for highway and transit capital improvement projects in Silicon Valley, even during difficult fiscal times, and was a strong supporter of public transit; and

WHEREAS, as a member of the Assembly, John Laird distinguished himself as an extraordinary leader on issues affecting transportation, health care, public education, civil rights, water conservation, renewable energy, and the environment.
THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority does hereby give special tribute, due honor and recognition to John Laird for his years of distinguished service to Santa Clara County as a member of the California State Assembly.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on this 8th day of January 2009 by the following vote:

AYES: DIRECTORS

NOES: DIRECTORS

ABSENT: DIRECTORS

Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Board of Directors

ATTEST:

Deborah Harrington, Secretary
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: Resolution of Commendation for Assembly Member Sally Lieber

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

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a Resolution of Commendation for Assembly Member Sally Lieber.

BACKGROUND:

Because of term limits, Assembly Member Lieber is leaving the California State Assembly this year after six years of service. As a member of Santa Clara County’s legislative delegation, Assembly Member Lieber demonstrated a strong commitment to improving transportation in the region. Her expertise and leadership will be greatly missed.

DISCUSSION:

It is fitting for the Board of Directors to honor Assembly Member Lieber with a Resolution of Commendation for her years of outstanding service and many achievements as a member of the Assembly.

ALTERNATIVES:

Because of her efforts in transportation during her legislative career, we believe Assembly Member Lieber is deserving of this honor.
**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this recommendation.

Prepared by: Kurt Evans
RESOLUTION OF COMMENDATION BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY
GIVING SPECIAL TRIBUTE, DUE HONOR AND RECOGNITION TO
ASSEMBLY MEMBER SALLY LIEBER

WHEREAS, Sally Lieber is leaving the California State Assembly after six years of
distinguished public service; and

WHEREAS, Sally Lieber was first elected to the Assembly in 2002, and most recently served as
Speaker pro Tempore; and as an influential member of the Health, Insurance, Judiciary, and Local
Government Committees; and

WHEREAS, prior to being elected to the Assembly, Sally Lieber served as a member of the
Mountain View City Council and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of
Directors; and

WHEREAS, while serving as Assembly Speaker pro Tempore, Sally Lieber played a key role in the
development and passage of legislation, and presided over Assembly floor sessions; and

WHEREAS, throughout her career in the Legislature, Sally Lieber supported numerous bills that
helped improve the transportation system in Silicon Valley and was a strong advocate for public
transit; and

WHEREAS, as a member of the Assembly, Sally Lieber distinguished herself as an extraordinary
leader on such issues as transportation, public education, health care, social justice, and the
environment.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority does
hereby give special tribute, due honor and recognition to Sally Lieber for her years of distinguished
service to Santa Clara County as a member of the California State Assembly.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors
on this 8th day of January 2009 by the following vote:
AYES: DIRECTORS

NOES: DIRECTORS

ABSENT: DIRECTORS

Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Board of Directors

ATTEST:

Deborah Harrington, Secretary
Board of Directors
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 December 2008 and January 2009 and Supervisor of the Quarter

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Employees of the Month for December 2008:

Phyllis Maggiore, Secretary in the Facilities Maintenance department at River Oaks, is the Administration Award Winner for December. Phyllis has been with VTA since 1999. She is known by her coworkers as a great team player who consistently steps up to help others whenever needed. Phyllis puts her excellent communication and organizational skills to use in supporting her manager and helping with maintenance scheduling. Phyllis’s supervisors consider her a valued member of the Facilities Maintenance team, noting that her exceptional professionalism and willingness to assist others help make VTA a better place to work. Congratulations to Phyllis Maggiore, Administration Employee of the Month for December!

Diana Hermone, North Division Coach Operator, is our December Operations Award Winner. Diana has been with VTA for over 12 years, and consistently exceeds the high performance standards of her job. She has received many positive customer comments for her cheerfulness and courtesy to all her customers. In addition to her Coach Operator duties, Diana serves as a member of VTA’s Critical Incident Support Team, providing on-scene intervention and stress debriefing to VTA employees who experience a critical incident while on duty. Recognized by her supervisors for her dedication to her work, Diana sets a great example for her fellow Coach Operators, and is very deserving of this award. Congratulations to Diana Hermone, Operations Employee of the Month for December!

Neil Baker, Facilities Worker at Chaboya Division, is our Maintenance Employee of the Month for December. Neil has been with VTA since 2001. In his current assignment as a Facilities Worker, Neil maintains the administrative offices, break rooms, maintenance shops, and landscaped areas in a clean and orderly manner to help ensure that VTA facilities are in excellent
condition. Neil takes pride in performing his duties, and is very supportive of his fellow employees. Recognized by his supervisors as an outstanding and self-motivated worker, Neil serves as an excellent role model to his coworkers while upholding VTA’s high standards of quality job performance. Congratulations to Neil Baker, Maintenance Employee of the Month for December!

Employees of the Month for January 2009 and Supervisor of the Quarter:

Sandra Thomas, Office Specialist II in the Employee Services department at River Oaks, is the Administration Award Winner for January. Sandy has been with VTA since 1997. She is known by her coworkers for going out of her way to help others. Sandy recently joined the Retirement Services unit at River Oaks after 8 successful years with the Chaboya Maintenance team. Sandy’s management notes that she is a hard worker, stepping up to challenging tasks and enthusiastically learning new skills as needed. Sandy’s exceptional courtesy and the high quality of her work set a great example for her fellow employees. Congratulations to Sandra Thomas, Administration Employee of the Month for January!

Oscar Edwards, Cerone Division Coach Operator, is January’s Operations Award Winner. Oscar has been with VTA for over 21 years, and consistently exceeds the high standards of his job. Oscar has received several customer compliments regarding his professional and courteous service, with one passenger remarking that Oscar “is particularly helpful to disabled passengers as they board and exit the bus.” Recognized by his supervisors for his dedication and professionalism, Oscar helps make VTA a better place to work. Oscar upholds VTA’s commitment to quality work performance, and is very deserving of this award. Congratulations to Oscar Edwards, Operations Employee of the Month for January!

Gil Hirsch, Facilities Worker at Guadalupe Division, is our Maintenance Employee of the Month for January. Gil has been with VTA since 1998. In his current assignment as a Facilities Worker, Gil performs cleaning and upkeep of the transit buildings, checks the general condition of facilities-related equipment to ensure operational readiness and reliability, and is responsible for assembling, installing, and moving office furniture, shelving, signs and other equipment. Noted by his supervisors as a highly respected employee with a can-do attitude and an exceptional attention to detail, Gil is a true role model to his fellow employees. Congratulations to Gil Hirsch, Maintenance Employee of the Month for January!

Bill Capps, Deputy Director, Operations, is our Supervisor of the Quarter for the first quarter of 2009. Bill has been with VTA for over 29 years. In his current position, Bill is responsible for directing the activities of Bus and Light Rail Transportation, the Operations Control Center, Field Supervision, and Bus and Light Rail Technical Training. Recognized as a key member of VTA’s leadership team, Bill is viewed by employees and his peers as a fair and knowledgeable supervisor who creates a positive work environment for others. His management notes that Bill works tirelessly to support Operations staff by practicing a balance-oriented leadership that entails coaching, developing and directing his staff to excel and meet the high expectations of VTA. He is clearly an asset to the Operations Division as well as to VTA as shown by his management ability and style. Congratulations to Bill Capps, Supervisor of the Quarter!

Prepared By: Mitsuno Baurmeister
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Board of Directors

THROUGH: N/A

FROM: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

SUBJECT: Contract Award for Auditor General Services

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a Task Order Contract with Deloitte & Touche, LLP to provide Auditor General Services for a two year period in the amount of $350,000. Additionally authorize the General Manager to execute three additional one year contract options for $175,000 per year subject to approval by the Audit Committee.

BACKGROUND:

On August 12th 2008 the Audit Committee reviewed and approved the Scope of Work and Proposers Minimum Qualifications for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Auditor General Request for Proposal (RFP). On September 4th 2008 the VTA Board of Directors, based on a recommendation from the Audit Committee, approved the Scope of Work and Proposers Minimum Qualifications for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Auditor General Request for Proposal (RFP).

DISCUSSION:

On September 5th 2008 VTA issued an RFP for Auditor General Services. VTA received and evaluated proposals from two qualified firms: Deloitte and Touche, LLP and KPMG, LLP. A Review Board was convened that included voting members with the requisite financial and audit experience from VTA, the City of Palo Alto, and BART. The voting members were, the Chief Financial Officers from VTA, BART and the City of Palo Alto and the Purchasing and Materials Manager from VTA. The Review Board read and evaluated the written proposals submitted by both firms. The written proposals demonstrated that both firms met the minimum qualifications outlined in the RFP document. The staffing proposed by both firms appeared to be experienced and professional. Both proposals outlined a clear understanding of the requirements
of the RFP and both are local firms. There was a clear difference in the proposed costs for the development of the Annual Audit Plan with Deloitte submitting the lower cost. The Review Board unanimously determined that based on the written proposals, both firms were minimally qualified to perform the required scope of work and should be invited for interviews.

The results of the oral interviews confirmed that both firms were very well qualified. Their presentations were extremely professional, well organized and indicated that they had a clear understanding of the scope of work contained in the RFP. In the case of the Deloitte & Touche team, Pat Hagan, the Audit Partner led the presentation and confirmed the conclusion drawn by the Review Board members that the firm meets and exceeds the required minimum qualifications for this assignment. The other team members present outlined their expertise and understanding of risk assessment in a number of important areas including transportation, Information Technology and SAP, Sarbanes-Oxley and Construction.

Although Mr. Hagan is headquartered in Chicago, the Review Board members felt he presented a level of national transit experience that would be of value to the Audit Committee. Additionally, the members of the auditing team work out of the San Jose Office. Although both firms were very well qualified it was felt that the Deloitte firm demonstrated a greater experience and understanding of transportation issues. Mr. Hagan also demonstrated that he and his team have a good understanding of the roles and responsibilities of an outsourced Auditor General. In addition to Mr. Hagan, the Deloitte and Touche local team includes an audit partner that has direct experience serving as an Auditor General to a large Silicon Valley technology manufacturer.

As part of their interview presentation, Deloitte included a very detailed listing of potential risks specific to Transportation in general and specifically to VTA. The Review Board viewed this listing and the responses to questions it generated as a strong positive indication the firm understood Transportation Risk Assessment.

Finally the cost proposed for the initial scope of developing the Annual Audit Plan was significantly less than that of KPMG. It should be noted that the hourly rates of both firms were essentially equal for all categories.

The Task Order Contract will be a two year term with three additional one-year options to be executed at the sole discretion of VTA. Compensation will be made on a firm fixed price basis for each task order. The Scope of Work for the first Task Order will include the following:

1. Develop and Recommend Goals and Objectives for the Internal Audit Program at VTA.
2. Develop and Recommend an Annual Internal Audit Plan.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Audit Committee could reject the staff recommendation and direct that the process be re-done. It should be noted that this option is only viable if there is a desire to revise the Auditor General scope of work and/or qualifications.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

Mr. Pat Hagan the Managing Partner from Deolitte & Touche was present at the December 11, 2008 Audit Committee meeting. Mr. Hagan introduced his team and indicated that they looked forward to serving as VTA's Auditor General.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action would result in approximately $350,000 of expenditures over the initial two-year period. Funds required for the work performed from January 2009 to June 2009 are available in the FY09 Adopted VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Budget approved by the Board on June 7, 2007. Appropriation for the remainder of the initial two-year task order will be included in the Recommended FY10 & FY11 Biennial Operating Budget.

Prepared by: Michael Burns, General Manager
# Listing of Consultants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Firm &amp; Location</th>
<th>Contact Name</th>
<th>Contractor Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte &amp; Touche Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>Pat Hagan</td>
<td>CPA – Auditor General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte &amp; Touche 225 West Santa Clara St. Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95113</td>
<td>Emily Kwan</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte &amp; Touche 225 West Santa Clara St. Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95113</td>
<td>Farah Faruqui</td>
<td>Project Co-Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte &amp; Touche 225 West Santa Clara St. Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95113</td>
<td>Greg Thomas</td>
<td>Project Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte &amp; Touche 225 West Santa Clara St. Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95113</td>
<td>Heather Honegger</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte &amp; Touche 225 West Santa Clara St. Suite 600 San Jose, CA 95113</td>
<td>Sandra Koenig</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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: Independent Auditor’s Report on the VTA’s Procurement Card Program
         Agreed-Upon Procedures for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Review and receive the Independent Auditor’s Report on the agreed-upon procedures performed on VTA’s Procurement Card for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008 (FY2008).

BACKGROUND:

At the August 21, 2008 meeting, the VTA Board of Director’s Audit Committee directed staff to request VTA’s Independent Audit Firm - Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP (VTD) to perform the agreed-upon procedures for the VTA’s Procurement Card Program. The purpose of the engagement is verify that the use of the procurement cards is in compliance with the fiscal controls over the Program as instituted by VTA and are operating effectively in accordance with the guidelines documented in VTA’s Procurement Card Manual (PCM). The scope included review of the PCM for completeness and existence of proper oversight controls; verification of cardholder maintenance file for completeness and compliance with PCM requirements; review of selected reimbursement packets for evidence of appropriate supporting documentation; and determination whether dispute resolution process as provided in the PCM has been followed and appropriately documented. VTD completed the performance of the agreed-upon procedures and issued its report on November 26, 2008.
DISCUSSION:

Compliance Review Results

VTD did not find exceptions on its application of the agreed-upon procedures as they relate to the VTA’s Procurement Card Program. The report states that VTA’s oversight controls included elements described in the PCM. The report also indicated that the auditor did not note any instances of non-compliance with file maintenance requirement and that based on the reimbursements selected, there were no instances of inappropriate documentation or non-compliance with the PCM. Furthermore, the report disclosed that there were no instances of disputes over the procurement card charges.

The Independent Auditor’s Report can be viewed online at <http://www.vta.org/inside/investor/index.html>. A hard copy may be requested by contacting Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Board Secretary’s Office, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95134-1927.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

The Audit Committee considered this item on December 11, 2008. Mr. Leonard Danna, Partner with the audit firm of Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co, LLP, gave a brief presentation. Member Casas commented that spot audits should be performed on an ongoing basis. Mr. Danna responded that it would be appropriate to have the Auditor General include them in their work plan. The Audit Committee unanimously accepted the FY2008 Report on the Agreed-Upon Procedures relating to VTA’s Purchase Card Program and recommended it to the Board of Directors for adoption at its January 8, 2009 meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

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

Reviewed and verified by: Grace Salandanan, Fiscal Resources Manager

Prepared by: Tony Sandhu, Financial Accounting Manager
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Joseph T. Smith


ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

VTA Board of Directors acting as the Trustees of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust (Trust) review and receive the audited financial report for Fiscal Year 2008.

BACKGROUND:

Pursuant to the provisions of the Trust, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Company, LLP (VTD), a Certified Public Accounting Firm, conducted an audit of the Trust finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008 (FY2008). The auditors are required by audit standards to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement as well as assess whether the accounting principles used and estimates made by management are reasonable.

The Trust was established by VTA Board of Directors in May 2008 to comply with the accounting pronouncement promulgated by the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) - the accounting standard making body for the state and local governments, and special districts such as VTA. The Trust Financial Statements report on the activities of retiree medical benefit program for Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority employees who meet certain age and service criteria and retire directly from VTA. The Trust is 100% funded by VTA’s contribution from payroll.
DISCUSSION:

Audit Results

VTD rendered a “clean” or unqualified opinion on the Trust Financial Report, a component unit report of VTA’s Consolidated Annual Financial Report (CAFR). The audit report states that it presents fairly, in all material respects, the activities of the Trust for the year ended June 30, 2008, in conformity the accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The Independent Auditor’s opinion addressed to the Board is on page 1 of the component unit report.

Financial Highlights

The Statement of Changes in Trust Net Assets (page 6) shows a total addition of $111.2 million to the Trust for the year ended June 30, 2008. It includes a one-time transfer of $101.7 million from Internal Service Funds to the Trust. Prior to the establishment of the Trust, VTA reported the activities of retiree medical benefit program as part of its Internal Service Funds. Total expenses of the Trust which mainly include the retiree medical premium payments were $6.8 million. As of June 30, 2008, total assets held by the Trust totaled $104.4 million. Report details are shown on pages 5 & 6 of the Trust component unit report.

These financial statements can be viewed online at <http://www.vta.org/inside/investor/index.html>. A hard copy may be requested by contacting Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Board Secretary’s Office, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95134-1927.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION
The Audit Committee considered this item on December 11, 2008. Mr. Leonard Danna, Partner with the audit firm of Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co, LLP, gave a brief presentation. The Audit Committee unanimously accepted the FY2008 audited Retirees’ OPEB Trust Report and recommended it to the Board of Directors for adoption at its January 8, 2009 meeting.

In his presentation, Mr. Danna reported that subsequent to June 30, 2008, the fair market value of the equity investments in the OPEB Trust had declined by approximately $6 million as of September 30, 2008.

FISCAL IMPACT:

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

Reviewed and verified by: Grace Salandanan, Fiscal Resources Manager

Prepared by: Tony Sandhu, Financial Accounting Manager
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Citizens Advisory Committee Appointment

Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend that the Board of Directors ratify the nomination of Peter Skinner to the Citizens Advisory Committee representing the Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

BACKGROUND:

The Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) is a 17-member committee representing the residents of the various city/county groupings of the VTA Board of Directors, specified community interests, and business and labor groups with an interest in transportation. The CAC advises the Board and VTA administration on issues impacting the communities and organizations they represent. It also serves in two other functions: (1) as the ballot-specified Citizens Watchdog Committee for the 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program; and (2) as the 2008 Measure D ballot-specified advisory body that reviews and comments on VTA’s comprehensive transit program as part of the countywide transportation plan.

The CAC bylaws require that a committee member must be a resident of Santa Clara County while on the committee and cannot hold elected public office. Committee members also cannot be VTA staff or employed by a city they represent. The membership term is continuous, with the member serving until resignation or replacement by their appointing organization or the VTA Board.

The process to fill CAC vacancies, as defined by the bylaws, is that member agencies and specified business and labor groups nominate representatives for their respective membership positions. For the six Community Interests positions, VTA’s Administration & Finance Committee appoints one member per position from nominations submitted by advocacy groups or received at-large. In all cases, the VTA Board must ratify the appointment.
DISCUSSION:

The VTA Administrative Code establishes the membership of the CAC. One of the five positions in the Business and Labor Groups section represents the Silicon Valley Leadership Group (SVLG).

Earlier this month, SVLG notified VTA that it has nominated Peter Skinner to replace its interim appointee, Bena Chang, as their representative on CAC. This position was previously held for eight years by Laura Stuchinsky, the former Director of Transportation and Land Use at SVLG. Ms Stuchinsky resigned from the CAC several months ago, when she left SVLG to begin employment with another organization. While SVLG was in the process of hiring a new staff member to replace Ms. Stuchinsky, it appointed Ms. Bena Chang to this CAC position during the interim.

Peter Skinner is the new Director of Transportation and Land Use at SVLG. Mr. Skinner has over a decade of public sector experience working on environmental programs including water conservation, solid waste/recycling and transportation. He has spent the last eight years with the City of Mountain View as their Senior Transportation Programs and Policy Analyst. At the end of his tenure with Mountain View, he served as its representative on VTA’s Technical Advisory Committee. Mr. Skinner is a resident of an unincorporated part of the county and has lived in California for 34 years. He received his Bachelor of Arts degree in Environmental Studies from San Jose State University. He is an avid hiker and occasional cyclist.

In light of Mr. Skinner's extensive knowledge of transportation and land use issues and his knowledge of and experience with VTA, staff recommends that the Board ratify the nomination of Mr. Skinner to this position.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Committee could choose to not ratify the nomination of this individual.

FISCAL IMPACT:

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

Prepared by: Stephen Flynn, Sr. Management Analyst
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Extra-Help RFP Contract Approval

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute contracts with seven (7) temporary employment agencies for three years, with two one-year options to extend, in an amount not to exceed $300,000 per year. The agencies are:

- AppleOne Employment Services
- CoreTechs, Inc.
- CornerStone Staffing Solutions, Inc.
- Global Infotech Corporation
- Josephine’s Personnel Services, Inc.
- Robert Half International, Inc.
- Venturi Staffing Partners, Inc.

BACKGROUND:

VTA on occasion requires temporary staffing services for special projects, extraordinary workloads, or extended absences. The Extra Help Program utilizes appropriate temporary employment firms for these services. The Human Resources Department is responsible for administering the program to ensure compliance with collective bargaining agreements and to monitor the effective use of extra help.

On September 12, 2000, VTA contracted with five employment agencies in an amount not to exceed $500,000 per year. The contracts expired on September 12, 2005. Due to budget considerations at that time, VTA determined that it would no longer use external temporary help and the contracts were allowed to lapse. However, there has been a continuing need for periodic
external temporary help. VTA has been utilizing individually negotiated contracts to fill these needs.

Typically, Extra Help contracts have been used for clerical and accounting services. Other temporary services have included Vaultroom Workers, Mail Messengers, and Graphic Designers. In 2007, VTA’s Extra-Help contracts totaled $253,812. In 2008, the Extra-Help contracts totaled $284,472. The most costly contracts included accounting personnel who assisted VTA in accelerating the TCRP billing.

Because it is clear that there will be a continuing need for extra help, and individually negotiated contracts are not the most cost-effective method to fill these needs, a request for proposals for temporary help firms was conducted.

DISCUSSION:

An RFP for the use of temporary firms was issued on September 18, 2008. VTA received proposals from eight (8) firms. The proposals were evaluated by a panel consisting of a Sr. Accountant, a Sr. Human Resources Analyst, and a Contracts Administrator utilizing the following factors and criteria:

- Qualifications of the firm (25 points).
- Staffing and Project Organization (25 points)
- Demonstrated understanding of the project requirements (10 points).
- Cost and price (30 points).
- Local firm preference (10 points).

Seven firms were determined to have the ability to meet VTA’s needs and are recommended for approval:

- AppleOne Employment Services- 95 points
- CoreTechs, Inc.-92 points
- CornerStone Staffing Solutions, Inc.-84 points
- Global Infotech Corporation-89 points
- Josephine’s Personnel Services, Inc.-81 points
- Robert Half International, Inc.-90 points
- Venturi Staffing Partners, Inc.- 89 points

West Valley was not selected due to VTA’s previous experience with this firm.

ALTERNATIVES:

The alternative to contracting with these firms would be to continue using individually negotiated contracts. However, this approach is unnecessarily time consuming and provides VTA with less leverage in negotiating rates. Conducting business through the use of the RFP process is the most efficient, competitive, and fair method of awarding contracts to VTA's vendors.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item at the December 18, 2008 meeting attended by Director Williams, Director Reed, Director Gage, and Alternate Director Moylan.

Director Moylan asked whether the seven proposed firms offered the same types of temporary employment services. Chief Administrative Officer Lopez responded that each firm offered a unique variety of services, ranging from clerical to professional accountants, at different pricing levels. However, there is some overlap in the type of services offered; for example almost all of the firms offer clerical services. Director Moylan followed up with a question regarding how firms were selected. Lopez responded that when the VTA identifies a temporary staffing need, Human Resources will review the qualifications and pricing of each firm and select the best firm for the work.

The committee unanimously approved the staff recommendation.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action would authorize up to $300,000 per year for temporary staffing services for the next three years with two one-year optional extensions. Budget appropriation is typically transferred from identified labor savings from vacancies or long-term absences that generate the need for temporary staffing. No additional budget appropriation is required to cover these expenditures.

SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:

VTA has not established a specific goal for this project due to the size of the project or unknown availability of sub-contracting opportunities. It is noteworthy that two of the selected firms that are recommended (Josephine’s Personnel Services, Inc. and Global Infotech Corporation) are SBE certified firms.

Prepared by: Belle Pannu
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTRACTOR FIRM</th>
<th>CONTACT NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Techs, Inc</td>
<td>Chandra Vines</td>
<td>Sr. Acct. Manager</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Half International</td>
<td>Shane Oberg</td>
<td>Branch Manager</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornerstone Staffing</td>
<td>Laura McCauley</td>
<td>Account Executive</td>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td>Josephine Hughes</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josephine’s Personnel</td>
<td>Josephine Hughes</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Kenneth Landau</td>
<td>Director of Government</td>
<td>Torrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple One Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venturi Staffing</td>
<td>Carole DiFilippi</td>
<td>Branch Manager</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Joseph T. Smith


Policy-Related Action: Yes  Government Code Section 84308 Applies: Yes

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to extend the contract with Hayden J. Lee Consultants, Inc. (HJL Consultants) to perform Small Business Enterprise (SBE) and Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) certification services, contract monitoring, progress reports and compliance services associated with DBE/SBE participation on VTA contracts for an additional 12 months in an amount not to exceed $191,040, for a new total contract total of $940,040.

BACKGROUND:

VTA is a recipient of U.S. Department of Transportation funds that are administered through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). As a requirement in receiving federal assistance, VTA is required to administer a DBE program to ensure the participation of disadvantaged businesses on federally funded contracts. VTA has also adopted a Small Business Enterprise program for its non-federally assisted contracting opportunities in response to California Proposition 209.

VTA entered into contract with HJL Consultants in October of 2002 to perform DBE and SBE services that include certifications and compliance services, the tracking of DBE/SBE participation on VTA contracts and investigate problems associated with program compliance. This initial contract award was the result of a formal RFP process and was for an initial period of three years and was in the amount of $397,000.

Subsequently, the Board approved a three year contract extension, increasing the cumulative contract value to $749,000.


**DISCUSSION:**

VTA has adopted a practice of limiting services contracts to a maximum of seven years if it is determined that the services rendered are of high quality and the price is determined to be fair and reasonable. In this case HJL Consultants perform at a very high level in all work areas. The rates range from $85.00 to $55.00 per hour and are among the lowest for professional services that we currently pay. We have determined that these rates are fair and reasonable. Additionally, these rates are capped by the local Consumer Price Index for the San Francisco Bay area. For these reasons the request for this twelve month contract extension is within acceptable and prudent business practice.

The recently completed Disparity Study revealed a need for increased data retention which is reflected in this request. Based on those needs and the ongoing need for DBE and SBE certifications it is anticipated that HJL Consultants will devote 2,496 hours to these ongoing tasks during this time period. Additionally we anticipate an additional 192 hours will be needed as temporary replacement of the retiring Manager of the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business. Mr. Andy Flores will be retiring after a long career here at VTA on December 12, 2008. Mr. Hayden Lee of HJL consultants will need to spend additional time on site performing some of the duties of Mr. Flores after his retirement.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could reject this recommendation and direct staff to immediately issue a new RFP for these services. This is not recommended however, because a formal procurement process would be time consuming and made more difficult without the incumbent manager. It is our intention to perform a formal solicitation for these services at the end of this one year extension.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action would result in approximately $191,040 of expenditures over the extension period. Funds required for the work performed from the effective date of the extension though June 2009 are available in the FY09 Adopted VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Budget approved by the Board on June 7, 2007. Appropriation for the remainder of the extension period will be included in the Recommended FY10 & FY11 Biennial Operating Budget.

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

Based on the limited scope of work and no subcontracting opportunities, no specific goal has been established for this contract. Contractor is encouraged to make reasonable efforts to utilize SBEs in its procurement of ancillary services and products associated with the performance of this contract. Although there is no SBE goal requirement, contractor is a certified DBE that can participate and be counted as a Small Business Enterprise.
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item as part of its December 18, 2008 Regular Agenda and approved it unanimously without comment.

Prepared by: Thomas B. Smith, Contracts and Materials Manager
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor Firm</th>
<th>Contractor Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayden J. Lee Consultants, Inc.</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Hayden J. Lee</td>
<td>4037 Judah Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: VTA Contribution to Caltrain Capital Projects & Approval of a Cooperative Agreement with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a cooperative agreement with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) for contributions of: 1) up to $11.6 million of Measure A funds for Santa Clara Station and San Jose Diridon Station improvements; and 2) up to $600,000 of Measure A funds for Caltrain capital planning efforts.

BACKGROUND:

VTA has received a request from staff of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board to provide Santa Clara County’s share contribution to several capital projects under development. VTA contributes capital funds to Caltrain in three different ways:

1. Funds contributed through the annual VTA Capital Budget to Caltrain. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 the contribution is scheduled to be $2.8 million.

2. Funds contributed from Measure A for Caltrain projects directly managed and implemented by VTA. These include all projects south of Tamien Station and grade crossing safety improvements in Santa Clara County.

3. Measure A funds contributed to the Caltrain projects managed and implemented by Samtrans as the managing partner for Caltrain.

The Joint Powers Agreement that governs the Caltrain partnership calls for the partners to
equally share in the cost of system wide improvements such as track and signal projects, bridge replacement and equipment purchases. The single biggest system improvement is the Caltrain Modernization Project which includes electrification of the system. Other projects such as station access improvements located north of Tamien Station are the responsibility of the county in which they are located. All system and station improvements south of Tamien Station are VTA’s responsibility to fund and construct. In certain cases individual counties have taken on the responsibility of “jump starting” projects and paid for the entire local share. VTA and Samtrans are doing this with the grade crossing safety improvements in their respective counties.

**DISCUSSION:**

The recommended Board action applies to the first and third category described above. The action authorizes VTA Measure A funding for two separate projects for which funding has been requested by Caltrain:

1. **Improvements to Santa Clara Station and additional platforms at San Jose Diridon Station.**

2. **VTA’s funding allocation for Caltrain capital planning effort known as Project 2015.**

**Santa Clara Station Improvements and San Jose Diridon Platform Expansion**

**Santa Clara Station**  
The Santa Clara Station is currently only being used by Caltrain trains. The Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) and the Capitol Corridor would also like to use the station but cannot due to physical and operational limitations. The station features an outside boarding platform serving the southbound track. In order to access the northbound track, riders use an at-grade crossing to cross the first track from the platform, then stand on a narrow strip of asphalt between the two tracks, to board or de-board a northbound train. To prevent stranding riders on the asphalt strip, a "hold out" rule has been instituted at this station, where only one train at a time can enter the station. This provides a level of safety for passengers boarding or de-boarding the train on the northbound track, when using the at-grade crossings to cross the tracks. However, it severely restricts rail operations in the congested corridor between the Santa Clara and Diridon stations impacting on-time performance and schedule reliability.

Caltrain is currently completing the design of a center boarding platform and pedestrian tunnel at the Santa Clara Caltrain station that will link the new platform and the existing station platform. This will eliminate the “hold-out” rule and allow ACE and Capitol Corridor trains to use the Santa Clara Station while improving pedestrian safety by grade separating the track crossing.

**Diridon Station**  
The San Jose Diridon Station is used by Caltrain, ACE, the Capitol Corridor and Amtrak for commuter rail services. Union Pacific trains also traverse the terminal area and add to train congestion. The Capitol Corridor plans to expand from seven round trips between San Jose and
Sacramento to eleven round trips in 2012 and eventually sixteen round trips in the future. There is a shortage of both platform and track space to accommodate all the services using the San Jose Diridon Station. Caltrain is proposing to add two additional platforms at the station to ensure the reliability of the existing train services. The platform expansion, costing $52 million, increases the current station capacity from three to five platforms. Additional platform space will give train operations more flexibility and will also facilitate any future plans for expansion of Caltrain, ACE and Capitol services. Additional tracks and signal work necessary for the added platforms are also included in this phase.

There is a cost savings and contracting benefit of pairing the Santa Clara project with the San Jose Diridon project. A single contract will allow one contractor to efficiently deploy crews and result in procurement efficiencies. The JPB has estimated a savings of $6 million if both Santa Clara Station and San Jose Diridon improvements are consolidated into a single construction effort.

Santa Clara and Diridon Station Improvements Funding Recommendations
The funding plan for the San Jose Diridon improvements includes $47.3 million from federal and state sources, of which $20 million is being contributed from funds available to the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority. There may be uncertainty surrounding the availability of state funds due to the current budget situation. A local share of $4.7 million is required from the three JPB partners ($1.6 million from each partner) to complete the funding package. Caltrain staff has stated the funds are available from San Mateo and San Francisco local sources for their shares. VTA's contribution will be contingent on other elements of the funding plan being in place.

It is anticipated that work on both projects will begin in 2009 and be completed in 2011.

The total project budget for the Santa Clara Station upgrade is $26 million. ACE is responsible for a contribution of half of the project cost. Caltrain staff approached VTA requesting a $10 million contribution to complete the funding plan. This type of improvement is defined as a “system” improvement benefiting the entire Caltrain operation, in which each of the Caltrain funding partners are expected to contribute one-third of the local share. However, this project also has specific benefits to Santa Clara County, providing greater access to the ACE and Capitol Corridor regional rail providers. In comparison, San Mateo County transportation funding sources have also carried the local burden of upgrading the South San Francisco Caltrain Station, which also provides system benefits.

The $10 million in Measure A funding will complete the funding plan and allow Caltrain to advance the project into construction in early 2009. Because of the benefits anticipated for ACE, the Measure A funds will come from the $33.3 million in ACE upgrades category as listed in the 2006 Measure A Revenue and Expenditure Plan.

The improvements to San Jose Diridon Station will improve the reliability of Caltrain and other commuter services and provide flexibility for future service expansions. There are economies of scale in proceeding with both projects at the same time, making the projects more cost effective. In addition, VTA funds are being used to leverage significant contributions from other sources.
COMBINED FUNDING PLAN FOR SANTA CLARA AND SAN JOSE DIRIDON IMPROVEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Federal/State</th>
<th>ACE Capitol Corridor</th>
<th>San Mateo/San Francisco</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Station</td>
<td>$3.1M</td>
<td>$12.9 M</td>
<td>$10 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Diridon Platforms</td>
<td>$26.6 M</td>
<td>$20.6 M</td>
<td>$3.2 M</td>
<td>$1.6M</td>
<td>$52 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$29.7 M</td>
<td>$12.9 M</td>
<td>$20.6 M</td>
<td>$3.2 M</td>
<td>$11.6M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The staff recommendation is to approve the use of Measure A funding to contribute VTA’s share of $10 million to the Santa Clara Station and $1.6 million for the Diridon Station Project.

Caltrain Capital Planning

VTA annually contributes funds to Caltrain’s capital budget for projects that fund the replacement and rehabilitation needs of the system. In FY 2009 the budgeted contribution is $2.846 million. VTA has historically increased this allocation by 3 percent annually, which has proved adequate since the inception of the Caltrain JPB in 1996. Caltrain is now including a discreet element of its planning and engineering for an expanded Caltrain system, Project 2015, as a part of the annual capital budget request causing a shortfall in the budgeted VTA allocation of $600,000.

Because the additional expense is caused by the needs of planning and engineering for Caltrain expansion VTA staff recommends using Measure A funds to close the gap. With the recent passage of the High Speed Rail measure, much of the anticipated planning work should center on how Caltrain modernization goals may be able to be met by a future High Speed Rail improvement in the corridor. Staff also proposes to negotiate a master planning and engineering agreement with Caltrain encompassing VTA and JPB staff to perform work tasks on future Caltrain projects. VTA also has staff and consultants working on Caltrain projects and by pooling staff/consultant resources there may be savings.

Caltrain Electrification Final Engineering

Caltrain electrification, as defined by the project environmental document, is one component of a larger plan to modernize, improve and expand Caltrain service. Other elements include buying new equipment, replacing the signal system, modifying stations and building supporting infrastructure. The estimate to complete the modernization program including electrification is approximately $1.5 billion.

Caltrain has completed Preliminary Engineering for a project scope that includes the traction power supply elements, the overhead contact system and modifications to support those two elements. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will soon be submitted to FTA. The total cost
of these elements is $608 million. It should again be stressed this cost does not include rolling stock and other key project components. Caltrain staff has requested $8.33 from each of the three partner agencies to fund the initial portion of Final Engineering phase.

Electrification is a system wide improvement that must be supported equally by each Caltrain partner county. At this point, it is not clear that a financial plan to fund all elements of the $1.5 billion modernization project, including the $608 million needed to simply electrify the line, is in place.

Additionally, with the passage of Proposition 1A, the High Speed Rail (HSR) Bond, on November 4, 2008, the impacts of a new electrified train service utilizing the Caltrain Corridor is unknown at this time.

In view of this information, the JPB and High Speed Rail Authority need to define the impact that the HSR Project has on the scope, costs and schedule of the Caltrain 2015 Modernization Program prior to proceeding with the Final Engineering phase proceeds on just the Caltrain electrification elements.

The total Measure A allocation for Caltrain projects administered by the JPB, if these requests are approved is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Funding from VTA Measure A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara and San Jose Diridon Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The alternative is to fund only a portion of the requests above, or not fund any of the requests.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action would commit up to $12.2 million of 2000 Measure A funds to the listed projects. The 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Capital Budget approved by the Board of Directors on June 7, 2007 includes adequate appropriation authority to cover this action.

**STANDING COMMITTEE/DISCUSSION RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee recommended the Board of Directors approve this item.

Committee members asked questions on the relationship of the High Speed Rail Project and
Caltrain capital plans. The additional $600,000 for planning studies will help address those issues.

Prepared by: Steven Fisher
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: State Local Partnership Program Contribution to BART Warm Springs Extension Project

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the contribution of State Local Partnership Program of $8 million and its funding match from 2000 Measure A Program of $8 million for the BART Warm Springs Extension project.

BACKGROUND:

The BART Warm Springs Extension project is a 5.4 mile project that extends from the Fremont BART Station to southern Fremont. The Warm Springs Extension would run under Lake Elizabeth in Fremont Central Park and then run along the Union Pacific Railroad Corridor to the Warm Springs Station (shown in Exhibit A). The project cost is estimated at $890 million (in year of expenditure dollars). The first phase of construction, the subway box construction under Lake Elizabeth, is ready for advertisement in February 2009. The project is expected to be open for revenue service in 2014.

On September 24, 2008, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) approved the Resolution 3434 2008 Strategic Plan, which included a funding strategy to close the funding shortfall for the BART Warm Springs Extension project. The Resolution 3434 Strategic Plan identifies the following funding partners: BART, MTC, Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA), Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA), and VTA. The funding plan is shown in Exhibit B.
DISCUSSION:

The passage of Proposition 1B in November 2006 created a number of funding programs for transportation. The State Local Partnership Program (SLPP) was one of these designated programs. The legislation included one billion dollars, to be allocated as a funding match program to projects funded by other local voter-mandated transportation programs. The agency receiving the SLPP funds will need to match 1:1 with the local transportation revenue source. Based on a recently enacted formula, the SLPP program is anticipated to allocate about $42 million to VTA for transit projects.

The BART Warms Springs Extension project funding plan includes a contribution of SLPP funds and its match from MTC ($40 million), ACTIA ($30 million), and VTA ($16 million). MTC’s contribution of its Regional Measures 1 and 2 bridge toll funds requires that ACTIA and VTA take Board action on the commitment of their contribution and match funds.

VTA would contribute $8 million in SLPP funds and $8 million in 2000 Measure A funds towards the Warm Springs extension to meet the MTC requirements. The contribution of $16 million in SLPP from VTA would be used towards the Warm Springs project elements that would have a shared benefit with the SVRT project. These elements include the tail tracks that allow for construction, testing and start up of the SVRT extension.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board could choose to not make the commitment of the SLPP and its matching funds. However, the commitments by all the funding partners are necessary for BART to move the Warm Springs Extension project into construction. The delay in commitments would likely delay the project, and due to seasonal constraints for the subway box construction would result in increased costs.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action would commit $16 million of SLPP and 2000 Measure A funds to the Warm Springs Project. The appropriation for this expenditure will be included in the Recommended FY10 & FY11 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration and Finance Committee heard a presentation from staff about the BART Warm Springs Extension project and the board actions and commitments required from VTA to move the project into construction in mid-2009. The committee voted unanimously to approve the contribution of $8 million State Local Partnership Program funds and the $8 million local match from Measure A. Staff clarified that the action reflects a commitment to $16 million towards the BART Warm Springs extension project but that the actual allocation of funds
towards the project would be spread over the next few years and contained within the budget.
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### BART Warm Springs Extension Funding Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County 2000 Measure B Tier 1</td>
<td>$220.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)</td>
<td>$100.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Measure 2 Bridge Tolls (Includes $91M Dumbarton Swap)</td>
<td>$176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Measure 1 Bridge Tolls</td>
<td>$118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)</td>
<td>$69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County CMA</td>
<td>$2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition B 50% Revenue-Based (BART), 50% Population-Based (MTC)</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 1B SLPP (MTC $40M, ACTIA $30M, SCVTA $16M)</td>
<td>$86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Agency Contribution</td>
<td>$24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Airport Extension Surplus Revenue (MTC $27M, ACTIA/BART Advance)</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$890 Million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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:    Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Funding Plan for an Operable BART Segment

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Reaffirm the Board’s commitment to the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor project (BART to Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara); and approve a funding plan (Exhibits C and D) for an operable BART segment into Santa Clara County as an assurance for the BART Warm Springs Extension project.

BACKGROUND:

The BART Warm Springs Extension project is a 5.4-mile project that extends from the Fremont BART Station to southern Fremont. The Warm Springs Extension would run under Lake Elizabeth in Fremont Central Park and then run along the Union Pacific Railroad Corridor to the Warm Springs Station (shown in Exhibit A). The project cost is estimated at $890 million (in year of expenditure dollars). The first phase of construction, the subway box construction under Lake Elizabeth, is ready for advertisement in February 2009. The project is expected to be open for revenue service in 2014.

On September 24, 2008, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) approved the Resolution 3434 2008 Strategic Plan, which included a funding strategy to close the funding shortfall for the BART Warm Springs Extension project. The BART Warm Springs Project is funded by a number of agencies. The Resolution 3434 Strategic Plan identifies the following funding partners: BART, MTC, Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA), Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA), and VTA. The MTC contribution of funds requires three conditions be met:

1. BART contributes an additional $24 million;
2. Alameda and Santa Clara Counties contribute $30 million and $16 million, respectively, from Proposition 1B State Local Partnership Program proceeds; and
3. VTA’s Board commits to a full funding plan for an operable BART segment in Santa Clara County.

In addition, ACTIA’s Measure B funds are conditioned in that “funds for construction of the BART rail extension to Warm Springs in Southern Fremont may not be used until full funding for the rail connection to Santa Clara County is assured.”

To meet the conditions for fully funding the Warm Springs Extension, VTA is required to take two actions: 1) Approve a full funding plan to build and operate a BART extension in Santa Clara County; and 2) Approve the SLPP contribution and its matching funds of $16 million. This memorandum and associated action addresses the first condition. A separate memorandum will address the SLPP contribution.

**DISCUSSION:**

The extension of BART into Santa Clara County is a priority of the VTA Board and VTA has the financial capacity to build and operate an extension of BART. For the purpose of meeting the conditions on the Warm Springs Extension revenue, VTA staff has developed a funding plan for an operable BART segment in Santa Clara County, a two-station extension to the east San Jose Area near Berryessa Road (Exhibit B). Although the funding plan only includes a segment of the BART extension in the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor, VTA is committed to the full BART project to downtown San Jose and the Santa Clara Station.

The proposed funding plan for the operable BART segment will also be included in the federal Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) planned for public comment in the January/February 2009 timeframe. The segment and related financial analysis will also be submitted for the Federal Transit Administration’s annual New Starts report next year.

As shown in Exhibit C, VTA has developed a funding plan that includes three key capital funding sources: (1) local 2000 Measure A sales tax, (2) state Traffic Congestion Relief Program funds, and (3) federal Section 5309 New Starts funds. The 2008 Measure B revenues would fund the operating and maintenance costs of the extension. The memorandum to the Board of Directors dated August 4, 2008 provides the summary analysis of the revenue and costs for the on-going operating and maintenance of the SVRT project (Exhibit D).

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could choose not to approve a funding plan for an extension of BART into Santa Clara County. This alternative would jeopardize funding for the BART to Warm Springs Extension, and could result in delay and increased costs.
**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The approval of a funding plan for an operable BART segment does not have a fiscal impact at this time. Subsequent Board actions would be needed to allocate and budget funds towards the SVRT activities.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee heard a presentation from staff about the BART Warm Springs Extension project and the board actions and commitments required from VTA to move the project into construction in mid-2009. The staff explained that the funding plan in Exhibit A was for the New Starts segment of the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor Project. The committee voted unanimously to approve the funding plan for the New Starts segment as an assurance for the BART to Warm Springs Extension project.

Prepared by: Carolyn M. Gonot
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: Silicon Valley Rapid Transit New Starts Candidate Project Funding Plan

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Reaffirm the Board’s commitment to the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor project (BART to Milpitas, San Jose, and Santa Clara); and approve a funding plan (Exhibits C and D) for the federal New Starts Candidate project as an assurance for the BART Warm Springs Extension project.

BACKGROUND:

The BART Warm Springs Extension project is a 5.4-mile project that extends from the Fremont BART Station to southern Fremont. The Warm Springs Extension would run under Lake Elizabeth in Fremont Central Park and then run along the Union Pacific Railroad Corridor to the Warm Springs Station (shown in Exhibit A). The project cost is estimated at $890 million (in year of expenditure dollars). The first phase of construction, the subway box construction under Lake Elizabeth, is ready for advertisement in February 2009. The project is expected to be open for revenue service in 2014.

On September 24, 2008, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) approved the Resolution 3434 2008 Strategic Plan, which included a funding strategy to close the funding shortfall for the BART Warm Springs Extension project. The BART Warm Springs Project is funded by a number of agencies. The Resolution 3434 Strategic Plan identifies the following funding partners: BART, MTC, Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority (ACTIA), Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA), and VTA.
The MTC contribution of funds requires three conditions be met:

1. BART contributes an additional $24 million;
2. Alameda and Santa Clara Counties contribute $30 million and $16 million, respectively, from Proposition 1B State Local Partnership Program proceeds; and
3. VTA’s Board commits to a full funding plan for an operable BART segment in Santa Clara County.

In addition, ACTIA’s Measure B funds are conditioned in that “funds for construction of the BART rail extension to Warm Springs in Southern Fremont may not be used until full funding for the rail connection to Santa Clara County is assured.”

To meet the conditions for fully funding the Warm Springs Extension, VTA is required to take two actions: 1) Approve a full funding plan to build and operate a BART extension in Santa Clara County; and 2) Approve the SLPP contribution and its matching funds of $16 million. This memorandum and associated action addresses the first condition. A separate memorandum will address the SLPP contribution.

**DISCUSSION:**

The extension of BART into Santa Clara County is a priority of the VTA Board and VTA has the financial capacity to build and operate an extension of BART. For the purpose of meeting the conditions on the Warm Springs Extension revenue, VTA staff has developed a funding plan for the federal News Starts Candidate Project. The New Starts Candidate Project is a two-station extension to the east San Jose Area near Berryessa Road (Exhibit B). Although the funding plan only includes a segment of the BART extension in the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor, VTA is committed to the full BART project to downtown San Jose and the Santa Clara Station.

The proposed funding plan for the New Starts Candidate Project will also be included in the federal Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) planned for public comment in the January/February 2009 timeframe. The New Starts Candidate Project and related financial analysis will also be submitted for the Federal Transit Administration’s annual New Starts report next year.

As shown in Exhibit C, VTA has developed a funding plan that includes three key capital funding sources: (1) local 2000 Measure A sales tax, (2) state Traffic Congestion Relief Program funds, and (3) federal Section 5309 New Starts funds. The 2008 Measure B revenues would fund the operating and maintenance costs of the extension. The memorandum to the Board of Directors dated August 4, 2008 provides the summary analysis of the revenue and costs for the on-going operating and maintenance of the SVRT project (Exhibit D).
**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could choose not to approve a funding plan for an extension of BART into Santa Clara County. This alternative would jeopardize funding for the BART to Warm Springs Extension, and could result in delay and increased costs.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The approval of a funding plan for the New Starts Candidate Project does not have a fiscal impact at this time. Subsequent Board actions would be needed to allocate and budget funds towards the SVRT activities.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee heard a presentation from staff about the BART Warm Springs Extension project and the board actions and commitments required from VTA to move the project into construction in mid-2009. The staff explained that the funding plan in Exhibit A was for the New Starts segment of the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor Project. The committee voted unanimously to approve the funding plan for the New Starts segment as an assurance for the BART to Warm Springs Extension project.
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EXHIBIT C

Sources of Capital Funding for New Starts Candidate Project ($YOE in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>New Starts Candidate Project Funding</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTA Local Sales Tax Measure A and Other(^a)</td>
<td>$1,542.7</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Traffic Congestion Relief Program(^b)</td>
<td>$240.0</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Section 5309 New Starts</td>
<td>$750.0</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL(^c):</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,532.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
\(^a\) “Other” includes possible state and local funds and potential joint development revenues that might replace Measure A funds.
\(^b\) Total TCRP funds committed to the project are $648.6 million. Approximately $408.6 million of this total has either been expended or is programmed to be expended on engineering and environmental activities to date that are not included in the project costs listed in Table 9.2-2. See text for more detail.
\(^c\) Measure A and TCRP funds also support the following past and existing commitments for related projects and other activities in the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor:
- Pre-NEPA Engineering and Environmental Analysis: $413 million
- Freight Railroad Relocation Activities: $231 million
- Newhall Yard Acquisition and Maintenance: $42 million
- Mitchell Block Acquisition and Maintenance: $39 million

Source: VTA, December 2008
MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors
FROM: Michael T. Burns
       General Manager
DATE: August 4, 2008
SUBJECT: BART Operating Subsidy

This memorandum summarizes and presents the analysis that calculates the operating subsidy amount and demonstrates that a 1/8-cent sales tax covers this expense. The purpose of the potential sales tax is to cover VTA’s obligation to BART for the cost of operating the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Project, also known as the BART Extension, in Santa Clara County. At my request our consultants, AECOM Consult, Inc., have provided us a detailed calculation updating the assumptions to give the most reliable estimate of the projected cost to operate and maintain the extension together with offsetting revenue. Their detailed response indicates that the proposed 1/8-cent sales tax will cover our payment to BART for operations, maintenance, fixed overhead and future capital reserve contributions. The calculation shows a reserve at the end of 2036. It is critical that VTA be able to meet this obligation without reducing our existing service or raising fares solely to support this effort.

The attached executive summary and technical memo from AECOM Consult describes the methodology for estimating these costs and offsetting revenue. This methodology complies with the 2001 Comprehensive Agreement between the VTA and BART in connection with the proposed Santa Clara County BART Extension. Also attached are brief bios of the AECOM employees who have done this analysis and a list of representative projects on which they have worked.

Please feel free to contact me or Carolyn Gonot, Chief SVRT Program Officer, at (408) 321-5623 if you have any questions or need further information.

Attachments (3)
Executive Summary

VTA SVRT Extension BART Subsidy Funding

VTA consultants and staff have examined the projected VTA subsidy for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Extension (SVRT) project and determined that the proposed ¼-cent sales tax will be sufficient to fund the subsidy. This includes consideration of VTA responsibilities for direct Operating & Maintenance (O&M) costs, fixed overhead O&M costs, and VTA capital reserve contributions to BART and offsetting incremental passenger fare revenue.

The attached memo and appendix from AECOM Consult describes the methodology for estimating the projected operating costs, capital reserve contribution and revenue. This methodology is consistent with the 2001 Comprehensive Agreement between the VTA and BART in connection with the proposed Santa Clara County BART Extension.

In summary, the annual SVRT Extension O&M cost subsidy equals:

- **Net direct O&M cost of the SVRT Extension** - calculated as the BART systemwide direct O&M cost for the SVRT Project alternative minus the BART systemwide direct O&M cost for the Core System (the “No Build” alternative) without the SVRT Extension; PLUS

- **Allocation of BART fixed overhead O&M costs** - calculated on the basis of additional SVRT Project direct O&M costs relative to Core System direct O&M costs; MINUS

- **Net incremental BART systemwide passenger revenue** - for the SVRT Project alternative relative to the BART systemwide passenger revenue for the Core System.

In addition, VTA makes a capital reserve contribution, an annual deposit set aside to cover the capital expenses, equal to a percentage of SVRT Extension O&M costs which grows over time. This is specified in the VTA and BART Comprehensive Agreement.

The table below demonstrates that the projected amount of ¼-cent sales tax revenue is sufficient to cover projected SVRT Extension O&M costs and the capital reserve contribution for the SVRT Extension through 2036. SVRT Extension O&M costs net of fare revenue are projected to total $1,224.2 Million. The capital reserve contribution is projected to total $560.1 Million. Therefore, total VTA SVRT Extension subsidy payments to BART are projected to total $1,784.3 Million. The ¼-cent sales tax is projected to bring in $1,938.5 Million, a difference of $154.2 Million.

July 31, 2008
## Executive Summary

### SVRT Extension Subsidy Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL SUBSIDY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT Direct O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td>$(102.0)</td>
<td>$(106.7)</td>
<td>$(113.0)</td>
<td>$(117.8)</td>
<td>$(122.4)</td>
<td>$(130.1)</td>
<td>$(135.0)</td>
<td>$(140.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT Allocation of Fixed Overhead O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td>$(11.9)</td>
<td>$(12.3)</td>
<td>$(12.9)</td>
<td>$(13.2)</td>
<td>$(13.7)</td>
<td>$(14.3)</td>
<td>$(14.7)</td>
<td>$(15.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - SVRT O&amp;M Costs</strong></td>
<td>$113.9</td>
<td>$119.0</td>
<td>$125.9</td>
<td>$131.1</td>
<td>$137.2</td>
<td>$144.3</td>
<td>$149.7</td>
<td>$155.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT Incremental Fare Revenue</td>
<td>$65.0</td>
<td>$69.2</td>
<td>$74.2</td>
<td>$78.6</td>
<td>$83.4</td>
<td>$88.6</td>
<td>$93.7</td>
<td>$98.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SVRT O&amp;M Cost Net of Fare Revenue</td>
<td>$(48.8)</td>
<td>$(49.9)</td>
<td>$(61.6)</td>
<td>$(52.6)</td>
<td>$(63.8)</td>
<td>$(68.2)</td>
<td>$(68.6)</td>
<td>$(69.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT Capital Reserve Contribution</td>
<td>$(5.8)</td>
<td>$(6.3)</td>
<td>$(10.1)</td>
<td>$(11.8)</td>
<td>$(13.7)</td>
<td>$(15.9)</td>
<td>$(18.0)</td>
<td>$(20.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total SVRT Subsidy</strong></td>
<td>$(53.6)</td>
<td>$(63.1)</td>
<td>$(61.7)</td>
<td>$(64.4)</td>
<td>$(67.5)</td>
<td>$(71.4)</td>
<td>$(74.9)</td>
<td>$(77.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL TAX REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$56.8</td>
<td>$52.4</td>
<td>$56.5</td>
<td>$59.6</td>
<td>$61.1</td>
<td>$63.3</td>
<td>$66.6</td>
<td>$68.8</td>
<td>$71.5</td>
<td>$74.7</td>
<td>$76.5</td>
<td>$78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH BALANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$56.8</td>
<td>$53.4</td>
<td>$56.5</td>
<td>$59.6</td>
<td>$5.4</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.0</td>
<td>$3.3</td>
<td>$2.5</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$50.6</td>
<td>$104.0</td>
<td>$160.6</td>
<td>$220.1</td>
<td>$256.8</td>
<td>$230.7</td>
<td>$237.6</td>
<td>$240.1</td>
<td>$244.1</td>
<td>$247.4</td>
<td>$250.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Surplus/Deficit Without Interest</td>
<td>$56.8</td>
<td>$104.0</td>
<td>$160.6</td>
<td>$220.1</td>
<td>$225.6</td>
<td>$230.7</td>
<td>$237.6</td>
<td>$240.1</td>
<td>$244.1</td>
<td>$247.4</td>
<td>$247.4</td>
<td>$260.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Prior Year Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$6.7</td>
<td>$9.3</td>
<td>$9.8</td>
<td>$10.5</td>
<td>$11.1</td>
<td>$11.6</td>
<td>$12.4</td>
<td>$13.0</td>
<td>$13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Surplus/Deficit With Interest (at 4%)</strong></td>
<td>$56.8</td>
<td>$106.0</td>
<td>$168.8</td>
<td>$233.1</td>
<td>$247.8</td>
<td>$262.3</td>
<td>$278.3</td>
<td>$293.9</td>
<td>$309.7</td>
<td>$325.4</td>
<td>$340.9</td>
<td>$356.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SVRT Project - Millions of YOE$ - 2025 to 2036

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2033</th>
<th>2034</th>
<th>2035</th>
<th>2036</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL SUBSIDY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT Direct O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td>$(147.6)</td>
<td>$(153.1)</td>
<td>$(160.3)</td>
<td>$(167.6)</td>
<td>$(174.9)</td>
<td>$(181.4)</td>
<td>$(190.1)</td>
<td>$(197.0)</td>
<td>$(206.1)</td>
<td>$(214.1)</td>
<td>$(218.6)</td>
<td>$(226.0)</td>
<td>$(3,204.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT Allocation of Fixed Overhead O&amp;M Costs</td>
<td>$(15.8)</td>
<td>$(19.2)</td>
<td>$(18.7)</td>
<td>$(17.3)</td>
<td>$(17.9)</td>
<td>$(18.4)</td>
<td>$(19.0)</td>
<td>$(19.5)</td>
<td>$(20.1)</td>
<td>$(20.8)</td>
<td>$(21.0)</td>
<td>$(21.5)</td>
<td>$(332.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - SVRT O&amp;M Costs</strong></td>
<td>$(163.4)</td>
<td>$(172.3)</td>
<td>$(185.0)</td>
<td>$(185.9)</td>
<td>$(202.8)</td>
<td>$(209.9)</td>
<td>$(216.9)</td>
<td>$(225.2)</td>
<td>$(234.9)</td>
<td>$(238.8)</td>
<td>$(247.5)</td>
<td>$(3,536.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT Incremental Fare Revenue</td>
<td>$104.7</td>
<td>$109.7</td>
<td>$115.7</td>
<td>$122.1</td>
<td>$128.5</td>
<td>$134.4</td>
<td>$141.6</td>
<td>$147.7</td>
<td>$154.7</td>
<td>$162.0</td>
<td>$166.7</td>
<td>$173.4</td>
<td>$2,312.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SVRT O&amp;M Cost Net of Fare Revenue</td>
<td>$(68.6)</td>
<td>$(59.5)</td>
<td>$(61.3)</td>
<td>$(63.1)</td>
<td>$(64.4)</td>
<td>$(66.4)</td>
<td>$(67.6)</td>
<td>$(68.9)</td>
<td>$(76.6)</td>
<td>$(72.9)</td>
<td>$(72.9)</td>
<td>$(74.1)</td>
<td>$(1,224.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT Capital Reserve Contribution</td>
<td>$(22.9)</td>
<td>$(25.4)</td>
<td>$(28.3)</td>
<td>$(31.5)</td>
<td>$(34.7)</td>
<td>$(38.0)</td>
<td>$(41.8)</td>
<td>$(45.3)</td>
<td>$(45.1)</td>
<td>$(47.0)</td>
<td>$(47.9)</td>
<td>$(49.5)</td>
<td>$(560.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total SVRT Subsidy</strong></td>
<td>$(81.5)</td>
<td>$(84.9)</td>
<td>$(88.8)</td>
<td>$(94.6)</td>
<td>$(99.1)</td>
<td>$(103.4)</td>
<td>$(109.4)</td>
<td>$(112.3)</td>
<td>$(115.6)</td>
<td>$(119.8)</td>
<td>$(120.9)</td>
<td>$(123.6)</td>
<td>$(1,784.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANNUAL TAX REVENUE</strong></td>
<td>$81.6</td>
<td>$83.6</td>
<td>$86.4</td>
<td>$89.5</td>
<td>$92.1</td>
<td>$94.2</td>
<td>$97.7</td>
<td>$100.4</td>
<td>$103.8</td>
<td>$107.7</td>
<td>$108.7</td>
<td>$111.8</td>
<td>$1,938.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/8 cent Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CASH BALANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Surplus (Deficit)</td>
<td>$81.6</td>
<td>$83.6</td>
<td>$86.4</td>
<td>$89.5</td>
<td>$92.1</td>
<td>$94.2</td>
<td>$97.7</td>
<td>$100.4</td>
<td>$103.8</td>
<td>$107.7</td>
<td>$108.7</td>
<td>$111.8</td>
<td>$1,938.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$251.3</td>
<td>$251.4</td>
<td>$250.0</td>
<td>$246.8</td>
<td>$241.7</td>
<td>$234.7</td>
<td>$225.5</td>
<td>$213.8</td>
<td>$202.1</td>
<td>$190.3</td>
<td>$176.1</td>
<td>$166.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Surplus/Deficit Without Interest</td>
<td>$251.4</td>
<td>$250.0</td>
<td>$246.8</td>
<td>$241.7</td>
<td>$234.7</td>
<td>$225.5</td>
<td>$213.8</td>
<td>$202.1</td>
<td>$190.3</td>
<td>$176.1</td>
<td>$166.0</td>
<td>$154.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest on Prior Year Balance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$14.2</td>
<td>$14.8</td>
<td>$15.3</td>
<td>$15.8</td>
<td>$16.3</td>
<td>$16.6</td>
<td>$16.9</td>
<td>$17.1</td>
<td>$17.4</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
<td>$302.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cumulative Surplus/Deficit With Interest (at 4%)</strong></td>
<td>$251.4</td>
<td>$250.0</td>
<td>$246.8</td>
<td>$241.7</td>
<td>$234.7</td>
<td>$225.5</td>
<td>$213.8</td>
<td>$202.1</td>
<td>$190.3</td>
<td>$176.1</td>
<td>$166.0</td>
<td>$154.2</td>
<td>$302.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values are presented in year-of-expenditure (YOE) dollars. Inflation is based on projections for VTA by Moody’s Economy.com, with special consideration of expenses for components of costs that inflation faster than the Consumer Price Index (e.g., wages & salaries, healthcare benefits, and electricity). This projection assumes that the ½-percent tax is implemented following award of a Full-Funding Grant Agreement with the Federal Transit Administration for the SVRT project in 2013 with revenues going into a dedicated SVRT O&M fund.

July 31, 2008
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Development Quarterly Status Report

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

VTA is involved in two project review processes: 1) review of environmental documents and development proposals as part of VTA’s Development Review Program; 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 Process (“Proactive”) integrates these two VTA review processes prior to project development approval by Member Agencies. As part of the Proactive process, VTA produces quarterly reports on land-use approvals (attached) consisting of two elements:

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

- **City/County Responses Quarterly Report:** 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.

Both elements of the report include the lead agency and project name, project description and location, and a summary of VTA review comments while the second element of the report includes a listing of the agency’s responses to VTA’s comments and recommendations. A glossary of abbreviations and acronyms used in the quarterly report (Attachment A) is included to assist the reader.

**STANDING COMMITTEE/DISCUSSION RECOMMENDATION:**
The CMPP received the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Project Quarterly Status Report information.

Prepared By: Robert Swierk
Comments on Selected Projects Reviewed by VTA

VTA Comments Provided during July, August and September of 2008

November 14, 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>SCH# 2000092027</td>
<td>ML0102</td>
<td>DSEIR</td>
<td>6/9/2008</td>
<td>7/25/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Milpitas Midtown Specific Plan Transportation Update**
Western portion of Milpitas, generally located west of the Union Pacific Railroad Tracks

**Description:** Proposed changes to the existing and planned roadway system within the Milpitas Midtown Area.

**VTA Comments:**

- **Bus Service:**
  - VTA provides bus service along Main Street within the project area. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA staff recommends that the project maintain the bus stop on southbound Main Street, south of Great Mall Parkway, and provide the following improvements:
    - A 10’ X 55’ PCC pavement pad per VTA standards (attached).
    - An 8’ X 10’ passenger waiting zone.
    - No trees or shrubs within the bus loading area.

- **Impacts to Transit Service:**
  - The environmental document states that the project’s transit impacts would be less than significant since the "project would not change the demand for transit facilities, modify transit stops, nor modify routes for buses in the Midtown area" (page 25). However, it should be noted that there could be delays to bus service during peak hours due to the significant adverse traffic impacts noted in the environmental document.
Milpitas Water and Sewer Master Plan Update  
Citywide  
Description: NOP for a Draft EIR for a Water and Sewer Master Plan Update.

VTA Comments:
Transit Service Impacts:
There are several projects that may have impacts on transit operations due to the location of existing transit facilities. These projects include: W-MP-4, S-MP-11A, S-MP-11B, S-MP-11C, S-MP-11D, and S-MP-12.

The plans for the projects should have a note to contact VTA Operations Planning if a bus stop or bus route will be affected by construction activities.

VTA requests the opportunity to review more detailed maps of the projects when they are made available as part of the Master Plan. We may have additional comments concerning potential impacts to existing or planned transit service.
Dunne - Church Townhomes
East Dunne Avenue at Church Street

Description: Construction of 60 Townhome units on 0.47 acres

VTA Comments:
VTA provides bus service along Dunne Avenue adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to provide a new bus stop west of the railroad tracks with the following improvements:

* A 22-foot curb lane
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad consistent with VTA standards (attached).
* An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting area
* No plants or planter boxes in the bus stop boarding area.
City of Mountain View

**Target at Showers Drive**
**Bounded by Latham Street, California Avenue, and Showers Drive**

**Description:** Request for Planned Community Permit, Development Review Permit for demolition of existing 112,125 SF Target to construct a new Target of 148,457 SF and a new 8,436 SF retail/office building.

**VTA Comments:**
VTA provides bus service adjacent to the project site and maintains a bus stop on Showers Drive, north of Latham Street, and on California Avenue, east of Showers Drive. VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to provide the following improvements for the two bus stops:

* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad according to VTA standards (attached).
Umbarger – Monterey Industrial
Southeast corner of Monterey and Umbarger Roads

**Description:** General Plan Amendment to change the LU/TD designation from Combined Industrial/Commercial to Light Industrial on a 46.35-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**

VTA provides bus service on Monterey Road and maintains two bus stops adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to provide the following improvements at the bus stops:

**Bus Stop on Monterey Road, north of Umbarger Road**

* Existing bus stop has a PCC bus stop pavement pad. However, proposed driveway is in the bus stop loading zone. Therefore, relocate bus stop sign and pole 20 feet north and extend the PCC bus stop pavement pad 25 feet north (overall length of 55 feet extending from driveway).
* Provide an 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
* Repair the damaged pavement north of the PCC bus stop pavement pad
* No trees or planter strips in the bus loading area

**Bus Stop on Monterey Road, mid-block Lewis Road**

* Bus stop is already fully improved, no further improvements 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>CP08-057</td>
<td>SJ0730</td>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>6/30/2008</td>
<td>7/9/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brokaw Commons North**  
*Northwest corner of Brokaw Road and Oakland Road*

**Description:** Conditional Use Permit to demolish existing industrial use buildings and construct 100,500 SF for commercial uses, to allow off-sale of alcoholic beverages for future tenants, and to allow drive-through use for a pharmacy on an 8.19-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**
VTA provides bus service adjacent to the site on Oakland Road and maintains a bus stop adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access for transit use, VTA recommends that the city condition the developer to maintain the bus stop at the current location and provide the following transit improvement:

* A PCC bus stop pavement pad according to VTA standards (attached).

...
<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>PD08-046</td>
<td>SJ0545</td>
<td>PD Permit</td>
<td>7/21/2008</td>
<td>7/31/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Century Center Court Residential**  
Southwest corner of North 1st Street and Century Center Court

**Description:** Planned Development Permit for 460 single-family attached residences and 20,000 square feet of retail use on 2.37 gross acres.

**VTA Comments:**  
VTA supports the proposed development of high-density residential uses due to the location of the project along the Guadalupe LRT line.
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<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>PDC08-037</td>
<td>SJ0814</td>
<td>PD permit</td>
<td>7/22/2008</td>
<td>7/31/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skyport Hotel
Southwest corner of N. First Street and Skyport Drive

Description: Construction of a 322-room hotel.

VTA Comments:
There is currently a PCC bus stop pavement pad at this location. The bus stop is currently inactive but may be used again in the future. In order to provide convenient access for transit service in the future, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to provide the following transit improvement:

* An 8’ X 40’ PCC concrete boarding area adjacent to the bus pad and centered on the PCC bus stop pavement pad.
<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>PDA07-006-01</td>
<td>SJ0617</td>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>8/20/2008</td>
<td>8/28/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Crescent Park**

**Termination of Zanker Road and Innovation Drive**

(Southeast corner of Zanker and River Oaks Parkway)

**Description:** PDP Amendment to amend previously approved permit on the phase two project, to allow construction of 365 residential units and 10,000 square feet of commercial use on a 9.5-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**

**Bus Service:**

VTA provides bus service along River Oaks adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA staff recommends that the following bus stop improvements be provided for the following existing bus stops:

- **Eastbound River Oaks, east of Zanker**
  - * Install 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (VTA standards attached)
  - * Provide 22’ curb lane or bus duckout (VTA standards attached)
  - * Provide 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad (per ADA standards).

- **Eastbound River Oaks, opposite Cisco**
  (We assume that this bus stop will be relocated as part of the development to just west of Rivoli Circle)
  - * Convert bus stop from shuttle stop to VTA bus stop.
  - * Install 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad.
  - * Provide 22’ curb lane or bus duckout
  - * Provide 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad

- **Eastbound River Oaks, west side of Research Place**
  - * Install 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad
  - * Provide 22’ curb lane or bus duckout
  - * Provide 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
**Housing Element Update 2007-2014**  
**Citywide**

**Description:** GP Text Amendment to revise GP Text and Appendix C: Housing to update demographic data, housing needs, and goals, objectives, and policies, and implementation actions for the planning period between 2007 and 2014 (Housing Element Update 2007-2014)

**VTA Comments:**

- **Land Use/Transportation Integration and Housing Density:**
  VTA supports policies that target growth around the established transportation cores, corridors, and station areas in the County, as described in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual. Densification in these areas will promote alternative transportation methods and help reduce vehicle miles traveled. North San Jose, for example, provides an excellent opportunity to locate high-density transit-oriented-developments, resulting in housing that is close to major employers. High-density housing can also reduce vehicle miles traveled if it is located near areas with existing high-quality transit services, such as our identified cores, corridors, and station areas. Densification here can help support and justify these transit investments.

  VTA, in cooperation with member agencies, is in the process of exploring enhanced transit services along several corridors in San Jose, including the San Carlos/Stevens Creek corridor, The Alameda (in cooperation with the Grand Boulevard Initiative), and the Santa Clara/Alum Rock corridor. Densification of housing along these corridors could support and justify these transit investments as well.

- **Bicycle Access and Automobile Parking:**
  VTA supports the development of bicycle and pedestrian trails that work in tandem with additional housing, in order to improve access and connectivity of these important travel modes. Providing trails, bridges, and crossings in a regionally-integrated fashion will improve quality of life for area residents. We also support development policies that limit the number of free automobile parking spaces while encouraging bicycle parking facilities, in an effort to reduce auto travel. VTA suggests that the City of San Jose consider policies that manage automobile parking in ways that promote alternative transportation choices. This principle is discussed in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual.
Rosemary Housing
Southeast corner of N. First Street and Rosemary Street

Description: 290 multi-family residential units (including 106 senior housing units)

VTA Comments:

Site Density:
VTA supports the proposed density (62 to 100 du/acre) and mix of uses for a site located within ¼ mile of a LRT station.

Site Design and Pedestrian Access:
Based on the Planned Development Permit site plan dated August 11, 2008, it appears that the project’s frontage along North First Street will have no pedestrian entrances or active uses. VTA suggests that the proponent consider adding pedestrian entrances from North First Street or including other uses (such as incidental ground-floor retail space) that would create a more active, pedestrian-friendly street frontage on this important transit and pedestrian thoroughfare. VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Guidelines 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. The CDT Guidelines are available upon request to agency staff. For more information on CDT Guidelines, please contact the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division.
<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>GP08-03-01</td>
<td>SJ0817</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>8/26/2008</td>
<td>9/3/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First-Archer GPA**  
East side N. First Street, 400 feet north of Archer Street

**Description:** General Plan Amendment for combined industrial/commercial on 8.6 acres

**VTA Comments:**

**Land Use Mix:**
VTA would like to note that providing a variety of land uses along North First Street, including retail, will help to improve the pedestrian-friendliness and transit-friendliness of the corridor. This is particularly important for this site, which is located within one-third of a mile of a VTA Light Rail station. The vision of including retail in this area is supported by the Rincon South Specific Plan, and is consistent with the principles in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation manual. VTA would like to encourage the City to allow maximum flexibility for including neighborhood-serving retail uses on this site through the current General Plan Amendment and any subsequent planning actions.
<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>GP08-07-03</td>
<td>SJ0819</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>9/3/2008</td>
<td>9/11/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phelan - Monterey Industrial**

**Southeast and northeast corners of Phelan Ave and Monterey Road**

**Description:** General Plan Amendment for Heavy Industrial on 32.98 acres

**VTA Comments:**

VTA provides bus service on Monterey Road and maintains three bus stops adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to provide the following improvements at the bus stops:

- **Bus Stop on Monterey Road, opposite Stauffer**
  - A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (see VTA standards)
  - An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
  - A 10’X 55’ bus stop pavement pad (see VTA standards)
  - No trees or planter strips in the bus loading area

- **Bus Stop on Monterey Road, north of Phelan Avenue**
  - A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see VTA standards)
  - No trees or planter strips in the bus loading zone

- **Bus Stop on Monterey Road, south of railroad tracks**
  - A 10’X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad
  - No trees or planter strips in the bus loading zone
Communications Hill Housing
Bounded by SR 87, Monterey Highway, Hillsdale Avenue

**Description:** PD prezoning to allow up to 2,389 residences on 306 acres

**VTA Comments:**

* Site Design and Transit, Pedestrian and Bicycle Access:
  * VTA supports the plan to connect the two (currently) disjointed parts of Communications Hill Blvd, creating a roadway that will link Hillsdale Avenue and Curtner Avenue. A roadway through the development such as this would be essential for any future plans to provide effective transit service to the development area. We expect that the road would have sidewalks, bike lanes and pedestrian-scale lighting and encourage the roadway design to be in conformance with VTA's Pedestrian Technical Guidelines, Bicycle Technical Guidelines, and Community Design & Transportation Manual.
  * VTA would support adding language to the development plans that would call attention to the possibility of future transit service serving the area. Language could be added that would provide for possible bus stop locations, etc.
  * The development is situated between two significant transit stations - the Curtner Light Rail Station to the northwest and the Capitol Caltrain station to the southeast. However, pedestrian and bicycle access to these stations from Communications Hill and nearby areas is currently not conducive to attracting transit riders from these areas. We suggest that the following improvements be considered:
    - A ped/bike only (nonmotorized) connection from the north of the project site to the vicinity of Mill Pond Drive would help attract riders to the Curtner LRT station from the development.
    - A ped/bike only (nonmotorized) crossing of the Caltrain tracks in line with the Capitol Caltrain station; the current station configuration is not conducive to attracting riders from the development because access to areas west of the tracks (including the proposed development) at the station is currently prohibited. For the projects' residents and employees to use the Capital Caltrain station, a ped/bike only (nonmotorized) crossing of the tracks to the west, either grade-separated or at-grade, as at Sunnyvale Caltrain, is essential. The nearest alternate pedestrian crossing to the north is more than a mile away.
    - An additional ped/bike only (nonmotorized) crossing of the Caltrain tracks to the north, between the Capitol Caltrain station and the proposed extension of Communications Hill Boulevard. Even with a crossing at the Capitol station, the Caltrain railroad tracks would continue to be a significant barrier to pedestrian and bicycle circulation. We would suggest another crossing of the tracks, either grade separated or at-grade, to allow people to safely conveniently and legally cross the existing railroad tracks. This will be an important consideration with a new school planned for the Communications Hill development.
  * Since the development is located in such a strategic position between the Caltrain line and the Curtner light rail station, we see this as a rare opportunity to benefit from both transit modes by providing a bicycle/pedestrian path that runs through the development and connects to both stations. This attractive investment would promote alternative modes of transportation and falls in line with the City’s commitment to create 100 miles of interconnected trails within 15 years.

* Site Density:
  VTA supports the proposed site density (38 du/acre) in proximity to two transit corridors - Caltrain and VTA light rail. The site density and site design will help promote transit usage and reduce vehicle miles traveled. However, it will only be effective if walking and biking are convenient.
and direct routes are provided between the stations and the development site, and the street design is supportive to future potential transit service, as described above.

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 will likely 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.

Design Compatibility with Caltrain Overpass:
There is an existing overpass which was constructed as part of the Caltrain Tamien to Lick Double Track Project. Any foundation for a new overpass for the proposed development will require design compatibility with the tie-back wall that was constructed for the Caltrain project.

(Initial VTA comments sent on 9/10/08; revised letter sent 9/30/08.)
<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>

**Yahoo! Santa Clara Campus**  
**Tasman Drive between Patrick Henry Drive and Old Ironsides Drive**

Description: NOP for a Draft EIR for the redevelopment of a 48.6 acre site with approximately 3.2 million square feet of new office space and auxiliary buildings, and demolition of 10 existing R&D buildings totaling approximately 640,000 square feet.

**VTA Comments:**

Environmental Impacts to be Considered:
VTA suggests that the EIR should include more specific analysis of potential environmental impacts of the project in the area of Transportation and Circulation. This should include an analysis of the project’s relationship to the transit, bicycle and pedestrian system, and the project’s impact on Congestion Management Program (CMP) facilities. Consideration should be given to how to mitigate new vehicle trips on CMP facilities, as well as how to reduce vehicle trips overall. This may include Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, as well as land use/site design measures such as land use mix, building orientation, and parking ratios. The following sections provide more specific comments and suggestions in these areas.

Land Use/Transportation Integration and Site Density:
VTA supports policies that target growth around the established transportation cores, corridors, and station areas in the County, as described in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual. Densification in these areas will promote alternative transportation methods and help reduce vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Yahoo! corporate campus supports these goals by locating substantial new development in close proximity to the Old Ironsides and Reamwood light rail stations and multiple bus lines. We hope the project will result in a dense office complex that integrates transit services and encourages the use of a multi-modal mix of transportation choices.

Transportation Demand Management:
VTA recommends urging large employers to implement transportation demand management (TDM) programs in order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by their employees. The Yahoo! Santa Clara Campus project offers a unique and ideal opportunity to request the implementation of such a program. Effective TDM programs include:

* Car-sharing
* 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
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Guaranteed Ride Home Program
VTA also recommends providing preferentially located electric vehicle parking with charging stations. Providing charging stations for these vehicles at work and shopping locations allows for more frequent and convenient use of these clean air vehicles.

Site Design:
Based on the Project Description in the NOP, we understand that Democracy Way, an existing public thoroughfare in the development site, will be vacated and used as part of the campus development. VTA is concerned that this may have negative impacts on pedestrian access and connectivity in the area. VTA suggests that this issue be considered specifically in the EIR and requests that the proponent consider measures to preserve pedestrian connectivity such as establishing pedestrian paths through the development that would be open to the general public.

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 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.

Bus Service
VTA provides bus service and maintains bus stops adjacent to the project site on Patrick Henry Drive, Tasman Drive, and Old Ironsides Drive. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA staff recommends that the City condition the developer to retain the bus stops in their current location and provide the following transit improvements:

Patrick Henry Drive, mid-block on the curve
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (see VTA standards attached)
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see VTA standards attached)
* A sidewalk connecting to passenger waiting pad
* No trees or planter strips in the bus loading area

Tasman Drive, east of Patrick Henry Drive
* Bus stop is already fully improved, no changes requested

Old Ironsides, west of Democracy
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see attached VTA standards)
**City of Santa Clara**

**Agency File #** PLN2008-06947/CEQ2008-01060  
**CMP ID** SC0805  
**Type of Document** NOP  
**Document Received** 8/18/2008  
**VTA Response Date** 9/22/2008

### 49ers Stadium Project

**Southwest corner of Tasman Drive and Centennial Boulevard**

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

**VTA Comments:**

Land Use/Transportation Integration:  
VTA supports policies that target growth around the established transportation cores, corridors, and station areas in the County, as described in VTA’s CDT Manual. Densification in these areas will promote alternative transportation methods and help reduce vehicle miles traveled. The proposed 49ers stadium project offers an excellent opportunity to build on and make use of the existing transit network in the Great America area. The stadium can benefit from the existing transportation infrastructure, although it may justify or require additional transportation improvements given the size of the project and highly peaked travel characteristics of its users, as noted below.

Development Design:  
VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual is a useful reference in the development design process. The CDT Manual document provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. The CDT Manual is available upon request to any agency staff. For more information on the CDT Manual and Guidelines, please call VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.

Transit Service and Infrastructure:  
The proposed stadium project offers a major opportunity to build on and make use of existing transit and transportation resources, particularly the VTA light rail system. However, given the size of the project and highly peaked travel characteristics of its users, careful consideration will need to be given to the impacts of the project on the transportation system and measures to ensure that it functions as desired when the project is implemented.

Based on our current understanding of the project and information from the 49ers organization shared with VTA staff in spring 2007, we believe that the project could potentially generate more light rail passenger trips than the system as currently designed could handle, particularly during peak demand periods after events. VTA requests that the project proponent conduct an analysis of the anticipated travel patterns of facility users, including demand on the VTA light rail system and bus system. We also suggest that the proponent gather information on the anticipated Origins and Destinations of facility users as a way of determining areas of greatest demand on the transportation system.

Given the potential passenger demands on the VTA light rail system, it is possible that additional investments may be needed in the vicinity of the proposed project. These might include:
* Tail tracks to store extra trains during events
* A spur station to allow efficient loading and unloading of passengers closer to the stadium and out of the main Tasman Drive right-of-way
* Other platform, canopy and pedestrian infrastructure improvements
* New electric power substation(s) for the light rail system
* Fare collection infrastructure or methods – potentially fare gates or extra staff
* Other new personnel requirements, including security, customer service ambassadors, and flaggers

Measures such as those above and others may be necessary to ensure that the VTA light rail system can handle the demand generated by the proposed project. VTA would like to ensure that the operation of its light rail system is not impacted by the potential closure of a portion of Tasman Drive as mentioned in the NOP for the EIR. In addition, VTA and the proponent will need to discuss plans for bus routing during events to ensure that VTA bus service is able to operate and is not negatively impacted through the area.

VTA is currently beginning a Light Rail Systems Analysis study that is taking a comprehensive look at the entire light rail system. The purpose of the study is to identify future needs in terms of both infrastructure and service to improve the performance of the system and help it meet future demands. We welcome the City’s input during this process and will be in contact with you regarding City participation in the study.

Transportation Demand Management:
VTA recommends urging large employers and large trip generators to implement transportation demand management (TDM) programs in order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by their employees or developments. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the proposed project include:
* Direct or Indirect Payments for Taking Alternate Modes
* Transit Fare Incentives such as Eco Pass and Commuter Checks
* Preferentially Located Carpool Parking
* Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Employee and Visitor Services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Restaurants

VTA also recommends providing preferentially located electric vehicle parking with charging stations. Providing charging stations for these vehicles at work and shopping locations allows for more frequent and convenient use of these clean air vehicles.

Transportation Impact Analysis Report:
VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. Based on the information provided on the size of the project, a TIA may be required. VTA’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines should be used when preparing the TIA. These guidelines include the analysis of bicycle facilities, parking, site circulation and pedestrian access, as well as roadways.

Bicycle Access and Parking:
VTA supports the development of bicycle and pedestrian trails in order to improve access and connectivity of these important modes. Providing trails, bridges, and crossings in a regionally-integrated fashion will improve quality of life for area residents. We also support development policies that limit the number of free parking spaces while encouraging bicycle parking facilities, in an effort to reduce auto travel. In the vicinity of the proposed stadium site, creating bicycle and pedestrian trails, bridges and crossings will be important because of the physical constraints around the site, including the adjacent creek, arterial roadways, and nearby railroad tracks.

VTA would like to work in partnership with the City of Santa Clara in the advancement of the proposed stadium project. It may be beneficial to convene a working group consisting of City staff, VTA staff (including planning, service/operations, and facilities staff), and staff from other agencies to discuss transit service and infrastructure, transportation impacts, and other considerations. Please do not hesitate to contact VTA to discuss how we can work with you in this process.
General Plan Update
Citywide

Description: Notice of Preparation for a Draft EIR for General Plan Update

VTA Comments:

Land Use/Transportation Integration and Site Density:
VTA supports policies that target growth around the established transportation cores, corridors, and station areas in the County, as described in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual. Densification in these areas will promote alternative transportation methods and help reduce vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Yahoo! corporate campus, for example, can take advantage of the transportation infrastructure in the vicinity, with its close proximity to the Old Ironsides and Reamwood light rail stations and multiple bus lines. We hope the project will result in a dense office complex that integrates transit services and encourages the use of a multi-modal mix of transportation choices. As another example, the proposed 49ers stadium project offers an excellent opportunity to build on and make use of the existing transit network in the Great America area. The stadium can benefit from the existing transportation infrastructure, although it may justify or require additional transportation improvements given the size of the project and highly peaked travel characteristics of its users.

VTA also supports focusing development toward existing areas already dedicated to the urban fabric, rather than consuming additional land in outlying areas. Areas along El Camino Real, such as the El Camino and Lawrence Expressway intersection, provide an excellent opportunity to target development in a nodal fashion. VTA supports this type of development that reinforces existing transportation investments and can help allow VTA to improve service quality.

The City of Santa Clara is unique in that most of the jobs are in the northern part of the city and most of the housing in the southern part of the city. This unique characteristic provides some transportation challenges as large numbers of working people move north in the morning and south in the evening. Depending on future growth patterns, there may be an opportunity for VTA to work with the City of Santa Clara to enhance transit service in the north-south direction to accommodate these travelers. VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy & Service Design Guidelines contains information about land use thresholds and characteristics that VTA looks for in considering potential service changes. This document may be a useful reference as the City of Santa Clara considers ‘triggers’ of its own for land use changes and accompanying transportation or infrastructure investments. For more information on VTA’s Transit Sustainability Policy, please call VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.

Transportation Demand Management:
VTA recommends urging large employers to implement transportation demand management (TDM) programs in order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by their employees. We would support the inclusion of policies in the General Plan requiring a TDM program as a condition of approval or mitigating measure for projects. The upcoming Yahoo! corporate campus project will offer a unique and ideal opportunity to request the implementation of such a program. Additional opportunities exist in future residential development proposals, such as requiring multi-family housing developments to provide VTA EcoPass transit passes to their residents. Other effective TDM programs include:
* Car-sharing
* 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

VTA also recommends providing preferentially located electric vehicle parking with charging stations. Providing charging stations for these vehicles at work and shopping locations allows for more frequent and convenient use of these clean air vehicles.

Transportation Analysis:
VTA looks forward to the opportunity to review the Circulation element in the General Plan update as it is developed, as well as the Transportation analysis within the EIR for the General Plan Update. VTA can help provide comment and guidance on the analysis of transit services and facilities, bicycle facilities, parking, vehicular circulation and pedestrian access, as well as roadways.

Bicycle Access and Parking:
VTA supports the development of bicycle and pedestrian trails in order to improve access and connectivity of these important modes. Providing trails, bridges, and crossings in a regionally-integrated fashion will improve quality of life for area residents. We also support development policies that limit the number of free parking spaces while encouraging bicycle parking facilities, in an effort to reduce auto travel.

Development Design:
VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual is a useful reference in the development and review of site designs in later stages of the planning process. VTA supports development that provides a diverse mix of uses and establishes streets as places. The CDT Manual document provides guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. It also contains broad principles that may be a useful reference for the City during its General Plan update. The CDT Manual is available upon request to any agency staff. For more information on the CDT Manual and Guidelines, please call VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.

Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Project:
VTA requests that the City of Santa Clara continue to support the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Project, with project-related land use and transportation designations and policies that support a BART extension, and a planned BART station on Brokaw Road, east of the Santa Clara Caltrain Station.

VTA would like to work in partnership with the City of Santa Clara in its General Plan update process. We would be happy to attend key meetings and present information related to our CDT program, our Transit Sustainability Policy, the Congestion Management Program, or other VTA programs or efforts. Please do not hesitate to contact us to discuss how we can work with you in this process.

(Initial VTA comments sent on 9/25/08; revised letter sent 9/29/08.)
Great America Campus Expansion
Northeast corner of Great America Parkway and Mission College Boulevard

Description: NOP for a Draft EIR for construction of 718,000 square feet of office space, a 25,000 square foot commons building, and a parking structure, and demolition of an existing 118,000 square foot office building, on 18.5 acres.

VTA Comments:

Environmental Impacts to be Considered:
VTA suggests that the EIR should include more specific analysis of potential environmental impacts of the project in the area of Transportation and Circulation. This should include an analysis of the project’s relationship to the transit, bicycle and pedestrian system, and the project’s impact on Congestion Management Program (CMP) facilities. Consideration should be given to how to mitigate new vehicle trips on CMP facilities, as well as how to reduce vehicle trips overall. This may include Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, as well as land use/site design measures such as land use mix, building orientation, and parking ratios. The following sections provide more specific comments and suggestions in these areas.

Land Use/Transportation Integration and Site Density:
VTA supports policies that target growth around the established transportation cores, corridors, and station areas in the County, as described in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual. Densification in these areas will promote alternative transportation methods and help reduce vehicle miles traveled. The proposed Great America Campus Expansion generally supports these goals by locating substantial new development in close proximity to multiple bus lines. The project is also located roughly two-thirds of a mile from the Great America light rail station, somewhat beyond the typical walking radius of a light rail station but close enough to be easily served by an employer shuttle. We hope the project will result in a dense office complex that integrates transit services and encourages the use of a multi-modal mix of transportation choices.

Transportation Demand Management:
VTA recommends urging large employers to implement transportation demand management (TDM) programs in order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by their employees. The Great America Campus Expansion project offers an ideal opportunity to request the implementation of such a program. Effective TDM programs include:

* Car-sharing
* 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

VTA also recommends providing preferentially located electric vehicle parking with charging stations. Providing charging stations for these vehicles at work and shopping locations allows for more frequent and convenient use of these clean air vehicles.

Site Design:
Based on the Project Description in the NOP, we understand that the parking for the new office buildings will be located on the eastern side of the project site, closest to the Great America theme park. VTA supports the decision to locate parking at the rear and to orient the office uses along the street. We suggest that the project proponents consider the inclusion of a small component of ground-floor retail in the proposed office buildings, as a way of encouraging walking and transit use and reducing automobile trip generation.

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 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.

Bus Service:
VTA provides bus service on Great America Parkway and maintains a bus stop on Great America Parkway north of Mission College Boulevard. In order to provide convenient access for transit service, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to retain the existing bus stop and provide the following improvements:

* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see attached VTA standards).
* An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
City of Sunnyvale

**Tasman-Fair Oaks Pedestrian Circulation Plan Improvements**
Tasman Drive, Fair Oaks Avenue

**Description:** Pedestrian circulation plan improvements

**VTA Comments:**
VTA recommends that no trees be placed in bus stop loading areas for bus stops along Fair Oaks, including the bus stop on northbound Fair Oaks, north of Weddell Drive.
Luminaire/Lawrence Station Road Project
1275 and 1287 Lawrence Station Road, at SR 237

**Description:** GPA & RZ to develop up to 430 residential units and between 14,400 and 72,200 SF of commercial/office uses on a 6.63-AC site.

**VTA Comments:**

**Traffic Analysis**

Trip Generation and Distribution:
Appendix C: Traffic Impact Analysis - The new project trip generation estimates presented in the report for the Near-Term Background, Near-Term Project, and Future 2020 traffic conditions analysis are inaccurate. The trip reduction values from the adopted VTA Congestion Management Program Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, March 29, 2004 version were not used to calculate the new project trips. Page 24, second paragraph of Appendix C states that the internal capture rate (trip reduction percentages) was obtained from the VTA Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, December 2006, which is an internal draft document that has not been adopted by the VTA Board.

On-site System Planning and Design

Bicycle Parking:
The proposed project 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 residential and retail employee use. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines, December 2007 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. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact VTA’s Development & Congestion Management Division.
Sunnyvale Retail Center @ El Camino
El Camino and Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road

**Description:** Demolish existing Pak ’N Save, Shoe Pavilion, and Drug Barn, and construct a new Safeway and other retail spaces on a slightly smaller footprint. Demolish Firestone and build 2 new retail pads totaling 18,000SF.

**VTA Comments:**

**Bus Service:**
VTA provides bus service on El Camino and maintains a bus stop adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the City condition the developer to provide the following improvements:

- A 75’ X 10’ PCC bus stop pavement pad consistent with VTA standards (attached).
- A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout consistent with VTA standards (attached).
- An 8’ X 40’ passenger boarding area
- A 7’ X 25’ bus shelter pad
- No trees in the passenger boarding area

**Bicycle Parking Access:**
VTA commends the project proponent for providing plentiful and convenient bicycle parking options (both Class I and Class II spaces) across the project site, consistent with VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines.

**Pedestrian Access:**
VTA commends the proponent for improving pedestrian access at the northern end of the site by orienting the new retail pads to the street and creating the landscaped plaza between the buildings. These improvements are consistent with VTA’s Community Design and Transportation Manual and the goal of creating pedestrian-friendly, transit supportive development.

The traffic study notes that the pedestrian pathway between Safeway and Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road will be rebuilt into a raised trail. VTA supports this improvement, and we suggest that the developer identify other opportunities to improve pedestrian connections through the parking lots, on both frontages, where possible.
City/County Responses Quarterly Report
Projects Approved in July, August and September of 2008

November 14, 2008

<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California High Speed Rail Authority</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>CHSRA0501</td>
<td>Program EIR/EIS</td>
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<td>5/21/2008</td>
<td>7/9/2008</td>
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**High-Speed Train System**
Bounded by the Pacheco Pass to the south, Altamont Pass to the north, the BNSF corridor to the east, and the Caltrain Corridor to the west.

**Description:** Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train (HST) Program EIR/EIS to evaluate potential impacts of proposed Altamont Pass and Pacheco Pass alignment alternatives and station location options.

**VTA Comments:** (Letter from Michael T. Burns, VTA General Manager to California High-Speed Rail Authority, dated October 2, 2007)

L015-1: The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) strongly endorses the High Speed Train (HST) and supports the Pacheco Pass alignment as the entry point for the HST into the Bay Area.

L015-2: The HST is a vital transportation link, providing a competitive alternative to air travel between Northern and Southern California that will support the continuing economic development of the state. The Pacheco Pass alignment provides a faster, more direct alignment between Southern California and Silicon Valley, a primary engine for growth in the California and national economies. The Pacheco Pass alignment provides the opportunity to serve the three Bay Area urban centers—San Jose, San Francisco and Oakland—with the HTS without having to construct a new crossing of San Francisco Bay. The Mineta San Jose International Airport is projected to have more air travelers between the Bay Area to Southern California than the Oakland and San Francisco Airports combined. The Pacheco Pass alignment better supports this demand.

L015-3: The Caltrain Commuter Rail Corridor from San Jose to San Francisco is fully utilized by the Pacheco Pass alignment and is already in public ownership, requiring the least acquisition of private freight rail rights-of-way in the Bay Area for the HST.

L015-4: In contrast, the Altamont Pass alignment requires a new crossing of San Francisco Bay to serve San Francisco, which will have unnecessary environmental impacts to sensitive South Bay wetlands that are currently being restored in a decades-long process.

L015-5: Furthermore, the Altamont Pass alternative is designed to address a Central Valley to Bay Area commute. There are less expensive ways to address this problem, such as upgrading the existing Capitol Corridor and Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) rail services. VTA supports efforts to improve rail service to relieve commuter traffic from the Central Valley to the Bay Area, but not by using the HST, which must tie San Francisco-Silicon Valley-Los Angeles together without degrading San Francisco Bay.

L015-6: The attachment provides additional comments on the Draft EIR/EIS.
Comments on the Draft Bay Area to Central Valley High-Speed Train (HST) Program EIR/EIS by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority:

Purpose and Need
L015-7: The Statewide Need (S-1.2.2) for the project is related to future growth for intercity travel (Northern to Southern California), capacity constraints at commercial airports, and limits on the ability of airport and highway expansion to accommodate that growth. The Regional Need (S-1.2.3) is related to the Central Valley to Bay Area commute. The draft EIR/EIS should recognize that there are trade-offs for the HST serving both a statewide and regional need, and present those trade-offs when analyzing the alternatives. These trade-offs are reflected in the Bay Area/California High-Speed Rail Ridership and Revenue Forecasting Study, August 2007, prepared by Cambridge Systematics. The Cambridge Report states on page 2-7 that the Pacheco Pass alternative has higher ridership in the Los Angeles-Silicon Valley/San Francisco market. This is an important piece of information that should be highlighted in the Executive Summary. The difference in travel markets served by the two primary alternatives, Altamont and Pacheco, should be clearly understood by the public and decision-makers, and included in the Executive Summary. The Pacheco Pass alternative best serves a statewide need connecting California's major urban centers with few intermediate stations and provides a direct routing between Los Angeles, Silicon Valley and San Francisco. The Altamont Pass alternatives better serves the Northern Central Valley to Bay Area commute market.

L015-8: The limits of expanding airport capacity to address intrastate travel and the role that the HST can play in providing an alternative to intrastate airport trips is not adequately discussed. As California's economy expands and as global markets and travel become increasingly more important to the state, airport expansion must address those needs as a priority, with intrastate travel addressed by rail transit. Mineta San Jose International Airport will carry more Bay Area to Southern California air trips than the other two major Bay Area airports combined, showing the important economic relationship between Silicon Valley and Southern California, as well as the need to have a high-speed rail alternative to address that travel need.

L015-9: Table S.5-1 omits Mineta San Jose International Airport, which is served by alignments using Pacheco Pass. Travelers to and from this airport could use a bus shuttle to and from the San Jose Diridon Station.

L015-10: The unique impacts of the continuing growth in Silicon Valley jobs are not adequately discussed in this section of the document. The synergy between new technologies being developed in Silicon Valley and the entertainment industry in Southern California, for example, increases the need for high quality intrastate travel best addressed by the Pacheco Pass alignment.

Alternatives Description
L015-11: There are 21 alternatives summarized in Table S.5-1. An additional Pacheco Pass alternative that does not include service to Modesto should be added in order to compare the least expensive Pacheco Pass alternative that goes to San Francisco to the least expensive Altamont Pass alternative to San Francisco.

L015-12: The alternatives do not adequately address lower-cost ways of improving transit travel times from the Central Valley to the Bay Area. For example, if the HST is designed to meet a statewide need to relieve airport congestion by linking the Bay Area to Southern California, the Pacheco Pass alignment best fulfills that purpose. This could be combined with improvements to the existing regional rail network, such as expanding and improving the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) and Capitol Corridor Intercity Rail routes at a lower cost to achieve the purpose of relieving Central Valley to Bay Area traffic congestion. A hybrid alternative using HST with a Pacheco Pass alignment combined with a package of improvements to the ACE and Capitol Corridor routes should be evaluated.
Capital Costs
L015-13: The capital costs may be underestimating some elements. For example, a new San Francisco Bay crossing would have extraordinary construction costs, plus substantial environmental and construction mitigation costs.

L015-14: The inclusion of a connection to the Modesto area in every Pacheco Pass alternative does not provide information on the least expensive HST alternative between Southern California and the Bay Area. This is important information that needs to be provided in the document.

Operating Plan
L015-15: The EIR/EIS is not clear on the level of service being provided to individual cities in the Bay Area under different alignment options. For example, the frequency of HST service at San Jose Diridon Station is not clearly delineated for any option. This information needs to be included in the document.

Travel Times
L015-16: Table S.5-1 shows the express trip travel times for San Jose/Silicon Valley-Los Angeles to be 2:09 with a Pacheco Pass alignment versus 2:19 for the Altamont Pass alignment. This is a significant finding and points to the different markets served by the two alternatives.

Ridership
L015-17: The ridership discussion in the Executive Summary (S-1.4.4) and presented in Table S.5-1 does not adequately convey the work done by Cambridge Systematics contained in the previously referenced report. Figure 2.7 in the Cambridge Report shows that Los Angeles-San Francisco ridership is more than 3 million annual riders higher with the Pacheco Pass alternative than with the Altamont Pass alternative. This important point-the fact that Pacheco Pass better serves this intrastate travel market-should be included in the Executive Summary. Figure 2.8 shows that the Pacheco Pass alternative generates $3.1 billion in revenue versus $2.84 billion for Altamont, with Pacheco doing particularly better than Altamont in the Los Angeles-Silicon Valley/San Francisco market. Tables 2.3 and 2.4 show station boardings, and there are sharp contrasts between Pacheco and Altamont that are not conveyed in the Executive Summary. For example, the San Francisco-Transbay Station draws 3 million annual riders more with Pacheco compared to Altamont. San Jose draws 3.3 million annual riders more with Pacheco than with Altamont. This information is important and needs to be conveyed to the public and decision-makers who do not have the time to wade through the background technical reports associated with the EIR/EIS.

Environmental Impacts
L015-18: A new crossing of San Francisco Bay is evaluated as a wetlands impact. The document should treat this as a more extraordinary impact, given the fragile nature of the Bay ecology, and the lengths and expense to which federal, state and local agencies have gone in restoring these wetlands. A more extensive evaluation of a new Bay crossing should be undertaken as part of disclosing environmental impacts of the alternatives. The efforts to restore South Bay wetlands and the detailed impact of a new Bay crossing, including construction impacts, must be studied in more depth as part of a full disclosure environmental document. This effort should include review panels with regulatory agencies and environmental groups, similar to the level of effort taken to peer review the ridership forecasts.

City/County Response: (in Final Program EIR/EIS)
L015-1: Support from the VTA for the Pacheco Pass Network Alternative played a role in the identification in this Final Program EIR/EIS of this alternative as Preferred.
L015-2: Reasons provided by VTA for its support of the Pacheco Pass Network Alternative were among the reasons that this alternative is identified in this Final Program EIR/EIS as the Preferred Alternative. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the Preferred Alternative.

L015-3: The Authority and FRA agree that a major benefit of the Pacheco Pass Network Alternative that uses the Caltrain Corridor is the reduced right-of-way acquisition required, given that the Caltrain Corridor is already in public ownership.

L015-4: Impacts on the San Francisco Bay and sensitive wetlands for the Altamont Pass alternatives serving San Francisco were among the reasons that the Pacheco Pass Alternative is identified in this Final Program EIR/EIS as preferred. The Preferred Alternative identified in this Final Program EIR/EIS is the Pacheco Pass, San Francisco and San Jose Termini, which includes the Henry Miller alignment and would not impact the South Bay wetlands or the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the Preferred Alternative.

L015-5: The Authority and FRA agree that the Central Valley to Bay Area commute is a critical issue that should be addressed. The Authority is working with local and regional government agencies to evaluate and pursue regional rail improvements in the Altamont Corridor to address the important travel demand in this corridor.

L015-6: The additional comments attached to the VTA letter are responded to below.

L015-7: The Authority agrees that the Pacheco Pass best serves the purpose and need for the proposed HST system. This has been included in Chapter 8 and the Executive Summary of this Final Program EIR/EIS. Please also refer to Standard Response 3 regarding the identification of the Pacheco Pass as the Preferred Alternative.

L015-8: The Draft Program EIR/EIS notes in the Purpose and Need Section, Chapter 1, that:
...The interstate highway system, commercial airports, and conventional passenger rail system serving the intercity travel market are operating at or near capacity and will require large public investments for maintenance and expansion to meet existing demand and future growth over the next 20 years and beyond. Moreover, the ability to expand many major highways and key airports is uncertain; some needed expansions may be impractical or may be constrained by physical, political, and other factors.” (page 1-5)
This chapter goes on to note:
As described in the regional transportation plans for areas that would be served by the proposed HST system, the highways and airports serving key cities are operating at capacity, and plans for expansion will not keep pace with projected growth over the next 20-40 years. (page 1-8)

L015-9: Mineta San Jose International Airport has been added to Table 5.8-1 in recognition that HST riders could use a bus shuttle to and from the San Jose HST station.

L015-10: Please see Response to Comment L015-7.

L015-11: The HST system is proposed to ultimately serve not only Modesto but also Sacramento. To provide a fair and objective comparison of the network alternatives (in terms of capital costs, overall impacts, ridership, etc.), the northernmost location in the Central Valley (included in the Bay Area to Central Valley study area) was held constant. Thus the National Environmental Policy Act / California Environmental Quality Act (NEPA/CEQA) evaluation and alternatives comparison was not influenced nor biased by the phasing plan for the HST system. Standard Response
3 and Chapter 8 regarding the Preferred Alternative acknowledge the differences that the Authority's adopted Phasing Plan would have on the cost and ridership for the network alternatives.

L015-12: The Authority and FRA acknowledge VTA’s suggestion for a "hybrid" alternative, with HST in the Pacheco Pass and regional rail improvements in the Altamont Corridor. Pacheco Pass has been identified as the HST Preferred Alternative, and the Authority is in the process of working with the regional partners and stakeholders to plan and pursue regional rail improvements in the Altamont Corridor.

The Authority and FRA agree that regional rail improvements in the Altamont Corridor would exhibit lower levels of adverse impacts (e.g., less right-of-way required, fewer sections of aerial alignment) when compared to an HST system in this corridor. The Authority and FRA agree that Regional Rail improvements in the Altamont Corridor could be developed in such a way as to provide for higher speed commuter rail to better meet commuter travel demand in this corridor. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the Preferred Alternative.

L015-13: The costs associated with the transbay crossing have been examined closely. The two alternatives that include a new transbay tube would have more than 36 acres of potential direct impacts on the San Francisco Bay. To put this into perspective, these alternatives would have 40.3 - 41 acres of potential impacts on water bodies (lakes + San Francisco Bay), whereas the Preferred Pacheco Pass Alternative (HST to San Francisco via the San Francisco Peninsula) would have only 3.8 acres of potential direct impacts. The cost of the additional 8.8-mile HST segment needed to implement a new transbay tube is estimated at about $4.6 billion – over $500 million per mile. Moreover, there is only slightly higher ridership and revenue potential (about 2% higher ridership, or 1.9 million passengers, per year by 2030) when comparing the transbay tube alternative via the San Francisco Peninsula versus the Preferred Alternative. To implement alternatives that included a new transbay tube, extensive coordination would be required with the USACE under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, USFWS, and the California Coastal Commission. Crossing the Bay would also be subject to the USACE, CDFG, and BCDC permit process.

L015-14: Please see Response to Comment L015-11. Table 4.2-3 provides the costs for the HST network alternatives. The remainder of the preferred alignment between Los Angeles and Merced is constant. The alternatives and their associated costs presented in Table 4.2-3 represent the full range of costs for the Bay Area. Assuming the remainder of the system is constant, the delta, or difference, in cost in these alternatives would be the difference for the system costs between Los Angeles and the Bay Area.

L015-15: Section 2.3.3 D (see excerpt below) outlines a conceptual operating plan for the statewide system. A more definitive operating schedule will be developed as part of the project-level analysis. However, a major station like San Jose with the Preferred Alternative will be served by several trains an hour. A description of the types of service that would serve the network is outlined below.

According to the 2030 operating plan, a total of 124-139 weekday trains in each direction would be provided to serve the statewide HST travel market as forecast for the low- and high-end scenarios. Ninety-one to ninety-six of the trains would run between northern and southern California, and the remaining 33-43 trains would serve shorter distance markets. The basic service pattern would provide most passenger service between 6 a.m. and 8 p.m., with a few trains starting or finishing trips beyond these hours. One hundred and twenty-four to one hundred and thirty-nine trains per day could be a highly frequent operation; however, as shown below, when divided into five types of service, the frequency is greatly reduced. Frequencies would be further reduced to serve multiple endpoints. For example, for HST service between northern and southern California through the Central Valley, some trains would go to the Bay Area and others to Sacramento. Therefore, although there could be 19-25 local trains, only a portion of these would serve each endpoint. The following five types of intercity trains are planned:

* Express (16 trains per day): Trains running between Sacramento, San Jose, or San Francisco and Los Angeles or San Diego without intermediate stops.
* Semi-Express (17-26 trains per day): Trains running between Sacramento, San Jose, or San Francisco and Los Angeles and San Diego with intermediate stops at major Central Valley cities such as Modesto, Fresno, and Bakersfield
* Suburban-Express (30-35 trains per day): Trains running between northern and southern California and locally within the major metropolitan areas (i.e., the San Francisco Bay Area and the Los Angeles area) at the beginning and end of the trip without intermediate stops in the Central Valley.
* Local (19-25 trains per day): Trains stopping at all stations. Some of these local trains might ultimately be operated as a "skip stop" or semi-express service, where trains would stop at only a portion of the possible stations on a specific line, to improve the service and better match patterns of demand
* Regional (33-43 trains per day): Sacramento to San Francisco service and early morning service from the Central Valley to San Francisco or Los Angeles/San Diego.

L015-16: Comment acknowledged.

L015-17: Chapter 8 of this Final Program EIR/EIS and Appendix 8A evaluate the differences between the network alternatives. Please also refer to Standard Response 3 regarding the identification of the Pacheco Pass as the Preferred Alternative.

The Altamont Pass and Pacheco Pass HST alternatives: have competitive advantages over each other in particular travel markets. While Altamont Pass generally achieves higher ridership between the Bay Area and northern Central Valley (Merced northward) and the Pacheco Pass achieves higher ridership between the Bay Area and areas from Fresno southward (including Los Angeles and San Diego regions), the relative magnitude of these differences varies among the network alternatives, alignment alternatives, and station location options. It is not possible to convey the nuanced differences among the dozens of key travel markets in the Executive Summary, and it would be misleading to single out the ridership differences for any single travel market or the boardings at any individual station. As noted by the commenter, the key comparative ridership information is fully disclosed in Chapters 2 and 7.

L015-18: The Authority considered the comments received on the Draft Program EIR/EIS prior to identifying the Preferred Alternative. Because of potential impacts on the South Bay wetlands restoration, the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge, and other environmental impacts as well as logistical and operational issues, the Authority identified the Pacheco Pass, San Francisco and San Jose Termini as the Preferred Alternative for the Bay Area to Central Valley portion of the HST system. Please see Standard Response 3 and Chapter 8 regarding the Preferred Alternative.
**PROACTIVE QUARTERLY STATUS REPORT**

**GLOSSARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agriculture Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Across Barrier Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Acre(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Altamont Commuter Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(PD)</td>
<td>Planned Development Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT</td>
<td>Bicycle Technical</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>TOD</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>Transportation Impact Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBP</td>
<td>Utility Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: STIP PPM Fund Transfer Agreement with Caltrans

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to execute fund transfer agreements with the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for four fiscal years from 2009 to 2012 for the State Transportation Improvement Program Planning, Programming and Monitoring Program.

BACKGROUND:

The VTA Board of Directors, at its December 13, 2007 meeting, approved VTA's Regional Improvement Program (RIP) for the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The VTA program included funds for VTA's Congestion Management Agency Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) activities.

The 2008 STIP programs $547,000 for each of the four years from FY 2009 to FY 2012. This is an increase over the prior annual amount, which was approximately $245,000 per year.

PPM funding is provided to Congestion Management Agencies to assist with the costs of preparing the STIP program every other year, performing oversight of projects receiving STIP and/or Federal funding, and performing project development support activities for STIP projects. VTA uses these funds for project development and program oversight activities including preparation of the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Reports.

DISCUSSION:

To receive the PPM funding, VTA is required to execute a fund transfer agreements with
Caltrans for each fiscal year. The recommendation is to approve the attached resolution authorizing the General Manager to execute fund transfer agreements with Caltrans covering the next four years.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no practical alternatives. Caltrans requires that a resolution be adopted by the governing body of the recipient authorizing execution of fund transfer agreements as a condition of receiving the funds.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

If approved, planning, programming and monitoring funds will be available to offset VTA CMA activities for planning, programming, developing and monitoring STIP projects for the four fiscal years from 2009 to 2012.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning (CMPP) Committee considered this item on December 18, 2008 and, on consent without discussion, recommended the approval by the Board of Directors.

Prepared by: Fiore, Celeste
RESOLUTION OF THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA) BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZING THE GENERAL MANAGER TO EXECUTE FUND TRANSFER AGREEMENTS WITH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS) FOR FISCAL YEARS 2009-2012 STIP PLANNING, PROGRAMMING AND MONITORING PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Board of Directors, on December 13, 2007, approved the 2008 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that allocated to VTA $547,000 for each of the four fiscal years from 2009 to 2012 for the STIP Planning, Programming and Monitoring Program; and

WHEREAS, VTA is eligible to receive STIP funding through Caltrans; and

WHEREAS, VTA will use these funds to meet the 1997 Senate Bill 45 (chapter 622, stats. 1997) local requirements for program planning, programming and monitoring STIP projects in Santa Clara County; and

WHEREAS, Caltrans has requested the VTA to execute fund transfer agreements in order to receive the STIP funds.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority that the General Manager is authorized to execute fund transfer agreements and any amendments thereto with Caltrans to receive fiscal years 2009 to 2012 funds for the STIP Planning, Programming and Monitoring Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that VTA agrees to comply with all terms and conditions of the fund transfer agreements.

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

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:

Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Board of Directors

ATTEST: Approved as to Form:

Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary
General Counsel
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Revised BEP Evaluation Criteria

Policy-Related Action: Yes

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the revised Bicycle Expenditure Plan Evaluation Criteria as described in Attachment D.

BACKGROUND:

The long range transportation plan for Santa Clara County, Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035, is currently being updated and is scheduled for adoption in December, 2008. The Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP) is the funding mechanism for planned bicycle projects. It is expected that the BEP will have capacity to add new projects as part of the VTP 2035 and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) scheduled for adoption in March 2009. The BEP is governed by a set of policies adopted by the VTA Board of Directors (BOD), including criteria for evaluating and scoring potential bicycle projects to include in the BEP. The current BEP Evaluation Criteria were last adopted/revised by the BOD in December 2004.

At its May meeting, the BPAC received a presentation of the current BEP Evaluation Criteria to re-acquaint them with the BEP project evaluation process. At its July meeting, the BPAC was presented with an analysis of the existing criteria and staff received comment on a proposed approach to revise the criteria. In August and September, this approach was then presented to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) subcommittee, which concurred with staff recommendations.

At their October 2008 meetings, the BPAC, TAC and CMPP were asked to recommend that the Board of Directors approve the revised BEP Evaluation Criteria. The BPAC and TAC unanimously approved the proposed Evaluation Criteria; however the CMPP requested that the BPAC and TAC reconsider the relative points assigned to Criterion 2 and Criterion 4A.
DISCUSSION:

CMPP Discussion
Member Moylan stated that he was surprised to see the assignment of points between criteria such that Grassroots Community Support would be the same as Access to schools, regional transit, lifeline transit or to/within regional activity center. Both are assigned a maximum of 10 points in the proposed BEP criteria. Therefore Criterion 2 - Access would go from 20% to 10% of the total while whereas it was interpreted that community support would double. Staff pointed out that Criteria 1 (Gap closure) and 3 (Safety) also rate the utility of the project and collectively they are 50% under the proposed criteria. However this is less than the current criteria where collectively they are 60%.

The CMPP discussed the merits of community support versus the utility of a bike project. They discussed the importance of community support in its many levels and many forms, i.e. city council, city plans, community groups and financial, (it was pointed out that Local Match is also a surrogate for local support). It was acknowledged that all of these forms of local support are important to get projects moving. Nevertheless, some members still questioned the appropriateness of giving Criterion 4A the exact same weight as Criterion 2.

Instead of revising the criteria without the benefit of the past discussions and considerations made by the BPAC and TAC, the CMPP asks that these Advisory Committees take another look at it with respect to the aforementioned discussion.

Analysis
Attachment A illustrates the current and proposed weights for the current and proposed evaluation criteria and the CMPP comments.

Criterion 4- The proposed Criteria 4a and 4b more clearly separates grassroots community support from official city support (planning documents, council or BAC). However together, community support has remained almost the same between the two versions with 22% under the existing criteria and 20% under the proposed criteria.

Criterion 2- Access to schools, regional transit, lifeline transit or to/within regional activity center is 20 points under existing criteria, and is reduced to 10 points under the proposed criteria. However, the proposed criteria have a screen that all projects must be countywide or regional, to be in eligible for BEP, where believed we had captured much of this intent. Also Criterion 1 - Gap closure and Criterion 3 - Safety are also very much part of the measure of the usefulness of the project.

Criterion 5- Local Match did increase from 6% to 15%; however, this is a math error due to converting the old criteria, which totaled 50 points. The new criteria were intended to add up to 100 and instead add up to 110. Staff intended criterion 5 and criterion 6 to remain more or less the same as existing; correcting for these would bring the total points to 100, as intended, and would reduce the weight of the local match to the original 6%.

Three approaches are suggested to resolve these issues, as shown in Attachment A and listed below:
1. CMPP preliminary suggestion: Switch points assigned to Criterion 2 and Criterion 4, so that Criterion 2 has 20 points and Criterion 4 (Criterion 4a and Criterion 4b) has 10 points. Fix the weights assigned to Criteria 5 and 6 so that the total is 100.

2. No change to Criteria 2 and 4, but fix the weights assigned to Criteria 5 and 6 so that the total is 100.

3. Increase Criterion 2 to 20 points and leave all other Criteria as proposed in October. The total before the bonus points would be an even 100. The bonus point criteria would remain the same but the new maximum total points possible would be 120. This approach is recommended by staff.

Attachment B presents the Existing BEP Evaluation Criteria and Attachment C is the Proposed BEP Evaluation Criteria presented at the October committee meetings.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The alternatives are presented above.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION /RECOMMENDATION:**

The BPAC and TAC Committee heard this item on November 12 and 13th, 2008, respectively, as requested by the CMPP. They recommended to modify the BEP Evaluation Criteria by increasing the weight of the "Access to Schools and Regional Destinations" criteria to 20 points as discussed by the CMPP and to account for this by reducing the points assigned to meeting the "optimal criteria of the Bicycle Technical Guidelines" to 5 points each for a total of 10 points. They agreed to restore Criteria 5 and 6 scoring to 6 and 4 points, respectively, down from 15 and 5 points. The BEP Evaluation Criteria as shown in Attachment D are recommended for approval by the Board of Directors. These revisions and two other minor changes are underlined.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION /RECOMMENDATION:**

The CMPP heard the recommendations of the BPAC and TAC. Questions pertaining to the relative merits of community support vs. local match were raised and answered. The original memo to the October CMPP meeting recommending adoption of the revised BEP criteria is attached as Attachment E which documents the reasons for revising and separating community support from local match and the other revisions to the criteria. The CMPP unanimously recommended to forward the revised criteria as shown in Attachment D to the Board for approval.

Prepared by: Michelle DeRobertis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>current #</th>
<th>prop #</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Current (adopted Dec '04)</th>
<th>Proposed October 2008</th>
<th>CMPP comment</th>
<th>1. CMPP preliminary suggestion</th>
<th>2. Fix Math Only-original intent</th>
<th>3. Increase Access to Activity Centers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gap closure</td>
<td>(10 points out of 50)</td>
<td>20 points: 20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Access to major activity centers</td>
<td>(10 points out of 50)</td>
<td>10 points: 10%</td>
<td>switch points with #4?</td>
<td>Increase 10 pts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Increase 10 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>(10 points out of 50)</td>
<td>20 points: 20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Community support is slightly different between the current and proposed criteria as show below</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Documented community &amp; neighborhood support? And implies project must be in 1 or more City plans*</td>
<td>(0 points out of 50)</td>
<td>split in 2; see below</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>- BAC endorsement?</td>
<td>(1 point out of 50)</td>
<td>included in 4b</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Grassroots or NGO support or in a Community of Concern?</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>10 points: 10%</td>
<td>switch points with #2?</td>
<td>decrease 10 pts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A and 4</td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>- In one or more City planning documents * and /or BAC endorsement?</td>
<td>Implies project must be in 1 or more City plans*</td>
<td>10 points: 10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current #</td>
<td>prop #</td>
<td>CRITERIA</td>
<td>Current (adopted Dec '04)</td>
<td>Proposed October 2008</td>
<td>CMPP comment</td>
<td>1. CMPP preliminary suggestion</td>
<td>2. Fix Math Only- original intent</td>
<td>3. Increase Access to Activity Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Local Match</td>
<td>(3 points of 50) 6%</td>
<td>15 points: 15%</td>
<td><strong>Make up for math error: Revert back to existing 6%</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Make up for math error: Revert back to existing 6%</strong></td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Multi-jurisdictional etc</td>
<td>(1 point out of 50) 2%</td>
<td>5 points: 5%</td>
<td><strong>Revert to lower %</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Revert to lower %</strong></td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>90**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>BTG bonus</td>
<td>minus 3 points (-6%)</td>
<td>10 points: 10%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>BTG bonus</td>
<td>see above</td>
<td>10 points: 10%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>no change</td>
<td>no change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>110**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*City plans are defined as adopted Bicycle plans, General Plans, CIPs, Specific plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, etc.

**Math error: local match was intended to remain 6% and Multi-jurisdictional was intended to remain 2%.
### Evaluation Criteria for Bicycle Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A SCREEN:</strong> County/ Regional Network</td>
<td>Is the projected included in at least one of the following: Regional Bicycle Network or Plan, Cross-County Bicycle Corridors, Santa Clara County Parks Trails Master Plan, Bay Trail, Short Range Transit Plan? (A &quot;no&quot; answer will be a 3 pt deduction)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B SCREEN:</strong> Governing Board Resolution</td>
<td>Is there a Governing Board resolution authorizing the project application with a committed or commitment to a minimum 20% local matching (non-BEP) funds?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C SCREEN:</strong> Standards</td>
<td>Will the project conform to VTA Bicycle Technical Standards, Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000, MUTCD, Santa Clara County Parks Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use and Management Guidelines, or other state/national guidelines as appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 Gap closures in sidewalk or regional bicycle network serving mobility needs.</strong> Addresses barrier* to completing trip. Increases convenience.</td>
<td>High: Project provides means to overcome a barrier e.g. bridge over freeway, expressway, waterway or rail line) or eliminates a gap (e.g. a new bike lane or a new sidewalk in a corridor without facilities) where no nearby facility exists. Med: Project reduces consequences of an existing barrier or gap to provide more direct non-motorized travel where limited or inferior alternatives exist. Low: Project extends an existing pedestrian facility or regional bicycle route (e.g. bike lane or sidewalk), working towards a gap closure, but not eliminating it.</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 Access to schools, regional transit</strong>, lifeline transit** or to/within regional activity center***</td>
<td>High: Project is specifically designed to significantly improve access to a destination. Project will be within 1/2 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination. Medium: Project will generally enhance access to a destination. Project will be within 1 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination. Low: Project improves upon limited existing access. Project will be beyond 1 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Barriers include major arterials, freeways, major transit facilities, railroad tracks, creek/streams, etc. A substandard or deficient facility is generally considered a "medium" gap.

** Regional transit is transit serving a regional activity center. Lifeline transit serves low-income, transit-dependent communities.

*** Regional activity centers include universities, hospitals, major commercial districts, major employment centers, central business districts and major public venues. Priority should be given to projects serving utilitarian trip purposes when possible. Pedestrian access to or within a regional activity center will be eligible for funding. Bicycle access to or within a regional activity center is only eligible if it is included on the regional bicycle network.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Safety</td>
<td><strong>High:</strong> Project will address a demonstrated safety issue (e.g. collision statistics are high). Project will address safety concern with a proven or demonstrated countermeasure. Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds.</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Med:</strong> Project will improve a situation with some safety issues (e.g. some reported collisions, conflicts, near-misses, or evidence of high vehicle traffic volume or speed). Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with medium ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with medium ADT/medium traffic speeds.</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low:</strong> Project will generally improve safety, even though there are no known problems. Project will reduce exposure/risk of conflicts between motor-vehicles and bike/pedestrians.</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Community Support</td>
<td><strong>High:</strong> Project has strong documented community and neighborhood support. Letters of support OR minutes indicating actions taken in support of project provided. Projects are included in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, etc.</td>
<td>8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Med:</strong> Project has some community &amp; neighborhood support. Projects are included in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, etc.</td>
<td>4-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Low:</strong> Community outreach will be completed as part of the project, but little or none done to date. Projects are included in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, etc.</td>
<td>0-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Project readiness</td>
<td><strong>(a) PLANNING</strong> A feasibility study, alternatives analysis, project study report, or master plan (a) has not been started: 0 pts., (b) is underway: 0.5 pts., (c) completed: 1 pt.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(b) ENVIRONMENT</strong> The environmental document (NEPA/CEQA) for the project (a) has not been started: 0 pts., (b) is underway: 0.5 pts., (c) has been completed: 1 pt.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(c) DESIGN</strong> Design work (a) has not been started: 0 pts., (b) is underway: 0.5 pts., (c) is at or beyond 65% PSE: 1 pt.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(d) ROW</strong> ROW process has not been started: 0 pts; ROW process has not started, but is all under public ownership: 0.5 pts; ROW has been secured: 1 pt.</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Local match</td>
<td>Project can commit over 60% of the total project cost (including the 11.47% required match for federal BEP funds) from non-BEP sources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria for Bicycle Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project can commit between &gt;40% and 60% of the total project cost (including the 11.47% required match for federal BEP funds) from non-BEP sources</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project can commit between &gt; 20% and 40% of the total project cost (including the 11.47% required match for federal BEP funds) from non-BEP sources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Regional Significance Bonus</td>
<td>Demonstrates multi-jurisdictional cooperation****; project is innovative; has potential to be replicated elsewhere; demonstrates regional significance</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 BAC endorsement</td>
<td>The local Bicycle Advisory Committee has endorsed the project for submittal to the Countywide Bicycle Program</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Total: 50

**** Jurisdictions include city/county public agencies, special districts, non-profit organizations, transit, etc.
### Proposed New Criteria Ranking and Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Criteria: Regional or Countywide significance?</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is project in the 2008 Countywide Bicycle Plan? If not explain its regional or countywide significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligibility Criteria: State and Federal Standards?</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the project conform to state and federal standards for bikeways, i.e. HDM Chapter 1000?</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Gap Closure</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compare distance using nearest alternate route of similar type with distance with project. Score 1 point for each 0.25 additional distance up to a maximum of 20 pts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Access to schools, regional transit**, lifeline transit** or to/within regional activity center***</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High: Project is specifically designed to significantly improve access to a destination. Project will be within 1/2 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.</td>
<td>8-10 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium: Project will generally enhance access to a destination. Project will be within 1 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.</td>
<td>4-7 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low: Project improves upon limited existing access. Project will be beyond 1 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination.</td>
<td>0-3 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Safety</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High: Project will address a demonstrated safety issue (e.g. collision statistics are high). Project will address safety concern with a proven or demonstrated countermeasure. Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds.</td>
<td>13-20 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium: Project will improve a situation with some safety issues (e.g. some reported collisions, conflicts, near-misses, or evidence of high vehicle traffic volume or speed). Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with medium ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with medium ADT/medium traffic speeds.</td>
<td>7-12 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low: Project will generally improve safety, even though there are no known problems. Project will reduce exposure/risk of conflicts between motor-vehicles and bike/pedestrians.</td>
<td>0-6 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4A. Community / Grassroots Support</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project supported or sponsored by a grassroots or a Non-Government Organization (NGO) as expressed by letters of support or other signs, and/or is it in a Community of Concern?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4B. Local Agency Support and Planning</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the project in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, and/or does it have the Local BAC endorsement?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Local Match / Project Readiness</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project can commit over 60% of the total project cost from non-BEP sources;</td>
<td>15 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project can commit between 41-60% of total project cost from non-BEP sources.</td>
<td>10 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project can commit betw. 21% -40% of total project cost from non-BEP sources</td>
<td>5 pts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Cooperation, Innovation</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates multi-jurisdictional cooperation****; project is innovative; has potential to be replicated elsewhere;</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** BONUS **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. BTG</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Bike lane, bike path, bike bridge and/or shoulder projects, will the width meet the optimal widths of the BTG</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. BTG</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the project be open for transportation purposes 24 hours a day?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** TOTAL **

* Barriers include major arterials, freeways, major transit facilities, railroad tracks, creek/streams, etc.

** Regional transit is transit serving a regional activity center. Lifeline transit serves low-income, transit-dependent communities.

*** Regional activity centers include universities, hospitals, major commercial districts, major employment centers, central business districts and major public venues.

**** Jurisdictions/agencies include public agencies, special districts, non-government organizations, non-profit organizations, transit, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed New Criteria</th>
<th>Ranking and Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Criteria: Regional or Countywide significance?</td>
<td>Is project in the 2008 Countywide Bicycle Plan? If not, explain its regional or countywide significance.</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Criteria: State and Federal Standards?</td>
<td>Will the project meet or exceed state and federal standards for bikeways, e.g. HDM Chapter 1000?</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gap Closure</td>
<td>Compare distance using nearest alternate route of similar type with distance with project. Score 1 point for each 0.25 additional distance up to a maximum of 20 pts.</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Access to schools, regional transit**, lifeline transit** or to/within regional activity center***</td>
<td>High: Project is specifically designed to significantly improve access to a regional destination. Project will be within 1/2 mile in actual walking/biking distance from destination. 13-20 pts</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Safety</td>
<td>High: Project will address a demonstrated safety issue (e.g. collision statistics are high). Project will address safety concern with a proven or demonstrated countermeasure. Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with high ADT/high traffic speeds. 13-20 pts</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med: Project will improve a situation with some safety issues (e.g. some reported collisions, conflicts, near-misses, or evidence of high vehicle traffic volume or speed). Project will help bicyclists (i) cross a road with medium ADT/high traffic speeds, and/or (ii) provide bicyclists a parallel route to a road with medium ADT/medium traffic speeds. 7-12 pts</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Project will generally improve safety, even though there are no known problems. Project will reduce exposure/risk of conflicts between motor-vehicles and bike/pedestrians. 0-6 pts</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A. Community / Grassroots Support</td>
<td>Is the project supported or sponsored by a grassroots or a Non-Government Organization (NGO) as expressed by letters of support or other signs, and/or is it in a Community of Concern? (COC receives fulls 10 pts)</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B. Local Agency Support and Planning</td>
<td>Is the project in a local, county or community-based plan, such as adopted Bicycle Plans, General Plans, Capital Improvement programs, Specific Plans, Park/Trail Master Plans, and/or does it have the Local BAC endorsement?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Local Match / Project Readiness</td>
<td>High: Project can commit over 60% of the total project cost from non-BEP sources; 6 pts.</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Med: Project can commit between 41-60% of total project cost from non-BEP sources. 4 pts.</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low: Project can commit, betw. 21% -40% of total project cost from non-BEP sources 2 pts.</td>
<td>0-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cooperation, Innovation</td>
<td>Demonstrates multi-jurisdictional cooperation****; project is innovative; has potential to be replicated elsewhere;</td>
<td>0-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONUS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. BTG</td>
<td>For Bike lane, bike path, bike bridge and /or shoulder projects, will the width meet the optimal widths of the BTG</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. BTG</td>
<td>Will the project be open for transportation purposes 24 hours a day?</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Barriers include major arterials, freeways, major transit facilities, railroad tracks, creek/streams, etc.

** Regional transit is transit serving a regional activity center. Lifeline transit serves low-income, transit-dependent communities.

*** Regional activity centers include universities, hospitals, major commercial districts, major employment centers, central business districts and major public venues.

**** Jurisdictions/agencies include public agencies, special districts, non-government organizations, non-profit organizations, transit, etc.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: FY 2009-2018 Mini Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the FY 2009-2018 Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP).

BACKGROUND:

The Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) is a ten-year projection of transit capital and operating expenses and revenues, along with supporting information about the operator’s services and programs. For Fiscal Year 2009, VTA has produced a “Mini” SRTP as defined by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), which presents the Service Evaluation, Operating Plan, and Capital Improvement Program. A full SRTP is required by MTC every four years with Mini’s required on an annual basis. The 2009 Mini SRTP is therefore seen as an update of the 2008 Full SRTP.

DISCUSSION:

VTA issued the 2008 SRTP in January 2008 and is scheduled to complete the 2009 Mini in January 2009. Work on the 2010 Mini will begin in the Spring of 2009 and because VTA will be entering a new 2-year budget cycle, modifications and updates will likely be significant.

The most noteworthy information is presented in the Operating Plan and Capital Improvement Program. Both of these chapters present 10-year projections of both revenues and expenses for operating and capital projects. The SRTP requires that planned transit services must identify the sources of operating revenues to match those services in order to be included in the plan.

The 2006 Measure A Revenue and Expenditure Plan is included as an appendix to the document.
since a fully funded operating plan for the program has not yet been established. As projects are prepared for implementation and operating funding is identified, these projects will be included in the body of future SRTP documents.

It must be emphasized that the projections contained in the 2009 Mini represents the most up-to-date information as currently understood by VTA staff. However, financial information is always subject to change, particularly in the out years of the plan as more information is gathered and financial conditions change over subsequent updates of the SRTP.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board can adopt the FY 2009-2018 SRTP or direct staff to modify the document and recommend adoption pending the incorporation of changes.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact resulting from approval of the FY 2009-2018 Mini Short Range Transit Plan. The Mini SRTP presents updates to VTA’s Operations Plan and Capital Improvement Program, which may indicate future expenditures for transit operations and capital improvements. Approval of the SRTP document makes VTA eligible for federal transportation grants.

**Standing Committee Discussion/ Recommendation**

The CMPP committee had questions on the timing of vehicle purchases and future service levels. The committee approved the FY 2009-2018 SRTP and recommends Board adoption.

Prepared by: Jody Littlehales
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Multi-Modal Design Practices and Principles

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend that the Board of Directors direct staff to follow the multi-modal design approach on all future roadway improvement projects as feasible, including projects within the State right of way.

BACKGROUND:

In 2003, the VTA Board of Directors adopted the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program. At the core of the CDT Program is the *Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use (CDT Manual)*, which sets out guidelines for the development and design of local transportation improvements.

In February 28, 2007, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) granted three projects in Santa Clara County approximately $187 million in Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) program funds, including the US 101 Operational Improvements project. This project includes the complete reconstruction of the US 101/Tully Road interchange. The project is in the 65 percent design phase.

As the interchange is within State right of way, the improvements are required to be designed based on Caltrans Standards. However, VTA and the City of San Jose are proposing to implement a design following principles from the CDT Manual, VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines, and VTA Pedestrian Technical Guidelines that result in an interchange with a multi-modal environment rather than one where the emphasis is strictly on vehicular traffic.
DISCUSSION:

The VTA staff recommendation is that the Board adopt a policy that would direct staff to follow the multi-modal design approach used for the US 101/Tully Road interchange project on all future roadway improvements as feasible, including projects within the State right of way.

The US 101/Tully Road improvements included the following features (also see the attached exhibits):

- Sidewalks widened from 6 feet to 10 feet and shoulders converted into 6-foot bike lanes, with the additional width being taken from the vehicle lanes;
- The outside dimension of the bridge structure remaining the same (no additional structure cost);
- The roadway approaches narrowed (curb-to-curb), with lanes narrowed and sidewalks widened;
- The ramp termini intersections “squared up” to provide lower vehicular speeds to better accommodate pedestrian and bicycle movements;
- Bulb-outs at intersections where feasible to decrease the distance pedestrians have to travel across vehicular pathways; and
- Widened sidewalks not only provide a safer environment for pedestrians, but also allow for placement of street trees to enhance the overall corridor environment.

Following multi-modal design principles such as those above from the start of a project development process should not result in additional costs to the project. In fact, there may be minor savings because of the reduced improvement footprint.

ALTERNATIVES:

VTA could choose to not adopt this policy and direct staff to continue using Caltrans Design Standards for roadway projects.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no direct fiscal impact due to this policy recommendation, however depending on the final design configuration there could be an impact on project costs. Depending on the final design of this project, there may be additional construction costs to accommodate the reconfiguration. If needed, VTA staff is considering applying federal Transportation Enhancement funds to cover the additional costs. This grant programming action would be brought to the VTA Board for approval in early 2009.

STANDING COMMITTEE/DISCUSSION RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee heard this item on December 18, 2008 and unanimously recommended that the VTA Board of Directors take the action to approve this item.

Prepared by: Jim Costantini and Casey Emoto
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Regional Transit-Oriented “Bike Share” Program

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Direct staff to conduct a Bike Sharing Pilot program as described in the recommendations outlined in the attached memorandum.

BACKGROUND:

In late 2008, a ground swell of interest in developing bike sharing programs began sweeping through the county. VTA, the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition (SVBC), local employers and several cities are all interested in developing Bike Sharing Programs. During October 2008, VTA and the SVBC convened a meeting of interested parties consisting of city, business, and public agency staff representatives. San José Councilmember Sam Liccardo and Palo Alto Councilmember Yoriko Kishimoto assumed leadership roles at this meeting describing their visions and support for bike sharing.

The key meeting outcomes included: 1) a recognition that there are many possible approaches; 2) that whatever approach must fit Santa Clara County’s conditions; 3) the first program must be successful proof-of-concept if we want to fulfill the vision of countywide bike sharing programs; and 4) that some initial planning work take place to in define a proof-of-concept “Pilot” program. Accordingly, it was generally agreed that a Pilot Program was needed to address these outcomes.

DISCUSSION:

The initial steps of a Pilot Program would involve identifying consumer needs/markets, a management and operating approach, and key locations. A pilot program would undoubtedly focus on one or more Caltrain stations which would address all of the issues identified above and involve the potential partners who have expressed interest.
Potential partners include Caltrain, who is experiencing chronic shortage of onboard bicycle capacity, cities with high demand Caltrain stations, visitors’ bureaus and chambers of commerce, the SVLG, major employers, VTA and SVBC. Attachment A provides a memorandum from Board Members Yoriko Kishimoto, Sam Liccardo, and Ken Yeager recommending support for a Regional Transit-Oriented “Bike Share” Program.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could decide to not authorize staff to proceed with the study.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact as a result of this action. However, future long-term fiscal impact and potential funding sources for a “Bike Share” Program would be a primary focus of the initial analysis and evaluation being recommended.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION /RECOMMENDATION:**

The CMPP heard the presentation by Sam Liccardo and unanimously recommended that the Board approve the recommendations in the memo.

Prepared by: Michelle DeRobertis
To: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

From: Board Members Yoriko Kishimoto, Sam Liccardo, and Ken Yeager

Subject: A Regional Transit-Oriented “Bike Share” Program

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Conduct staff analysis and evaluation of opportunities to contract with private parties to pilot a “bike share” program at a few key transit nodes such as downtown San Jose, Palo Alto and Mountain View;
2. Concurrently refer to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for discussion and input;
3. Return to the Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee with results of staff’s preliminary study regarding proposed implementation of a pilot “bike share” program at key transit nodes.

BACKGROUND:

Commuting by bicycle brings widespread benefits for air quality, carbon emissions, public health, fiscal savings, and community well-being. Improving this “mode share,” or the percentage of all trips taken by bicycle, may seem like hard slogging in this car-dependent Valley. Yet despite our habitual driving, over forty percent (40%) of our automobile trips extend less than two miles. Those shorter routes appear ripe for increased bike usage, particularly with improved bike facilities, such as lanes and racks. Even on those longer routes, transit could become a more viable option if transportation planners could solve the “first mile/last mile” quandary—one that afflicts communities with low-density, sprawling development patterns. Bicycles provide an inexpensive solution to that problem, by getting people to and from key transit nodes where home and work venues may exceed walking distance from transit. In short, we have ample room to grow the “mode share” of bicycling as a commute option.

Signs of hope abound in our Valley. Palo Alto significantly increased its rate of bicycle commuting by creating “bicycle boulevards” on select streets, orienting stop signs to provide the right-of-way to cyclists on the boulevard. In San José, recent surveys by the Friends of Guadalupe River Park and Gardens indicate that several hundred cyclists
already rely upon the recently-completed trails along the Guadalupe to reach jobs in North San José and Downtown each day. Usage increased 70% from 2007 to 2008 alone.

With this in mind, on September 29, 2008, representatives from the Silicon Valley Bike Coalition, SAMTRANS, the City of Palo Alto, the City of Mountain View, the City of San Jose, BAAQMD, and several other organizations gathered to discuss the possibility of a “bike share” program for VTA. The conclusion shared by all was that bike share programs could help provide local transportation in employment and business centers for everyone, whether they commute by transit or car.

**DISCUSSION:**

“Bike share” refers to a privately-managed program of short-term rental of bicycles from unattended “docking stations” with the use of a credit card or pre-programmed membership card.

This program can solve two problems. First, it can overcome the inhibitions of those reluctant to store their own bikes at public racks. Second, where cyclists often cannot find space to board their bikes on CalTrain, Light Rail, and buses, a bike share program at key transit hubs can boost transit ridership and bike use.

Boarding trains and light rail with bikes has become more difficult with increased usage of bicycle and transit usage in recent years. Currently, only 13% of Caltrain riders with bikes actually park their bike at the station; the remainder bring them along the train, resulting in over 2,300 bicycle boardings per day. In a 2007 survey, 42% of cyclists reported having experienced an inability to board Caltrain five times or more in the past year because the “bicycle car” was full. Obviously, this lack of predictability will deter many commuters from using Caltrain, Light Rail, ACE, or the Capitol Corridor. Bike share helps resolve this issue, without the expense of adding rolling stock to the trains.

Bike share programs, managed by private companies, have already enjoyed considerable success in many European cities. The French city of Lyon adopted a system in May 2005, relying upon JC Decaux, a contractor already familiar to denizens of San José’s downtown for its self-cleaning restrooms. By linking bike share with other transit modes, Lyon’s program has 2,000 bicycles at 175 docking stations, resulting in up to 16,000 rentals per day. Since Paris initiated the same program (the “Vélib”) in 2007, it has logged as many as 120,000 bike rentals per day, and the city has earned some $31 million in revenue from subscribers.¹ JC Decaux also runs programs in Vienna, Brussels, Seville, and Cordoba.

In the United States, Washington D.C. will embark upon a program of its own. Under the D.C. model, “SmartBike DC” users pay a $40 annual fee to pick up a bike

---

from ten select docking stations around the city and return them to any other station. For funding, the program relies upon Clear Channel Outdoor, which leverages the bike rack installations for advertising space. Minneapolis has just issued a Request for Proposals for its own bike sharing program, a copy of which is attached to this memorandum as Appendix A.

The critical benefit comes not in the mere use of rental bikes by those otherwise likely to ride anyway, but in enticing new riders. As one Vancouver transportation official has noted, “[e]xperience from Lyon suggests that a significant increase in private cycling trips is likely to occur as well since the public bicycle system acts as a ‘door opener’ to increase the acceptance of cycling as an urban transport mode.”

Obviously, Santa Clara County lacks the residential density and transit development of many European cities. Yet innovative companies and communities, such as Google and the Stanford Business Park, have shown that a closed-system bike-share program can work, and they may provide a suitable launching pad. The City of San José is also embarking on its own employee-only system.

PROPOSAL AND FISCAL IMPACT:

We urge evaluation of a regional “bike share” concept that focuses on transit nodes, such as one that places a docking station at key CalTrain and Light Rail stops throughout the Valley. For instance, a pilot might focus on a handful of CalTrain, Light Rail, and bus stations—Palo Alto, Mountain View, Santa Clara, Diridon, Eastridge, Great Mall, and Gilroy—and expand outward. The program would have multiple goals, but the most immediate might focus on enhancing transit ridership, that is, eliminating riders’ risk of becoming “bumped” from oversubscribed “bike cars” or buses with full racks.

Start-up funding of such a program would constitute a critical focus of staff’s work. Various models should be considered, including those that rely on sale of advertising rights, and more modest, publicly funded approaches. Many projects complete for scarce Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) dollars, so VTA should look at other sources as well, including foundation grants and regional governmental agencies such as MTC and BAAQMD. The VTA could also turn to private sources beyond advertisers; for instance, high-density developers and employers eager to reduce parking ratios on transit-oriented projects might have an incentive to invest in “bike share” infrastructure on-site. VTA staff should explore, with our regional partners, various means by it could leverage private and state funding to launch this innovative program here in Santa Clara County.

Some cities have tinkered with bike share pilot projects with less success, and we can learn from their lessons. In Portland, city officials noted a high rate of theft of bike parts. For that reason, successful systems rely upon using non-standard bike types, secure self-rental devices activated by credit cards. The key to the model lies in its capable execution by a competent private vendor/sponsor.

ClearChannel also operates similar programs in Barcelona, Oslo, Stockholm, and Rennes.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Countywide Expressway Study - 2008 Update

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Endorse the Santa Clara County Countywide Expressway Study.

BACKGROUND:

Adopted in 2003, the Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study provides a long-term plan for the improvement and maintenance of the County Expressway System. It includes all areas of need: capacity and operational improvements, signal operations, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and finishing elements such as landscaping and sound walls. It also includes a summary of ongoing operating and maintenance needs and funding strategy recommendations.

The 2003 Expressway Study formed the basis for the VTP 2030 Expressway Program and provided a list of expressway-related bicycle improvements for the VTP 2030 Bicycle Program.

DISCUSSION:

A similar collaborative planning process that was used to develop the 2003 Expressway Study was used for the 2008 Update. A Technical Working Group (TWG) consisting of staff from the cities with expressway mileage, South County cities, Caltrans, MTC, and VTA met six times to provide ongoing technical input. At their last meeting on August 22, 2008, the TWG reviewed the Administrative Draft 2008 document and concurred with moving it forward for approval.

The 2008 Draft Study is the first update of the 2003 Expressway Study. While it is primarily an administrative update to reflect new conditions, it also tackled some key issues unresolved in the
2003 Study. These issues included developing an expenditure plan for the highest priority expressway capacity and operational improvements, integrating South County’s Santa Teresa-Hale Corridor’s needs into the project lists, and developing a plan to more completely accommodate pedestrians on all expressways. Similar to the 2003 Study, it also forms the basis for the Expressway Program in VTP 2035 and provides a list of expressway-related bicycle improvements for the VTP 2030 Bicycle Program. Attachment A is the Draft 2008 Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study.

There are six elements that make up the Expressway Study. The main element is the Capacity and Operational Improvement element that includes a project list with capacity projects, operational and safety improvements, signal operational improvements, and high occupancy vehicle system projects. Another component is the Bicycle element, which looks at accommodation of bicycles on the Expressway system. Next, the Pedestrian element focuses on pedestrian route planning through the identification of continuous routes and providing pedestrian travel along both sides of the expressways wherever possible. The Finishing element involves improvements to expressway medians and edges. The Maintenance element includes all activities and material necessary to keep the expressways functioning safely and effectively while looking presentable.

The VTA/County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) reviewed and commented on the development of the bicycle and pedestrian elements in April and May 2008 and reviewed the entire draft 2008 Update on September 10, 2008, followed by additional discussion of the Pedestrian Element on October 8, 2008, culminating in a recommendation that the County Board of Supervisors approve the document.

The Expressway Study Policy Advisory Board (PAB) was reconvened for the 2008 Update. The PAB consisted of elected officials from the Board of Supervisors, cities with expressway mileage, South County cities, and VTA and representatives of the County Roads Commission. The PAB met three times during the update process to provide policy input. VTA Board Members Nancy Pyle (San Jose) and Dominic Caserta (Santa Clara) represented VTA on the PAB. The PAB recommended that the Board of Supervisors adopt the Draft 2008 Update dated October 9, 2008, after a public and city review process and incorporation of some changes discussed at the PAB meeting into an addendum sheet. Attachment B is the Addendum Sheet to the October 9, 2008, Draft 2008 Update document. Attachment C summarizes comments made by the VTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee and Technical Advisory Committees.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board may request changes to the Countywide Expressway Study. Changes may require approval from the PAB and the County Board of Supervisors.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact as a result of this action.
STANDING COMMITTEE/DISCUSSION RECOMMENDATION:

The TAC and CMPP approved the item to move forward to the Board for action. VTA has approved the Tier 1A project list that is in the Countywide Expressway Study and has included these projects in VTP 2035. Funding decisions on the Express way projects are considered future considerations by the VTA Board and therefore, the recommendation is to endorse the plan without endorsing the funding assumptions and expectations included in the plan.

Prepared by: John Sighamony
Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study

DRAFT 2008 UPDATE
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Adopted in 2003, the Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study provides a long-term plan for the improvement and maintenance of the County Expressway System. It includes all areas of need: capacity and operational improvements, signal operations, high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and finishing elements such as landscaping and sound walls. It also includes a summary of ongoing operating and maintenance needs and funding strategy recommendations.

The 2008 Update is the first update of the 2003 Expressway Study. While it is primarily an administrative update to reflect new conditions, it also tackled some key issues unresolved in the 2003 Study. These issues included developing an expenditure plan for the highest priority expressway capacity and operational improvements, integrating South County’s Santa Teresa-Hale Corridor’s needs into the project lists, and developing a plan to more completely accommodate pedestrians on all expressways.

The same collaborative planning process used to develop the 2003 Expressway Study was used for the 2008 Update. Elected officials and staff from twelve cities and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), representatives from the County Roads Commission, and the County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) participated in the development of the Update. Public comments will be solicited during the circulation of the Draft Update document.
Accomplishments Since 2003

The benefits of having the 2003 Expressway Study have been substantial and systemwide. The Study has brought a greater understanding of the value provided by the expressway system as part of the transportation system in Santa Clara County. It has also increased awareness of what is needed to keep the expressway system functioning well, thereby, helping the County take advantage of every possible opportunity. The highest priority expressway capacity and operational improvements (Tier 1A) became the Expressway Program in the VTA Valley Transportation Plan 2030 (VTP 2030), laying the groundwork for grant allocations and federal earmarks. In addition, the comprehensive list of expressway needs has been a resource for cities in conditioning developers to provide improvements.

Specific project delivery accomplishments include:

- **Capacity and Operational Improvements** – Twelve of the 28 highest priority expressway capacity and operational improvements (Tier 1A at-grade projects) have been completed or funded by various grants, County funding sources, and city contributions through developer mitigations. In addition, six of the seven next highest set of priority projects (Tier 1B grade separation projects) have full or partial funding commitments from city development impact fees.

- **Bicycle Improvements** – Nine of the eleven projects listed in the 2003 Study have been delivered or funded. These improvements involved widening shoulders at pinch points and improving delineation of shoulder areas for bicycle use.

- **Pedestrian Improvements** – Some progress has also been made in providing pedestrian improvements as identified in the 2003 Pedestrian Element including constructing new sidewalk segments along five of the expressways, providing crossing enhancements at several high demand locations, and installing pedestrian countdown timers at 39 intersections.

Little or no progress has been made in providing new and higher replacement sound walls or installing new landscaping due to a lack of funding sources. In addition, no progress has been made to increase levels of effort for expressway operations and maintenance. Rather, the annual operations and maintenance shortfalls were exacerbated by the declining value of the gas tax and the year-by-year uncertainty whether the State would borrow roadway maintenance funds, making it a challenge to sustain current levels of effort.
**Capacity and Operational Improvement Element**

As in the 2003 Study, the 2008 Update capacity and operational improvements include the following types of projects:

- **Capacity Projects** – Roadway widening, new turning lanes at intersections, and new or reconfigured interchanges/grade separations.

- **Operational and Safety Improvements** – Auxiliary lanes, median/access closures, and bridge replacements.

- **Signal Operational Improvements** – Traffic Operations System (TOS) equipment using advanced technologies to monitor and improve traffic flow, replacement of outdated equipment, and expanded coordination with city signal systems.

- **High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) System Projects** – Recommendations to improve the effectiveness of the HOV system, including corrective actions dealing with high violation rates and removing a little-used peak-hour queue jump lane on Central Expressway.

The total roadway capital program includes 74 projects at an estimated cost of $2.2 to 2.6 billion. To determine priorities for funding and implementation, the projects were divided into tiers using slightly modified criteria from the 2003 Study. Table ES-1 provides a summary of the tiers and Figure ES-1 maps the highest priority projects (Tier 1A and 1B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Tier Criteria</th>
<th># of Projects</th>
<th>Cost (2008 $/millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>Improves 2001 and 2006/07 LOS F intersections, provides operational improvements, or conducts feasibility studies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>Constructs interchanges at 2001 LOS F intersections</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>Improves 2025 projected LOS F intersections</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provides other expressway capacity improvements or new technologies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$875-930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reconstructs major existing facilities or constructs new facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$861-1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,231-2,551</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle Element

Bicycles are accommodated on all expressways and along the Santa Teresa-Hale Corridor. The 2003 Bicycle Element focused on bringing all expressways into compliance with the Expressway Bicycle Accommodation Guidelines. No changes in policy or approach are made in the 2008 Bicycle Element. A total of six projects are shown in the Bicycle Element. Included are projects from the 2003 Bicycle Element that have not been completed, a systemwide bicycle signal detection improvement project, and an improvement for the Santa Teresa-Hale Corridor.

Pedestrian Element

In line with the County’s belief that the safest way to accommodate pedestrian use of expressways is on improved sidewalks behind the curb or on parallel routes off the expressway, the 2008 Update has taken a far more proactive pedestrian route planning approach than the 2003 Study. The goal of the 2008 Update was to identify continuous routes, either in the right-of-way or along alternate parallel routes, providing for pedestrian travel along both sides of the expressways wherever possible. The 2008 Update Pedestrian Element completely replaces the 2003 Expressway Study Pedestrian Element, including all policies, project lists, and recommendations.

The net results of this proactive approach for pedestrian route planning are recommendations for 38 miles of new sidewalks, a comprehensive signage program to help guide pedestrians along parallel routes, and a recommendation that all expressway intersections should include design considerations for pedestrian crossing enhancements whenever opportunities arise for these improvements.

Finishing Element

The Finishing Program Element involves improvements to expressway medians and edges. These improvements include sound wall, landscaping, and street lighting. The 2008 Update carries forward the 2003 Study recommendations for 63,500 feet of new sound walls and replacing 36,000 feet of existing walls with higher sound walls. In addition, the basic level of landscaping recommended continues to be trees and limited shrubs, median finishes (such as decomposed granite), sound walls covered with ivy, and automated irrigation systems. Due to a lack of adequate annual funding for landscape maintenance, the Update also continues to support the County’s policy to only allow installation of new landscaping if full recovery of capital and maintenance costs can occur.
New to the Finishing Element for the 2008 Update is the consideration of pedestrian scale lighting to support the ambitious pedestrian access plans. Because the utility and maintenance costs of street lighting are high and beyond the means of the expressway system’s operating budget, the Update includes a policy similar to the landscaping policy, where installation of pedestrian scale street lighting along the expressways is only allowed if full recovery of capital and maintenance costs can occur.

**Annual Operations and Maintenance Costs**

Operations and maintenance (O&M) include all activities and material necessary to keep the expressways functioning safely and effectively while looking presentable. It includes signal operations, sweeping, pavement maintenance, landscape maintenance, enforcement, and aging infrastructure replacement. As part of the 2003 Study, target levels of effort were developed. The 2003 Study also indicated that the annual costs for these target levels of effort exceeded existing available revenues.

Since the 2003 Study, the annual O&M costs for the target levels of effort have grown 51% (from $18 million to $27.2 million) due to increased labor and material costs as well as an expanded Traffic Operations System that must be maintained. With an annual cost estimate of $27.2 million in 2008 dollars and only $10.8 million expected to be available for expressway O&M in 2009, there will be an annual shortfall of $16.4 million to achieve the target levels of effort. This shortfall is expected to grow as real gas tax revenue declines.

**Funding Strategy**

With approximately $2.5 billion in capital needs (see Table ES-2) and an annual $16.4 million shortfall for operations and maintenance, some innovative and aggressive strategies are needed. In reviewing all known and potential capital funding sources, the net result through 2035 is likely to be:

- All Tier 1A projects and half of the Tier 1B projects will be funded over the next 25 years. In addition, most of the bicycle needs and some of the pedestrian needs will be funded.

- The following needs will not be funded: the remainder of the Tier 1B projects; the roadway projects in Tiers 1C, 2, and 3; most of the pedestrian needs; and the sound walls and landscaping needs listed in the Finishing Program.
It will be a challenge to maintain the current O&M levels of effort, and it will not be possible to expand the levels of effort to reach any of the targets without an increase in sustainable revenue sources. O&M efforts necessary to maintain the safety of the expressway system will continue to be the highest priority for the limited funding. However, the forecast is that pavement conditions will decline, the County will be less responsive to signal timing requests, there will be less sweeping and more weeds/litter, and most other non-critical maintenance will be deferred.

The County will continue to take the following actions: pursue all possible grants and partnerships for expressway improvement and O&M needs; work with the cities to acquire traffic mitigation fees and new development conditions to support the expressway system; and, support all state efforts to index the gas tax to inflation and to increase the gas tax to help fund the O&M needs of the expressway system. However, these actions are not likely to be enough to deliver all the high priority capital needs or increase O&M levels of effort.
Acquiring new revenue sources for both capital and O&M needs is very difficult in the current economic environment. However, some opportunities do exist and the following strategies are recommended to meet the needs identified in the 2008 Update:

- Request full funding for the Tier 1A Capacity and Operational Improvements in VTP 2035 with Tier 1B projects also listed should additional funding become available.
- Seek $52 million from the 2010 STIP for the first set of Tier 1A projects with follow up requests of $25 million and $12 million from the 2012 and 2014 STIPs, respectively, to fund a little over half of the Tier 1A projects by 2015.
- Seek funding from VTP 2030’s Pavement Maintenance Program to cover the next round of expressway pavement maintenance needs to come due between 2010 and 2012 at a cost of approximately $12-15 million annually.
- Advocate for a commitment from future High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane revenue to help improve and maintain sections of expressways and Santa Teresa-Hale if determined to be within HOT lane corridors.
- Explore, through State liaison, opportunities for opening a State maintenance revenue stream for expressways.
- Support initiatives for vehicle registration fees or vehicle miles traveled fees to help fund expressway and local road improvement and maintenance needs.
- Advocate that MTC institute a return-to-source policy for its 10-cent gas tax authority giving the cities and County local control to meet high priority O&M needs, or continue to pursue new local funding sources for expressway O&M needs, taking advantage of partnerships with other local agencies facing annual deficits in road O&M budgets and pursue a 10-cent gas tax as a local initiative.

Next Update

The County will update the Expressway Study every four years in conjunction with the regular updates of VTA’s VTP plans to reflect changing traffic and financial conditions. Special tasks recommended for the 2012 Update include conducting new traffic modeling to project future conditions, evaluating the HOV performance targets, updating the sound wall needs list, and assessing where pedestrian crossing improvements are needed at expressway intersections. Similar to the 2003 Study and 2008 Update, a collaborative process involving elected officials, local agency staff, and the public will be used to develop the 2012 Update.
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ADDENDUM SHEET
DRAFT 2008 UPDATE

On October 9, 2008, the Comprehensive County Expressway Planning Study’s Policy Advisory Board (PAB) recommended that the County Board of Supervisors approve the Expressway Study Draft 2008 Update after public and city review. As part of the PAB’s discussion, some changes were suggested for the Draft 2008 Update document. These changes are listed below and should be considered part of the Draft document, dated October 9, 2008, currently out for public and city review. Text additions are underlined (e.g., underlined) and deletions are noted by strikethrough (e.g., deletion).

Executive Summary, Page ES-8, third bullet, and Section 7 Funding Strategy, Page 78, third bullet, make following word correction:

- “Seek funding from VTP 2030’s 2035’s Pavement Maintenance Program to cover the next round of expressway pavement maintenance needs to come due between 2010 and 2012 at a cost of approximately $12-15 million annually.”

Executive Summary, Page ES-8, fourth bullet, Section 7 Funding Strategy, Page 73, fifth bullet, and Page 78, fourth bullet, make following word change:

- Replace the terms “High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane” and “HOT lane” with the term “Express Lane” consistent with the new regional name for these types of facilities.

Section 4 Pedestrian Element, Page 52, third bullet, add word to following paragraph:

- “The cities will decide which sidewalks or crossing enhancements will be built first by applying for the VTA funds and providing one-third of the project costs as the city’s match, or by partnering with the County to apply for other grant sources. It is strongly recommended that the cities give priority consideration to improving pedestrian safety by focusing on the following types of locations:”

Section 4 Pedestrian Element, Pages 52-53, add the following bullet:

- “Expressway capacity and operational projects will include new sidewalks consistent with the pedestrian route plans shown in Figure 7 where meaningful and continuous segments can be included in the project limits. These projects will also provide crossing enhancements at major intersections included within the project limits. No existing sidewalks will be eliminated by roadway improvement projects.”
Section 7 Funding Strategy, Page 73, add the following bullets as potential funding opportunities:

- “Proposition 1A on the November 2008 ballot will provide funding to begin construction of a high speed rail line between Northern and Southern California. This funding could benefit Tier 2 and Tier 3 Capacity and Operational Improvements related to Caltrain grade separation projects along Central Expressway.”
- “Naming rights are a way to bring private sector funding into public works projects. The County of Santa Clara is exploring ways to generate naming rights revenue related to all of its facilities. There may be opportunities to use naming rights revenue related to the expressway system, perhaps using resources such as the Department’s website, since current Board policy is that the expressways themselves will not be renamed.”
- “The County has had discussions with the City of San Jose about relinquishing Capitol Expressway to the City when light rail is built in the median. Capitol Expressway is one of three expressways that are geographically located in just one city. Relinquishment of these expressways to the relevant cities would reduce the operating and maintenance burden on the County.”

Section 8 Future Updates, Page 80, add the following bullet:

- “Determine whether changes are needed in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements to support any revisions to the cities’ General Plan Circulation Elements that are made to implement the California Complete Streets Act, recently adopted in AB 1358. AB 1358 requires cities to modify their circulation elements to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways commencing with any updates to the circulation elements that occur after January 1, 2011. The County anticipates that the cities will include the expressways in their circulation elements and can use the Expressway Study’s Bicycle Element and Pedestrian Element provisions to help define the expressway’s role in the city’s balanced, multimodal transportation network. In the 2012 and future updates, it can be determined whether adjustments are needed to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Elements (e.g., the pedestrian route plans) based on the changes to the cities’ circulation elements.”
Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (BPAC)

At September 2008 meeting, the BPAC passed the following motion on the Pedestrian Element of the Comprehensive Expressway Planning Study:

A vote of 11 ayes, 1 no, and 1 abstention recommended that the County Board of Supervisors Adopt the County Comprehensive Expressway Planning Study with the following changes added to the document where appropriate.

Add this (text):
- If contradiction exists between prior Board of Supervisors policy and the Implementation Plan of a later date, the Implementation Plan takes precedence.
- The Implementation Plan is official policy of the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors and Santa Clara County.
- A "wide shoulder" shall be a shoulder that meets bike lane standards, which are shown in the Pedestrian-expressway maps of the 2003 Implementation Plan as five feet or wider width.

At the December meeting the BPAC was presented with the entire Comprehensive Expressway Planning Study. They were informed by the Board assistant that they could not take action and that the CMPP and BOS would be hearing this as an information item. The BPAC requested that the item come back to them as an action item. Staff advised them to make some comments in the event that the item does not get rescheduled as an action. County staff responded that action could be deferred to February and still be in time for the county schedule. In addition, the BPAC offered the following comments:

- Concern about language in prior board polices being superseded by this Plan
- Concern that informal pathways not be eliminated or posted as “No Pedestrians”
- Shoulder width comply with BTG, interested in the County making use of the VTA guidelines
- Would like the County adopt VTA guidelines rather than having two separate guidelines

Dan Collen stated that County staff at took the BPAC comments that were made in the (September) motion and included them in the transmittal to the Policy Advisory Board.

December Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
The TAC endorsed the plan. TAC discussion focused on the financial assumptions in the plan; there was concern that programming decisions and the timing of funding availability. Since these can’t be pre-determined the TAC suggested that the final plan be amended to reflect this.
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: Freight Railroad Relocation – Utility Relocation Agreement with Alameda County Transportation Authority and City of Fremont

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a Utility Relocation Agreement with Alameda County Transportation Authority and the City of Fremont for the purpose of relocating conflicting utilities for the Mission Warren Truck Rail Program. The utility relocation agreement will be for $24.3M, of which VTA’s share is not to exceed $7.8M.

BACKGROUND:

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

VTA entered into cooperative agreements on February 2, 2006 with the Alameda County Transportation Authority (ACTA) for preliminary engineering, and on January 4, 2007 with ACTA and the City of Fremont for final design of the combined improvements at Mission Boulevard (S.R. 262), Warren Avenue, and other FRR activities. These projects are collectively known as the Mission Warren Truck Rail (MWT) Program. VTA has now completed 65% design on the combined MWT Program improvements and will complete bid-ready construction.
documents in October 2009. The FRR activities were environmentally cleared by VTA in a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The FRR activities and cost estimate was presented to the VTA Board on June 5, 2008.

The Utility Relocation Agreement will outline the roles and responsibilities of each of the agencies and the overall funding plan for utility relocations.

**DISCUSSION:**

Utilities in conflict with the MWT Program of improvements have been identified. The utility relocation design to remove those conflicts will be finalized during the Final Engineering phase of the MWT Program. VTA will work with each of the utility owners, Kinder-Morgan, MCI, Level (3), Qwest, Sprint, Pacific Gas & Electric, and AT&T, to coordinate their utility relocation activities with future MWT improvements. Chevron has already relocated their facility during an earlier phase of the program at their cost.

Although utility relocation costs have not been finalized as design is still on-going, the cost responsibilities by each of the agencies are described below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Responsible</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>VTA</th>
<th>ACTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal petroleum lines</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitudinal fiber optic lines</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street utilities</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated value of relocations</td>
<td>$8.8M</td>
<td>$7.8M</td>
<td>$7.7M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under the proposed agreement, ACTA and the City will authorize VTA to act on their behalf for relocating conflicting utilities within the MWT Program.

It is necessary to begin the utility relocation effort in early 2009 to support the advertise date of December 2009 for major construction and the completion date of 2014 for the MWT Program.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board may decide to delay this agreement until a full funding agreement with ACTA and the City of Fremont for the entire MWT Program is executed, but this would delay VTA in complying with the UPRR Purchase and Sale Agreement and jeopardize grant funds secured for the Warren Avenue grade separation.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Appropriation for this utility relocation is included in the Adopted FY09 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital Budget. Funding for the expenditures will be provided by Alameda County Transportation Authority ($7.7M), the City of Fremont ($8.8 million), and 2000 Measure A ($7.8 million).
STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning & Operations Committee considered this item on December 19, 2008. The Committee asked if the two funding partners had committed their funds and whether current economic conditions put those funds at risk. Staff responded that the partners’ funding is reliable. The issue is one of timing and when this Spring the funds will be available.

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

Prepared by: John Donahue
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: Freight Railroad Relocation - Contract Award for Construction of Berryessa Creek Crossing, Abel Street Seismic Retrofit, and UPRR Railroad Relocation

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with Gordon N. Ball, the lowest responsible bidder, in the amount of $15,242,004 for the construction of the Berryessa Creek Crossing, Abel Street Seismic Retrofit, and UPRR Railroad Relocation.

BACKGROUND:

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

The Berryessa Creek Crossing, Abel Street Seismic Retrofit, and UPRR Railroad Relocation Contract (C210) is the first of several VTA construction contracts for FRR activities. The scope of Contract C210 extends from approximately Scott Creek Road to Montague Expressway and includes the following work activities:

- Earthwork including embankment and subballast within UPRR right-of-way in preparation for the UPRR’s installation of track;
• Replacement of the railroad crossing at Berryessa Creek with a box culvert;
• Seismic retrofit of the Abel Street Overhead, including constructing a skirt wall at one bent to accommodate the widening of Berryessa Creek;
• Construction of pier protection walls at Abel Street Overhead and Calaveras Boulevard Overhead;
• Replacement of the railroad crossing at Scott Creek with a box culvert;
• Construction of an approximately 1,140 foot long retaining wall north of Wrigley Creek culvert;
• Grading and drainage improvements;
• Creek diversions as necessary for the construction;
• Support and protection of existing utilities.

The work will be conducted within an operating rail yard and adjacent to active tracks. Contractor will be subject to restrictions to ensure safety and continuing yard operations.

Following Contract C210 construction, UPRR forces will perform the track and signal work. Once UPRR work is completed, VTA’s property from Kato Road in Fremont to Curtis Avenue in Milpitas is available for VTA’s use.

Construction under this contract will begin in February 2009 with completion scheduled for January 2011.

The next major FRR construction contract will be the Mission Boulevard/Warren Avenue UPRR Railroad Relocation (C101), to be advertised in late 2009. The limits of work for both Contract C101 and Contract C210 are shown in Exhibit A.

This contract was originally issued for bid on July 10, 2008 to begin the contractor pre-qualification and bidding phase. Bids were received on September 12, 2008. Following a thorough review of the bid documentation submitted, and in consideration of the questions raised post-bid, VTA elected to reject all bids and re-advertise the contract. The bid results of the re-advertisement of this contract are reported in this Board Memorandum.

**DISCUSSION:**

Contract C210 was issued for bid on November 13, 2008. The contractor pre-qualification list created during the original advertisement of this contract in July 2008 was used. Six bids were submitted on December 10, 2008, with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordon N. Ball</td>
<td>$15,242,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGW Construction</td>
<td>$15,337,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert A. Bothman</td>
<td>$15,594,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCI Construction</td>
<td>$15,740,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viking Construction</td>
<td>$15,753,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite Construction</td>
<td>$16,644,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer’s Estimate</td>
<td>$18,156,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VTA staff during their bid analysis raised questions on documentation submitted by the apparent low bidder, Gordon N. Ball, regarding the pre-qualification of sub-contractors. Additional documentation and clarification have been provided by Gordon N. Ball such that it has been determined that Gordon N. Ball is the lowest responsible and responsive bidder. The bid is 16% under the Engineer’s Estimate. The bid is fair and reasonable, and staff recommends award of this contract to Gordon N. Ball. The high number of bidders and extremely aggressive pricing is a result of the very competitive bidding environment that continues to exist in this region’s construction market.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board could elect to reject all bids and readvertise the contract. This alternative is not recommended as the resulting delay would have the first phase of construction in Berryessa Creek miss the 2009 summer window, delaying the contract work by 12 months.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action would commit $15.3 million to FRR. Sufficient funds are available in the FRR budget to perform this work. The budget for this work was included in the FRR FY 2009 Budget Amendment (Board Action June 5, 2008). The current budget and commitment status of FRR is shown in Exhibit B.

For Contract C210 and associated costs, Santa Clara Valley Water District under a Cooperative Funding Agreement between VTA and Santa Clara Valley Water District has committed a maximum of $16.6M for their share of the work scope based on an approximate 20% SCVWD and 80% VTA share of the planned work scope. VTA’s cost share of C210, $12.3M, will be funded by 2000 Measure A funds. Including the commitment of $15.3 million for Contract C210, $82.6 million in uncommitted budget remains in FRR.

**SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE):**

Based on identifiable subcontracting opportunities, a Small Business Enterprise (SBE) goal of 9% has been established for this contract. Gordon N. Ball met the goal and has committed to 9.18% SBE participation on this contract.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Transit Planning & Operations Committee considered this item on December 18, 2008.

The Committee commented that the bid amount is approximately 20% under the estimate.

Following a discussion regarding the bid analysis performed by VTA staff that determined Gordon N. Ball was a responsive and responsible bidder, the Committee asked about potential protests to the recommended award by the 2nd or 3rd low bidder, and the likelihood of success of any such protest. Staff responded that it had thoroughly reviewed all issues concerning the validity of the Gordon N. Ball bid, and was confident in its recommended award.
The Committee asked what constitutes “responsible”? Staff responded quality, fitness to perform, past performance and reference checks.

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

Prepared by: John Donahue
EXHIBIT A

C-101 & C-210 Project Limits
EXHIBIT B

FRR Budget and Commitments Status

Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous Budget (for UPRR Right-of-Way and FRR Design)</td>
<td>$ 90.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08/09 Budget</td>
<td>$ 45.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2008 Board FRR Budget Action</td>
<td>$ 72.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Measure A</td>
<td>$ 38.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Transportation Authority</td>
<td>$ 7.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td>$ 10.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
<td>$ 15.6 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Board Approved FRR Budget                                             $207.3 million

Commitments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committed Through November 30, 2008</td>
<td>$101.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Management Services (Board Action November 6, 2008)</td>
<td>$ 3.9 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kato Road Grade Sep Design (Board Action November 6, 2008)</td>
<td>$ 4.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C210 Board Memorandum (pending)</td>
<td>$ 15.3 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Incurred and Pending Commitments                                      $124.7 million

Total Uncommitted Budget Remaining:                                         $ 82.6 million
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: FY 2007 Transit Security Grant Program - Base

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to submit and execute grant applications and agreements, certifications, assurances, and other documents as necessary to receive $1,517,185 from the U. S. Department of Homeland Security's FY2007 Transit Security Program (Base).

BACKGROUND:

In June 2008, the Board of Directors adopted a Resolution satisfying OHS’ requirement for both the base and supplemental FY2007 TSGP funds. Recently, OHS has revised this requirement and directed grant applicants to submit separate Board Resolutions for the base and supplemental funds. This Board Memorandum was created to satisfy the revised requirement. Another Board Memorandum is included for the supplemental grant funds.

The FY2007 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act provided funds for a discretionary grant program to address security and preparedness enhancements for rail and bus transit systems. The Governor of the State of California designated the Office of Homeland Security (OHS) as the State Administrative Agency (SAA) to administer the funds for security and preparedness enhancements for bus and rail transit systems. For the FY2007 grant cycle, VTA was identified as a Tier I transit property, eligible for funding for both bus and rail transit. For this grant cycle, funding allocations for bus and rail properties were based upon risk analysis criteria developed at DHS.

For the FY2007 grant cycle, VTA was eligible to compete with eight transit agencies for approximately $22.2 million ($13,820,695 base and $8,400,000 supplemental) allocated to the
Bay Area Regional Transit Security Working Group (RTSWG). The priority for these funds is protecting critical transit infrastructure from terrorism, NIMS training, and Security Awareness training.

The FY2007 Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP) includes a requirement that the eligible transit systems selected for funding adopt a Resolution to authorize the submittal and execution of grant applications and agreements, certifications, assurances and other documents as necessary to obtain federal financial assistance provided by the DHS and participate in the RTSWG. The purpose of the RTSWG is to develop Regional Transit Security Strategies (RTSS) as well as a regional consensus on the expenditure of FY2007 TSGP funds. VTA staff continues to actively participate in the RTSWG.

For the FY2007 TSGP (Base) cycle, DHS allocated $1,517,185 to VTA. In December 2007, VTA submitted Investment Justifications to DHS for the following transit security projects:

- National Incident Management System (NIMS) training. NIMS training is a comprehensive, national approach to incident management that applies to all jurisdictional levels and across functional disciplines.
- CCTV video on demand and laser intrusion detection systems (LIDS) at Baypointe, I-880, Great Mall, Montague, Cropley, Tasman and Convention Center light rail stations.

VTA was awarded $1,122,880 and $394,305 for these projects in July and November 2008, respectively.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could choose not to accept the grant or select other qualifying security projects. The RTSWG and OHS must approve all changes in project scope. TSA has final approval authority.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no net fiscal impact as a result of this action. Authorization to receive the grants will fund programs and projects authorized in the FY09 VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Operating and Capital Budgets.

**STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Committee asked if there are any matching funds required for either the base or supplemental grant awards. Staff responded that matching funds are included in the FY09 Transit Enterprise Operating Fund and Capital Budgets. While specific matching funds are not required, some local dollars are needed to fund non-eligible expenses.

The Committee recommended that staff evaluate delegation of approval on these types of items, particularly when they have been through the Board process previously. The Committee further recommended staff evaluate organizational and financial impacts when determining whether delegation is appropriate.
Prepared by: Julia Jones
Resolution No. ______________

FY2007 TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL AND EXECUTION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES AND OTHER DOCUMENTS AS MAY BE NECESSARY FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND SUBGRANTED THROUGH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS, the United States (U.S.) Department of Homeland Security (DHS) provides federal financial assistance to eligible grantees, and

WHEREAS, the California Governor’s Office of Homeland Security (OHS) is the grantee for U.S. DHS federal funds in the State of California, and

WHEREAS, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is an eligible subgrantee for DHS funding through the California OHS;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority that the General Manager or designee is hereby authorized to file and execute grant applications and grant agreements, certifications, assurances, and other documents as may be necessary for the purpose of obtaining federal financial assistance provided by the Federal DHS and subgranted through the State of California Governor’s OHS.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on January 8, 2009 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

________________________________
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Board of Directors
I HEREBY CERTIFY AND ATTEST that the foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced, passed and adopted by the vote of 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.

Date: _____________

_______________________________
Deborah Harrington, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS FORM:

_______________________________
Counsel
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: FY2007 Transit Security Grant Program-Supplemental

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

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to submit and execute grant applications
and agreements, certifications, assurances, and other documents as necessary to receive $949,079
(Supplemental).

BACKGROUND:

In June 2008, the Board of Directors adopted a Resolution satisfying OHS’ stated requirement.
Recently, OHS has revised this requirement and directed grant applicants to submit separate
Board Resolutions for the base and supplemental funds. This Board Memorandum was created
to satisfy the revised requirement. A separate Board Memorandum is included for the base
grant funds.

The FY2007 Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Appropriations Act provided funds for a
discretionary grant program to address security and preparedness enhancements for rail and bus
transit systems. The Governor of the State of California designated the Office of Homeland
Security (OHS) as the State Administrative Agency (SAA) to administer the funds for security
and preparedness enhancements for bus and rail transit systems. For the FY2007 grant cycle,
VTA was identified as a Tier I transit property, eligible for funding for both bus and rail transit.
For this grant cycle, funding allocations for bus and rail properties were based upon risk analysis
criteria developed at DHS.

For the FY2007 grant cycle, VTA was eligible to compete with eight transit agencies for
approximately $22.2 million ($13,820,695 base and $8,400,000 supplemental), allocated to the
Bay Area Regional Transit Security Working Group (RTSWG). The priority for these funds is protecting critical transit infrastructure from terrorism, NIMS training, and Security Awareness training.

The FY2007 Transit Security Grant Program (TSGP) includes a requirement that the eligible transit systems selected for funding adopt a Resolution to authorize the submittal and execution of grant applications and agreements, certifications, assurances and other documents as necessary to obtain federal financial assistance provided by the DHS and participate in the RTSWG. The purpose of the RTSWG is to develop Regional Transit Security Strategies (RTSS) as well as a regional consensus on the expenditure of FY2007 TSGP funds. VTA staff continues to actively participate in the RTSWG.

For the FY2007 TSGP (supplemental) cycle, DHS allocated $949,079 to VTA. In December 2007, VTA submitted Investment Justifications to DHS for the following transit security projects:

- CCTV video on demand and laser intrusion detection systems (LIDS) at Baypointe, I-880, Great Mall, Montague, Cropley, Tasman and Convention Center light rail stations.

VTA was awarded $633,661 and $315,418 for these projects in June 2008 and November 2008, respectively.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Board of Directors could choose not to accept the grant or select other qualifying security projects. The RTSWG and OHS must approve all changes in project scope. TSA has final approval authority.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no net fiscal impact as a result of this action. Authorization to receive the grants will fund programs and projects authorized in the FY09 VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Operating and Capital Budgets.

**STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

The Committee asked if there are any matching funds required for either the base or supplemental grant awards. Staff responded that matching funds are included in the FY09 Transit Enterprise Operating Fund and Capital Budgets. While specific matching funds are not required, some local dollars are needed to fund non-eligible expenses.

The Committee recommended that staff evaluate delegation of approval on these types of items, particularly when they have been through the Board process previously. The Committee further recommended staff evaluate organizational and financial impacts when determining whether delegation is appropriate.

Prepared by: Julia Jones
Resolution No. ______________

FY2007 TRANSIT SECURITY GRANT PROGRAM
Supplemental

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SUBMITTAL AND EXECUTION OF GRANT APPLICATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, CERTIFICATIONS AND ASSURANCES AND OTHER DOCUMENTS AS MAY BE NECESSARY FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND SUBGRANTED THROUGH THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

WHEREAS, the United States (U.S.) Department of Homeland Security (DHS) provides federal financial assistance to eligible grantees, and

WHEREAS, the California Governor’s Office of Homeland Security (OHS) is the grantee for U.S. DHS federal funds in the State of California, and

WHEREAS, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is an eligible subgrantee for DHS funding through the California OHS;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority that the General Manager or designee is hereby authorized to file and execute grant applications and grant agreements, certifications, assurances, and other documents as may be necessary for the purpose of obtaining federal financial assistance provided by the Federal DHS and subgranted through the State of California Governor’s OHS.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors on January 8, 2009 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

________________________________
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Board of Directors
I HEREBY CERTIFY AND ATTEST that the foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced, passed and adopted by the vote of 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.

Date: _____________

__________________________________________
Deborah Harrington, Secretary
Board of Directors

APPROVED AS FORM:

__________________________________________
Counsel
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: Program Augmentation for Transportation Planning and Mass Transit Studies

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Augment the total value of contracts permitted under the previously approved Transportation Planning and Mass Transit Studies on-call list from $6,000,000 to $7,000,000.

BACKGROUND:

VTA staff is continuing transportation planning activities for 2000 Measure A projects, including the BART Extension to Milpitas, San Jose and Santa Clara; the Downtown East Valley Transit Improvement Project, encompassing the Capitol Expressway Light Rail Project and development of the Santa Clara Street/Alum Rock Avenue Corridor; Bus Rapid Transit Service; Caltrain; and future rail corridors. VTA is also initiating an aggressive Joint Development Program at VTA transit stations.

On September 29, 2005, the VTA Board of Directors approved an on-call list of consultants to support the Transportation and Mass Transit planning activities of the 2000 Measure A projects and VTA’s Joint Development Program. Each contract was approved for a maximum three-year period with an option for two additional years. The approved list of on-call consultants is:

- Connetics Transportation Group, Atlanta, GA;
- Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants, San Jose, CA;
- Hexagon Transportation Consultants, San Jose, CA;
- IBI Group, San Francisco, CA;
- Kimley-Horn and Associates, Oakland, CA; and
Consulting services provide transportation planning, mass transit, and site analysis studies and planning assistance. Typical examples of studies that these consultants will be requested to perform are:

- Station Area Planning;
- Travel Forecast modeling;
- Travel demand model assessments required by FTA;
- Operations service planning for VTA and interfacing transit agencies;
- Trip-reduction strategies for transit-oriented development;
- Transit mode and demand analyses; and
- Intermodal service analyses.

The maximum allowed aggregate value of all contracts to be issued under that list was originally set at $1,000,000. On June 1, 2006, the VTA Board of Directors increased this maximum aggregate value to $2,500,000. On November 1, 2007, the VTA Board of Directors increased this maximum aggregate value to $6,000,000. VTA staff is preparing a new request for qualifications for circulation in 2009 to establish a new list of on-call consultants that would be available to support subsequent Transportation and Mass Transit Planning activities.

**DISCUSSION:**

Projects in the 2000 Measure A Program and the Joint Development Program are in the development stages where transportation planning studies are necessary to support program development, planning and preliminary engineering activities. To date, under this on-call list, contracts have been advanced to provide services for the Caltrain Capital Needs Study, the BART Economic Effects Evaluation, and travel demand modeling and operations planning activities for the BART Extension Project during the Federal New Starts process. Continued and additional support of the 2000 Measure A Program projects including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Caltrain, Light Rail and the BART Extension will be required.

A total of $5,354,676 has been allocated to program activities as listed below:

- $ 600,000 to Hexagon Transportation Group for BART Extension Travel Demand Forecasting;
- $ 975,000 to Connetics Transportation Group for BART Extension Operations Planning and Cost Modeling;
- $ 3,345,000 to Kimley-Horn and Associates for Caltrain Capital Needs Study, Station Area Planning, Parking Studies and Planning Support to the SVRT Project; and
- $ 434,676 to Wilbur Smith Associates for BART Economic Effects Analysis.

Advancing the 2000 Measure A and Joint Development program activities requires augmentation of the maximum total value of all contracts granted under this on call list. Also, this on-call list of consultants will provide planning services related to satisfying FTA federal funding requirements for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Project BART extension. Staff recommends that the amount be increased by $1,000,000, increasing the total from $6,000,000 to $7,000,000 for anticipated needs over the two years remaining (through 2010) of the list eligibility.
**FISCAL IMPACT:**

This action would authorize up to $1,000,000 additional expenditures for transportation planning as needed. Appropriation for these expenditures is included in the Adopted FY09 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program Fund Capital and VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Operating Budgets.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee reviewed the request for an additional $1 million for transit planning studies. The committee members voted unanimously to approve the increased expenditure amount with no comments.

Prepared by: Dennis Ratcliffe
Contracts Office
List of Selected Firms
RFQ 05-05 Transportation Planning – Mass Transit

FIRM
IBI Group
225 Bush Street, Suite 1620
San Francisco, CA 94104
PM: David McCrossan, Sr. Transportation Consultant
(415) 439-8358
FAX: 439-8304

SUB
ARUP – Transit Planning
WRT – TOD/Urban Design
Lea + Elliott Transportation Engineering

FIRM
Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
555 12th Street, Suite 1230
Oakland, CA 94607-4095
PM: Leyla Hedayat
(510) 625-0712
FAX: 625-0714

SUB
HNTB Corporation for transit planning

FIRM
Wilbur Smith Associates
201 Mission St., Suite 1450
San Francisco, CA 94105
PM: Peter Martin, Principal Transportation Planner
(415) 495-6201
FAX: 495-5305

SUB
Technical Expert: no subs

FIRM
Connectics Transportation Group, Inc.
1175 Peachtree St., NE, Suite 414
Atlanta, GA 30361
PM: Dennis Markham, Sr. Associate
(510) 883-9614
FAX: 404-888-0418
SUB
Technical Expert: no subs

FIRM
Fehr & Peers associates, Inc.
255 N. Market Street, Suite 200
San Jose, CA 95110
PM: Robert H. Eckols, Senior Associate
(408) 273-1700 X214
FAX: 278-1717

SUB
Tech Consultant: no subs

FIRM
Hexagon Transportation Consultants
40 S. Market Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95113
PM: Jill Hough, Principal Associate
(408) 971-6102
FAX: 971-6102

SUB
Tech Consultant: no subs
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: N/A

FROM: Board Member Dolly Sandoval

SUBJECT: 2009 Board of Directors Meeting Calendar

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the 2009 Board of Directors Meeting Schedule.

DISCUSSION:

The Board of Directors Regular Meeting is generally scheduled on the first Thursday of the month in the Board of Supervisors' Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, or as otherwise posted. There are a few exceptions to the regular schedule in 2009.

1. Four Workshops are proposed to be held on February 27, April 24, September 25 and December 10, 2009, at 9:00 a.m.

2. A Joint VTA/BART Board Meeting to be held on March 20, 2009, at 9:00 a.m.

3. One Special Meeting is proposed on June 18, 2009, at 12:00 p.m. in lieu of the July Board of Directors meeting similar to prior years.

4. A Committee of the Whole is proposed on July 16, 2009, at 12:00 p.m.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact.

Prepared by: Deborah Harrington
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


FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Please find attached the Inaugural Semi-Annual Progress Report for the Facilities Program for the period ending September 30, 2008.

This is the first issue of what will be an important report for the Committee. The goal of this report is to communicate overall progress in a simple yet informative manner. We look forward to your continued feedback on this report as the Facilities Program moves forward.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning & Operations Committee received this item on December 18, 2008. The Committee complimented the format of the report, noting that the photographs and the pie charts illustrating funding are informative and easy to understand.

Prepared By: John Rowe
Facilities Projects

Semi-Annual Report
September 2008
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FACILITIES PROJECTS
SUMMARY REPORTS
Passenger Facilities Projects

Bus Stop Improvements

Estimated Cost: $1.7 million  
Approved Budget: $1.7 million  
Year of Completion: 2009  
Project Manager: John O’Brien  
Designers: VTA  
Contractor: J.J.R. Construction

Project Description:
This project is part of an annual program to identify, repair and upgrade bus stops. The scope of the upgrades includes concrete bus pads along roadways and pedestrian access improvements. In addition, accessibility improvements will be made to enable wheelchair use of the bus stops and to provide appropriate access clearances.

Specific work locations include the Capitol Transit Center, and locations in the cities of Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara and San Jose.

Project Status:
Construction on the Phase I of the Bus Stop Improvements FY08 work and the improvements at the Capitol Transit Center have been completed. Project closeout is underway.

Design is nearly complete on Phase II of Bus Stop Improvement FY08 work. The 95% design review began at the end of September 2008.

The Bus Stop Improvements FY09 65% Design Package review began at the end of September 2008.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design (FY 08 Ph II)</td>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>Dec-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (FY 09 Ph I &amp; II)</td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>Jul-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (FY08)</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Jan-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (FY09)</td>
<td>Feb-09</td>
<td>May-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout (FY 08 - FY 09)</td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>Jun-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget (a)</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Budget Balance (d = a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>1,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>722</strong></td>
<td><strong>696</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,080</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 39%
Approved Budget Committed 41%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0638</th>
<th>P-0638</th>
<th>P-0676</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0.62</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.54</td>
<td>$1.16 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.61 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td><strong>$0.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.77 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 35%
Federal 65%
Passenger Facilities Projects

De Anza College Transit Center

**Estimated Cost:** $2.4 million

**Approved Budget:** $2.8 million

**Year of Completion:** 2009

**Project Manager:** Jing Quan

**Designers:** VTA

**Contractor:** Bianchi-Amaker Construction

**Project Description:**

The project consists of constructing a new bus stop on the De Anza College campus. This entails removing 11 parking spaces and modifying the existing landscaping and is estimated to cost $1.1 million.

The new facilities will include a new bus stop, a passenger plaza with one bus shelter, and other improvements. A new concrete walkway will be added within the existing landscaped parking lot median to connect the campus to the new bus stop. Various underground utilities in conflict with the bus stop improvement will also be re-routed.

Since De Anza College requires that construction only take place in summer months, Phase 2 work involving Campus Drive roadway improvements, estimated at approximately $1.3 million will be constructed in the summer of 2009.

**Project Status:**

For **Phase I**, the majority of construction, including the bus stop, is complete. Shelters have been installed, punch list items are underway and VTA Operations is planning to bring the new bus stop into service on October 6, 2008.

**Phase II** will include engaging a consultant to work on an a report assessing Campus Drive structural integrity and implementing required roadway upgrades.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Phase II</td>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase II</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout Phase I</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Phase II</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>Sep-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout Phase II</td>
<td>Sep-09</td>
<td>Oct-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget (a)</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Budget Balance (d = a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,106</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,833</strong></td>
<td><strong>810</strong></td>
<td><strong>522</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,311</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 18%
Approved Budget Committed 29%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

---

## Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0.87 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$1.97 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.83 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal 31%
Local 69%

---

Passenger Plaza Area with Bus Pad and Shelter

Crosswalk Connecting Campus with the Bus Stop Area
Passenger Facilities Projects

Upgrade LR Stations Public Address System

Estimated Cost: $1.5 million
Approved Budget: $1.5 million
Year of Completion: 2010
Project Manager: Ramesh Dhingra
Designer: SBTA / Lamoreaux McLendon
Contractor: TBD

Project Description:
The project consists of a comprehensive assessment and of implementation of upgrades to the existing Public Address (PA) System at Guadalupe Corridor stations from Tasman Station in the north to Santa Teresa and Almaden Stations in the south.

The project includes modifying the split platform stations to allow PA messages to individual platforms rather than to both platforms at the same time.

Project Status:
Lamoreaux McLendon (as subconsultant to SBTA) has been awarded a work order to perform the comprehensive assessment of the public address system. Once that is complete they will prepare a design as well as contract bid documents that takes into account the results of the assessment and the available budget. This work will be coordinated with the VTA DPI real time information project.

Design review is anticipated in late 2008, with construction to begin in mid 2009.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>Nov-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Nov-09</td>
<td>Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Approved Budget:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Budget</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,506</strong></td>
<td><strong>198</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,428</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 5%
Approved Budget Committed 13%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

**Anticipated Funding:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.5 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local 20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal 80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race Station PA Speakers on VMB Lighting Pole

Winchester Station PA Speakers on an overhead power pole
Passenger Facilities Projects

Tamien Safety Improvements

**Estimated Cost:** $0.15 million  
**Approved Budget:** $0.15 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2009  
**Project Manager:** VTA - Andrew Ho  
**Designers:** DMJM Harris & AECOM  
**Contractor:** The Best Electrical Co.

**Project Description:**
This project will add lighting along the bike path from the Tamien Caltrain Station to Willow Street. The existing wall lighting will be replaced and/or upgraded. Free-standing bollard lighting will be removed and replaced with street lighting.

Substantial funding for construction will come from the Measure A Caltrain Safety Enhancements Project.

**Project Status:** Bids were received on the construction contract on September 24, 2008. Construction is scheduled to start in October 2008.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Bar" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Blue Bar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red Bar" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Red Bar" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td>Jun-09</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Purple Bar" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Purple Bar" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 42%
Approved Budget Committed 87%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0.12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.03 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.15 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bike Path Looking North, Toward Willow Street

Bike Path, Looking South
Maintenance of Way Projects

Guadalupe Platforms Retrofit – South Line

Estimated Cost: $23.0 million
Approved Budget: $23.0 million
Year of Completion: 2009
Project Manager: Ehsan Ilyas
Designer: Nolte Associates
Contractor: Robert A. Bothman

Project Description:
The platform retrofit program involves retrofitting the stations on the original Guadalupe line to accommodate VTA’s low floor light rail vehicles. This project will retrofit platforms from the Children’s Discovery Museum south to Santa Teresa and Almaden Stations. Work will also include upgrades of the Public Address System, shelter lighting, furnishings, painting and landscaping.

Once completed, VTA’s entire light rail system will be fully accessible, with level boarding at every station platform.

Project Status:
At present, the project has retrofitted eleven LRT stations to allow level boarding for low floor vehicles. The completed stations are: Tamien, Children’s Discovery Museum, Virginia, Curtner, Branham, Capitol, Almaden, Oakridge Mall, Ohlone/Chynoweth, Blossom Hill and Cottle. These stations have all been returned to the revenue service. Some communications, shelter lighting, and punch list work continues on these stations.

Snell and Santa Teresa stations were closed for retrofit in late September. Both stations are expected to return to revenue service in November. Communication, lighting and punch list work will continue on all stations until the end of January, when contract completion is anticipated.

In addition, VTA is amending the construction contract to include the installation of Closed Circuit TV (CCTV) systems at the Tamien and Curtner stations. This additional work will be completed prior to November 26, 2008.

A later phase of work will involve the retrofit of elevators and escalators. Development of the scope cost and schedule of this effort is currently underway.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jan-08</td>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Construct</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevators/Escalators</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance d = (a - c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>18,294</td>
<td>15,613</td>
<td>12,187</td>
<td>6,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>2,193</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,947</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,806</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,197</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 62%
Approved Budget Committed 78%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$16.60 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>6.35 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22.95 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal 72%
Local 28%

Completed Ohlone/Chynoweth Station
Completed Curtner Station
Maintenance of Way Projects

Rail Rehabilitation – Downtown Transit Mall

Estimated Cost: $3.7 million
Approved Budget: $3.7 million
Year of Completion: 2009
Project Manager: Andrew Ho
Designer: Rail Surveyors & Engineers, Inc.
Contractor: Stacy & Witbeck, Inc.

Project Description:
This project consists of the replacement of three single-track curves and embedded track in Downtown San Jose. The rail in this area has experienced extreme wear and rail has cracked in some locations.
The three curves are located at the following intersections:
- Second and San Carlos Streets
- Second and Devine Streets
- First and Devine Streets.

In addition to the curves, one diamond, located at the intersection of First and Devine Streets, requires replacement. The girder rail system for the existing track work locations will be replaced with a tee rail boot system with restraining rail. Granite tile paving integral to the two track curves at Second and San Carlos Streets and Second and Devine Streets will be salvaged and replaced in-kind.

An added benefit of replacing damaged rail is reduced rail-wheel generated noise.
Also included in this project is the assessment of the VTA track system to determine a rail replacement plan for future years.

Project Status:
The track replacement has been completed. Remaining work includes re-installation of granite tiles, punch list items, and contract closeout. Rail lubricator installation will take place later in fall 2008 under a separate contract.

Rail assessment of the initial (Northline) segment is complete; subsequent segments will be assessed in the late 2008 / early 2009 timeframe.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Sep-07</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Jan-08</td>
<td>Nov-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>Nov-08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>1,993</td>
<td>1,772</td>
<td>684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,485</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,845</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,875</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Approved Budget Incurred: 50%
- Approved Budget Committed: 67%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$3.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.7 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Federal: 80%
Local: 20%
Green Facility Improvements – Irrigation Controllers

Estimated Cost: $0.5 million
Approved Budget: $0.5 million
Year of Completion: 2009
Project Manager: Marc Delong
Designer: Stantec
Contractor: TBD

Project Description:
VTA’s Green Facility Improvements Program seeks to make VTA’s facilities more “green” by reducing resource consumption.

One element of this overall program consists of replacing outdated irrigation controllers.

The outdated controllers will be replaced with new weather-based irrigation controllers that utilize evapotranspiration-based adjustments and two-way control and programming via a web-based interface. The contractor will also be responsible for all work related to the replacement of the existing irrigation controllers.

Project Status:
Bid Opening is scheduled for October 3, 2008, with construction work beginning in November 2008.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td>Feb-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Feb-09</td>
<td>Mar-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget $a$</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs $b$</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs $c$</th>
<th>Budget Balance $d = (a-c)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>333</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>447</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Approved Budget Incurred**: 11%
- **Approved Budget Committed**: 67%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.5$ million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.5$ million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 100%
Maintenance of Way Projects

Left Hand Turn Abatement

**Estimated Cost:**
$2.3 million

**Approved Budget:**
$2.3 million

**Year of Completion:**
2010

**Project Manager:**
Ehsan Ilyas

**Designer:** VTA

**Contractor:** TBD

**Project Description:**
VTA has experienced over 100 left hand turn and track intrusion incidents resulting in injuries, damage to VTA equipment, and service disruptions.

This project will be performed in two phases. Phase I will implement strategies to reduce intrusions at high-incident locations including:

- Relocating stop bars and limit lines
- Installing striping and pavement markings
- Installing additional signage and bollards
- Replacing existing “Train Approaching” signs with dual flash “Train Approaching/No Left Turn” icon signs.

The second phase may include additional improvements or new scope to be determined by the VTA safety review board in early 2009.

**Project Status:**

Phase I design has been reviewed by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), the City of San Jose, and other jurisdictions, with review comments being included in the final design. After the CPUC and other agencies review and concur with the final design, the Phase I contract will be advertised for bid. This is anticipated to occur in December 2008, with work expected to be completed in July 2009.

Phase II scope and schedule are to be established once Phase I construction bids have been received.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Aug-07</td>
<td>Mar-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Apr-09</td>
<td>Sep-10</td>
<td>Ph I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td>Oct-10</td>
<td>Ph II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget (a)</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Budget Balance (d = (a-c))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be Categorized (Phase II)</td>
<td>1,611</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,261</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,248</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 1%
Approved Budget Committed 1%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0666</th>
<th>P-0681</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$1.28</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$1.28 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.98 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.61</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.65</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.26 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 43%
Federal 57%

Flashing No Left Turn sign
Tasman and North First Street Intersection
**Coach/LRV Facilities Projects**

**Maintenance Facilities Upgrades**

**Estimated Cost:** $1.5 - $1.6 million  
**Approved Budget:** $1.3 million  
**Year of Completion:** 2009

**Project Manager:** John O’Brien  
**Designer:** Stantec, SBAA  
**Contractor:** Bianchi Amaker

**Project Description:**
Includes maintenance and rehabilitation projects for the North, Chaboya and Cerone Bus Operating Divisions, the Cerone Overhaul & Repair (O&R) Division, and the Guadalupe Light Rail Vehicle Division.

The **Cerone Minor Maintenance Bay Pit Modifications** project will decommission and infill existing in-ground service pits and provide facility upgrades necessary to install an aboveground mobile bus lifting system. This project will mitigate clearance deficiencies, and is consistent with improvements previously completed at the Chaboya and North Divisions.

The **Cerone/Chaboya Steam Clean Lift Replacement** project will replace the existing steam rack lifts and will provide the necessary structural upgrades to the facility to allow the installation of new parallelogram lifts. This project mitigates maintenance issues caused by frequent malfunctions of and the diminishing availability of spare parts for the current system.

The **LRV Paint Mix Room Improvements** project will create a paint mixing and storage room in a maintenance shop area that currently lacks a room dedicated to this activity. The new room will provide safety measures specifically suited to paint mixing, and is consistent with improvements previously completed at the other bus operating Divisions.

**Project Status:**

The **Cerone Minor Maintenance Bay Pit Modifications** project is currently in construction. The permit application for a Closure-In-Place of the existing pits was approved by Santa Clara County Department of Environmental Health. Concrete for pit infill was placed in late-September 2008. Infrastructure improvements for the aboveground mobile lifts will be undertaken next.

The **Cerone/Chaboya Steam Clean Lift Replacement** project is currently undergoing a further round of value-engineering. Modifications to the design are on hold, pending review of the revised construction cost estimate and operational impact assessment.

The **LRV Paint Mix Room Improvements** project is currently in the 65% Design Phase.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Feb-08</td>
<td>Jan-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Cerone Minor Maint)</td>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Steam Clean Lift)</td>
<td>Dec-08</td>
<td>Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (LRV Paint Mix Rm)</td>
<td>Jan-09</td>
<td>Mar-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>Jul-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,264</strong></td>
<td><strong>576</strong></td>
<td><strong>433</strong></td>
<td><strong>831</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Approved Budget Incurred: 34%
- Approved Budget Committed: 46%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0540</th>
<th>P-0639</th>
<th>P-0644</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.41</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
<td>$0.56</td>
<td>$1.26 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.41</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.30</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.26 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 100%

- **Cerone Minor Maintenance Pit Modifications**
- **Cerone Steam Clean Bay (showing existing 4-post lift)**
Coach/LRV Facilities Projects

Fueling Improvements

Estimated Cost: $6.7 million
Approved Budget: $6.7 million
Year of Completion: 2009
Project Manager: John O’Brien
Designer: Stantec, SBAA
Contractor: Balch Petroleum

Project Description:

The implementation of the Community Bus Program has resulted in the procurement of gasoline powered, small capacity buses. Currently, these buses are fueled off-site, as the existing VTA fuel dispensing infrastructure only supports diesel fuel. This program, when completed, will allow VTA to store and dispense unleaded gasoline on-site for the Community Buses that operate out of each Division.

In addition, existing leak detection and monitoring systems will be replaced. Underground product piping will be reconfigured, and vapor recovery enhancements will be provided in accordance with regulatory requirements.

The Chaboya Division Fuel Island Modifications project converts one of the four existing 20,000 gallon diesel underground storage tanks to unleaded gasoline, and adds one new unleaded gasoline dispenser.

The North Division Fuel Island Addition project adds one new 20,000 gallon unleaded gasoline underground storage tank, one 20,000 gallon biodiesel underground storage tank, one unleaded gasoline dispenser and two biodiesel dispensers.

The Cerone Division Fueling Facility Improvement project will construct a new fueling facility to store and dispense unleaded gasoline for the Community Bus Program and the Outreach Paratransit Program.

Project Status:

The Chaboya and North Division projects have been completed on schedule and under budget. Fueling operations commenced in July 2008 at Chaboya, and in September 2008 at North Division.

The Cerone project is currently in the pre-design phase, with construction anticipated to begin in late 2009.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>Aug-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Chaboya)</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (North Yard)</td>
<td>May-08</td>
<td>Sep-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Cerone)</td>
<td>Sep-09</td>
<td>Jan-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>Apr-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget (a)</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Budget Balance (d = (a-c))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Be Categorized (Cerone Div. Fueling)</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,663</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,291</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,122</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,541</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 17%
Approved Budget Committed 19%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0609</th>
<th>P-0622</th>
<th>P-0669</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$0.91</td>
<td>$2.01</td>
<td>$3.74</td>
<td>$6.66 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.91</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6.66 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local 100%

- Chaboya Division Fuel Island Modifications
- North Division Fuel Tank Installation

P-0609, P0622, P0669
Security Projects

CCTV Projects

Estimated Cost: $3.5 million
Approved Budget: $3.5 million
Year of Completion: 2009
Project Manager: Ramesh Dhingra
Designer: VTA
Contractor: TBD

Project Description:
Install video surveillance and recording equipment including Closed-Circuit TV (CCTV) cameras, video recorders, and associated hardware at these VTA facilities:

1) The Cerone Division Bus Facility
2) An initial group of Light Rail Stations that includes Downtown Mountain View, Great Mall/Main, Hamilton, and Alum Rock
3) A second group of Light Rail Stations that includes Tasman, Baypointe, I-880/Milpitas, Montague, Cropley, Penitencia Creek, Tasman, and Convention Center
4) The Tasman East Aerial Structure

Once the CCTV equipment is installed, VTA’s Protective Services Department will have the ability to view these locations remotely in real time and in recorded images.

Project Status:
Environmental - These projects are Categorically Exempt from the provisions of CEQA and Categorically Excluded from the provisions of NEPA.
Design - The design is complete, and construction contracts have been awarded for the CCTV at Cerone Division and for the first four light rail stations. Design, Bid and Award for the remaining light rail stations and the aerial structure will be completed by summer 2009.
Construction - Construction is underway and proceeding on schedule. Work is expected to be complete by December 2008.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Apr-08</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Cerone)</td>
<td>Jul-08</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (1st 4 LR Stations)</td>
<td>Aug-08</td>
<td>Nov-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Remaining Locations)</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>Dec-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Oct-08</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>1,762</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,460</strong></td>
<td><strong>913</strong></td>
<td><strong>152</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,308</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 4%
Approved Budget Committed 26%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>P-0647</th>
<th>P-0649</th>
<th>P-0576</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0.31</td>
<td>$0.55</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$2.18 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.75 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.46 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State 15%
Local 22%
Federal 63%
Laser Intrusion Detection at LR Stations

Estimated Cost: $1.1 million
Approved Budget: $1.1 million
Year of Completion: 2009
Project Manager: Ramesh Dhingra

Project Description:
Provide a Laser Intrusion Detection System at both entrances to the Tasman East Aerial Structure, and at each entrance to the restricted track right-of-way from the Great Mall/Main and Montague Light Rail Station platforms.

The system will detect human and other non-light-rail-vehicle intrusions.

Project Status:
Environmental - The environmental review is complete. The project is Categorically Exempt from the provisions of CEQA and Categorically Excluded from the provisions of NEPA.

Design - Preliminary Design began in April 2008. The 65% Engineering Design package was distributed on August 1, 2008 for review, and review comments will be incorporated into the 95% final engineering design. The Final Design document set is expected to be completed in December 2008.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Jun-08</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>May-09</td>
<td>Dec-09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Dec-09</td>
<td>Feb-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approved Budget:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Approved Project Budget</th>
<th>Sep-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Sep-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Budget Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,147</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,088</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approved Budget Incurred 5%
Approved Budget Committed 5%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Anticipated Funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$0.50 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>0.56 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>0.08 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.15 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Aerial Structure East of Montague Station
Southwest entrance to restricted track at Montague Station
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: RIDE Task Force Annual Update

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The Ridership Initiative to Develop Energy-efficiency (RIDE) Task Force was initiated by a coalition of labor, environmental and community-based groups concerned about the decline in ridership on VTA bus and light rail transit services. In September 2005, the Board of Directors authorized the formation of the RIDE Task Force as proposed by the coalition; appointed two Board Members to serve as co-chairs; and added the Chairpersons of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA), and Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) to the Task Force.

The Task Force met nine times between October 2005 and August 2006 and produced a Final Report documenting its work and presenting recommendations in four broad goal areas aimed at improving VTA ridership:

- Fare Affordability and Convenience
- Better Information for Riders
- Better Access to System
- Service Improvements

On November 2, 2006, the Board acted to receive the RIDE Task Force’s Final Report and directed staff to continue to review and consider the report’s recommendations as it develops and implements fare, service, marketing, promotional, and community outreach proposals and plans. Among these recommendations is to provide the Board with an annual update on the status of the Final Report’s recommendations.

DISCUSSION:

Attachment A provides a list of the Final Report’s recommendations within each of the four goal
areas, along with the status of each recommendation. A summary of the status of these recommendations follows:

**Fare Affordability and Convenience**
All of the Final Report’s recommendations relating to fare affordability and convenience have been implemented as a result of the Board’s action to approve revisions to the fare tariff in June 2007. No further action is required.

The Eco Pass Program continues to expand and is aggressively marketed through enhanced promotional efforts with newspaper ads targeted at employers, employer email campaigns, and website banner ads. From September 2007 to August 2008, Eco Pass participation has increased by 15%.

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee reviews Marketing and Customer Service activities on a quarterly basis. Information about the Eco Pass Program is included in this review.

**Better Information for Riders**
VTA continually evaluates and improves print and electronic informational and promotional materials. VTA’s new website launched in October 2007, [www.vta.org](http://www.vta.org), offers online trip planning powered by Google and scrolling rider alerts for any service impacts. The redesigned interactive voice response system is also updated on an ongoing basis to provide critical rider and VTA information.

To enhance promotions of bus and light rail services, VTA initiated the use of new marketing tools such as web banners, video clips, outdoor digital displays, and direct links to online traffic reports. Recent marketing campaigns have focused on specific aspects of the new bus service, including Community Bus service, its reduced fare structure, and scheduling and routing tailored to serve schools and community facilities.

These programs are also part of the quarterly Marketing and Customer Service review by the Transit Planning and Operations Committee.

**Better Access to System**
The FY08 and FY09 Budget has more than doubled the resources made available each year to upgrade and improve access to bus stops. Completion of the light rail station platform retrofit program in November 2008 provides level boarding for all our customers throughout the light rail system.

The January 2008 New Bus Service plan added more midday and evening trips to accommodate individuals with non-traditional work hours. To achieve this, VTA worked closely with education, community, and health organizations to identify the needs of their respective constituencies.

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee reviews all service changes on a quarterly and annual basis. The Committee also receives monthly ridership and system performance reports in
addition to the Quarterly and Annual Performance Reports.

**Service Improvements**
The adoption of the Bus Service Operating Plan and subsequent service changes implemented in January 2008 addressed many of the Task Force’s recommendations for transit service improvements. The Quarterly and Annual Operations Performance Report has been revised to present a status of every line in the system. This report is reviewed by the Transit Planning and Operations Committee.

The Board-adopted Transit Sustainability Policy requires an annual review of transit services and this is achieved with the Annual Transit Service Plan. This Plan includes a review of performance standards, as identified in the Service Design Guidelines; a review of potential new services; assessment of opportunities for service refinements; and resource allocations. It also includes route-specific service changes and recommendations for further analysis and study.

A series of community meetings and outreach programs will allow our customers to fully evaluate and comment on the Annual Transit Service Plan. It will also be reviewed by the Board’s Advisory Committees and the Transit Planning and Operations Committee before it is adopted by the Board of Directors in April 2009.

**STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff noted that VTA has met and exceeded the recommendations of the Task Force and that these recommendations are incorporated into the day-to-day business of the organization.

Chairperson Sandoval recommended, and the Committee concurred, that this can be considered the final RIDE Task Force Report. She requested, and the Committee concurred, that each Task Force member receive a letter thanking them for their work and informing them that the Transit Planning and Operations Committee has recommended this be the Final Update from the RIDE Task Force. A copy of the final report will be sent to each of the Task Force members. Staff noted that Task Force chairpersons were briefed before this report went to Committee.

Prepared By: Sandra Weymouth
## Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fare Affordability and Convenience</strong></td>
<td><strong>Effective September 1, 2007, VTA reduced the price of Day Passes for Adult, Youth, and Senior/Disabled passengers by 4.8%, 11.1% and 11.1%, respectively.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Effective September 1, 2007, VTA reduced the price of Monthly Passes for Youth and Senior/Disabled passengers by 18.4% and 23.1%, respectively.</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Effective July 1, 2007, VTA initiated Community Bus Single Ride fares of Adult $1 and Youth and Senior/Disabled $0.50. Effective April 2008, in partnership with the County of Santa Clara, VTA initiated the UPLIFT Pass program, providing 1,850 quarterly transit stickers for homeless individuals at a cost of $111,000 per year (approximately a 92% discount from regular VTA pass pricing).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing fares paid by those least able to afford them: low-income, youth, seniors, and disabled persons.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider reducing the cost of a Day Pass to make it more affordable for people who need to transfer.</td>
<td><strong>Effective September 1, 2007, VTA reduced the price of Day Passes for Adult, Youth, and Senior/Disabled passengers by 4.8%, 11.1% and 11.1%, respectively.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider expanding the Eco Pass Program to community colleges and additional businesses and residential organizations.</td>
<td><strong>VTA continues to market Eco pass aggressively to educational institutions, businesses and residential organizations. 14% of the county’s workforce participates in the Eco pass program. The current number of Eco pass partners has increased from 93 in 2007 to 108 currently, a 15% increase from September 2007 to September 2008. The Eco Pass Program grew by an additional 16 corporate clients and one residential client. This equates to a total of 114,506 employees, 30,686 students, and 2,311 residents who benefit from Eco Pass.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider extending the Eco Pass Program to additional regional transit services, such as the Monterey/San Jose Express Service.</td>
<td><strong>VTA added the Monterey/San Jose Express Service to the Eco pass “E” Express option available to participants, resulting in some Eco Pass participants upgrading to the Express Eco Pass.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider making the discounted Summer Blast Pass a permanent program offered each summer to youth.</td>
<td><strong>Effective September 1, 2007, the Board added the Youth Summer Blast Pass to the fare tariff at a three-month price of $75. As part of the promotional efforts for the Summer Blast Pass, VTA partners with amusement parks, retailers and restaurants, adding additional value and benefits to an already excellent value. Sales of the Summer Blast Pass have increased each year; with this year’s sales reflecting an 18% increase over last year.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider making the Light Rail Excursion Pass a permanent element of the fare structure.</td>
<td><strong>Effective July 1, 2007, the Board approved the 8-Hour Light Rail Excursion Pass to the fare tariff, priced at twice the single-ride fare. VTA has aggressively promoted the use and convenience of the Excursion Pass for special events accessible via light rail. In FY 08, the first full year the pass was part of VTA’s fare tariff, 59,618 Excursion passes were sold.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Better Information for Riders** | **Website:** VTA’s new website, [www.vta.org](http://www.vta.org), was implemented in late October 2007 with a more prominent focus on transit service information, interactive maps, enhanced accessibility features, and easier navigation and use. Since the launch of the new website, we have seen 2.8 million visitors, an average of 258,000 per month. VTA’s Google transit trip planner was also launched October 1, 2007, providing website visitors with free self-directed trip-planning services. **Real-Time Passenger Information (RTI):** The RTI system will provide VTA’s customers with accurate and reliable real-time transit information. This includes the real-time location of transit vehicles and the estimated next vehicle arrival and departure times for all transit routes. Customers will access this information using the Internet and telephone as well as electronic information boards at key transit stops in Santa Clara County. Key stops include major bus stops, Bus Rapid Transit Stops, Light Rail Stations, transit centers, and transit stops shared with other providers. The real-time information will also be available through MTC’s 511 systems and through VTA’s customer service center. An agreement with the proposed vendor will be presented for approval to the VTA Board in November 2008 and will be completed by March 2010. |}

<p>| Market and promote activities aimed at the transit dependent, youth (to instill a transit culture early), and at making transit socially desirable, “the right thing to do.” | VTA is committed to introducing Santa Clara County youth to the benefits of public transportation and also providing education to our youth riders on how to be safe on and around VTA buses and light rail vehicles. Between September 2007 and August 2008, VTA’s Youth Outreach Program made presentations to 8,000 students; 50,000 students received bus and light rail service through the Class Pass Program for the same period. A new Youth Outreach video that emphasizes transit safety and benefits is in production and will be completed November 2008. VTA has actively promoted the environmental benefits of public transportation including participating in the Silicon Valley Green Fair, providing personal trip planning to attendees, and implementing a green advertising campaign highlighting the Eco Pass Program and our core network with 15-minute frequencies. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better Information for Riders</td>
<td>Between September 2007 and August 2008, VTA initiated 10 major service and pass promotions that contributed to significant ridership increases. Excursion Pass sales for July 4, 2008 increased by 48% versus the previous year. The completion of the light rail station platform retrofit program in November 2008 positively positions promotion of the Light Rail Excursion Fare for holiday activities. VTA has expanded partnerships with private and public sector organizations to promote riding VTA to community, cultural, and health events, and popular leisure destinations. From September 2007 through the year’s end, VTA will have participated in 21 major promotional partnerships with various government, non-profit, and business organizations, reflecting a 40% increase. To highlight the avoidance of congestion and parking hassles, VTA initiated two new campaigns: links to online traffic reports with visual displays of congestion and accidents that direct viewers to VTA service in the affected corridor, and a print campaign promoting the use of VTA’s Park and Ride Lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review print and electronic materials to include information to facilitate transit use, including connections between bus and light rail lines and with connecting regional transit services.</td>
<td>VTA’s new website has interactive maps showing all connecting routes and transit services; direct links to connecting transit systems are also provided. VTA provides community organizations with VTA service and connection information to include printed and electronic materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with others (e.g., hotels, events, visitor and convention bureaus, chambers) to promote transit to their customers.</td>
<td>VTA has implemented a new, more flexible Convention Pass program, resulting in increased sales. VTA is working with the Convention and Visitors Bureau and local hotels to promote the benefits of the Convention Pass to conference attendees. This heightened focus has resulted in a total of 2,332 convention passes for 6 conventions in 2008.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Better Access to System**                                                   | **Bus:** VTA increased funding from $250,000 per year (FYs 06 and 07) to $660,000 per year (FYs 07 and 08) to improve access to bus stops. $660,000 will pay for bus stop improvements at locations previously prioritized by the CTA. Favorable bids have allowed VTA to improve bus stop access to 25 bus stops rather than the 15-20 originally programmed.  
**Light Rail:** In January 2008, VTA began a construction project to raise the remaining 13 light rail station platforms on the Guadalupe Line from Children’s Discovery Museum south. This allows level boarding throughout the system, easing access for seniors and disabled customers. Construction was completed 3 months ahead of schedule at the beginning of November 2008. |
| Consider increasing the number of bus stop benches and shelters at higher-use bus stops and transit centers. | VTA maintains a supply of bus benches and installs them at locations with high ridership, or where requested, providing there is enough space to do so.  
VTA contracts with Clear Channel Outdoors to provide and maintain 564 shelters throughout our service area. With implementation of the New Bus Service Plan, staff is relocating 23 shelters from lower-use to higher-use bus stops. This current contract expires October 31, 2010 and VTA will solicit proposals for a new contractor. The new contract will include a goal to expand the current number of bus shelters. |
| Continue to work with cities to determine the need for curb cuts, sidewalks, crosswalks, and pedestrian traffic signals to facilitate safe and accessible paths of travel to bus stops, transit centers, light rail stations, and light rail platforms. | VTA regularly reviews environmental documents, general plan changes, zoning amendments and site development permits, providing comments and recommendations to the land use authority on improving access to existing and planned transit services. In FY08, VTA provided input on approximately 230 development proposals throughout Santa Clara County. |
| Develop a program to increase the number of bike racks located at high-volume bus stops, transit centers and light rail platforms. | VTA has a program underway to increase the number of bike racks available on its system. Bike rack installation at all transit centers and Park-and-Ride lots is more than halfway completed. VTA Facilities Maintenance has been working to replace all old, inadequate racks with more secure bike racks as well as increasing the number of racks at high-volume transit centers.  
VTA’s eLocker program received its Notice to Proceed. Retrofit of single-user lockers to an electronic card system will begin this fall. Retrofit is planned for 6 high-use locations: Branham Light Rail Station, River Oaks Park and Ride Lot, Great Mall Light Rail Station, Ohlone/Chynoweth, Winchester Light Rail Station, and Tamien Station. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Status</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Improvements</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore additional opportunities to implement “rapid” bus service, similar to the Rapid 522 service.</td>
<td>VTA will identify a Bus Rapid Transit network in five corridors beginning this Fall with a BRT Strategic Plan. The Plan will develop implementation strategies for future BRT corridors. In addition, a BRT project for the Santa Clara/Alum Rock corridor incorporating the existing 522 and future 523 is moving forward as part of the Downtown East Valley project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Valley Medical Center and other hospitals throughout the County to address a need for late-night transportation for their patients, when transit service is not available.</td>
<td>VTA staff met with Valley Medical Center representatives during the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) outreach process and in January 2008, the frequency of service on Lines 62 and 25 serving VMC increased. The demand for late night service is too low to warrant transit service at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with San Jose State University staff to better define and justify the transit needs of its students, including providing direct bus service from Northeast San Jose to Downtown San Jose, and providing a non-stop bus from the Fremont BART station to Downtown San Jose.</td>
<td>The Bus Service Operating Plan implemented in January 2008 includes direct service between the Fremont BART station and Downtown San Jose during peak commute hours (Line 181); Line 64 has been re-routed to provide direct service between Northeast San Jose (McKee and Capitol) and Downtown. Service to/from Berryessa is provided by light rail with a transfer to Line 22, 23, or 522. Combined, these three lines now provide 14 buses per hour in this corridor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to reallocate resources from low-productivity transit services to improve transit services that are likely to attract greater ridership.</td>
<td>The Bus Service Operating Plan was implemented in January 2008. The new plan places more resources and emphasis on high-productivity routes and market opportunities by finding savings within the system. The annual Transit Service Plan will continue this process. In April 2009, the Board of Directors will consider the Transit Service Plan after considerable community and committee review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with connecting transit services to coordinate schedules and connections, and fare structures.</td>
<td>VTA regularly works with staff from SamTrans, BART, ACE and Caltrain to coordinate schedules to the maximum degree possible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: January 2009 Service Changes

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

VTA implements service changes quarterly (January, April, July, October). Major changes are typically planned for January and July, while minor changes are implemented in April and October. Proposed service changes that meet any of the criteria listed below are submitted to the VTA Board of Directors for review and approval. The formal approval process typically takes place with approval of the Annual Transit Service Plan. Changes requiring formal approval include:

- The establishment or elimination of a new transit line.
- A change that impacts 25% or more of a line's route miles or revenue vehicle hours.
- Proposed changes that are anticipated to be controversial with a particular community or interested parties.

Service change proposals not meeting the criteria for formal approvals described above are handled at staff level. However, these proposals are still subject to an appropriate level of public and community review and comment. The changes listed are minor in nature and did not require any specific public outreach.

DISCUSSION:

On Monday January 12, 2009 the following service changes will go into effect.

Schedule Changes
The following routes will only have schedule changes to address running times, connections, and other minor issues. These changes do not impact the frequency, span or routing of the service.
Service Changes

Line 27 (Santa Teresa Hospital - Good Samaritan Hospital)
Line 66 (Santa Teresa Hospital - Milpitas)
The official destination of both lines will be changed from “Santa Teresa Hospital” to “Kaiser San Jose” to reflect recent renaming of this facility. Bus heads signs and time guides will be updated to reflect the new change.

Line 31 (Eastridge Transit Center - Evergreen Valley College)
This route will be identified as operating northbound and southbound instead of a loop. Minor weekday and weekend schedule changes will be made to better reflect actual running times.

Line 180 (Fremont BART - Great Mall Transit Center - San Jose Diridon Station)
A new northbound weekday trip will be added leaving San Jose Diridon Station at 8:31 p.m. due to increased passenger demand.

Alum Rock Transit Center - The bus stops for Lines 23, 25 and 45 will be changed inside the transit center to allow more bays for Line 23 buses to lay over.

Prepared By: Jim Unites
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

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

SUBJECT: Annual Transit Service Plan - Information

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

In 1999, the VTA Board of Directors approved the creation of a Service Management Plan, a process to evaluate the performance of the transit system using adopted standards of productivity. This plan, which included an evaluation of transit service ridership performance and recommendations for route improvements, was annually presented to the VTA Board for review and approval. This annual process was deferred in 2007 and 2008, while VTA developed and conducted the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA).

The COA was an 18-month in-depth process to analyze VTA’s existing bus services, identify underserved markets, and ultimately produce a new structure for bus services. The VTA Board adopted a new Bus Service Operating Plan at its August 30, 2007 meeting and implementation occurred on January 14, 2008. The COA incorporated the latest in market research and a detailed examination of VTA’s existing transit operations and ridership performance to develop a new cost-neutral bus transit network.

As part of the COA, the annual service review process was further defined and strengthened when the VTA Board of Directors adopted the Transit Sustainability Policy (TSP) and the accompanying Service Design Guidelines (SDG). The TSP provides a policy framework for the efficient and effective expenditure of funds to achieve the highest return on transit investments. The policy guides the development and implementation of new transit services, as well as the refinement of existing services. In accordance with the Transit Sustainability Policy, all transit services are subject to an annual evaluation of ridership and operating efficiency, based on the performance standards contained in the Service Design Guidelines.

The primary performance standard is Average Boardings per Revenue Hour. This standard applies to Community Bus, Local Bus, Bus Rapid Transit, and Light Rail. For evaluation purposes, the standard is calculated for all time-periods and for weekdays, Saturdays, and Sundays. This standard is recalculated quarterly and may move up or down. This indicator
shows how well service is utilized, given the hours of service provided.

The categorical minimum standard for any bus transit service is 15 Boardings per Revenue Hour. Bus lines that consistently operate below this threshold and that are unresponsive to marketing, restructuring, and operational refinements are subject to deletion. Express routes are evaluated on a different standard of 60% of the seated vehicle loading capacity to reflect the special characteristics of Express lines, where seat turnover is low.

The Annual Transit Service Plan functions as the process and document that implements the policies set forward in the Transit Sustainability Policy. The mandated annual review of transit services, which is now called the Annual Transit Service Plan, includes an evaluation of existing services compared to the performance standards contained in the Service Design Guidelines, review of potential new services, assessment of opportunities for service refinement and resource reallocation, route-specific service changes, and recommendations for further analysis and study. The plan includes an extensive marketing and community outreach effort, as described later in this memorandum.

The Quarterly Transit Operations Performance Report provides the VTA Board a regular report card on the performance of every line in the VTA transit system. Based on these performance updates, passenger and operator input, detailed ridership data, and other information, the Annual Transit Service Plan proposes modifications to the bus and rail service through measures such as increases or decreases in service hours or frequency, changes in routing or service span, and increased marketing. The ultimate alternative for underperforming lines is deletion and reinvestment of those resources into stronger transit markets.

VTA also has an adopted policy that requires proposed major service changes that meet any of the criteria listed below to be submitted to the VTA Board of Directors for review and approval. The approval process typically takes place with the adoption of the Annual Transit Service Plan, as presented here. Major service changes requiring VTA Board approval are:

- The establishment of a new transit line or service.
- The elimination of a transit line or service.
- A route change that impacts 25% or more of a line’s route miles.
- Span of service or frequency changes affecting 25% or more of a line’s revenue vehicle hours.
- Proposed changes anticipated to be controversial with a particular community or interested parties.

Service change proposals not meeting the criteria for formal approvals described above are handled at the staff level. However, these proposals are still subject to an appropriate level of public and community review and comment. These “minor” changes are included in the proposed Annual Transit Service Plan for public comment, review, and revision as necessary.

Finally, to comply with Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Title VI requirements, VTA must evaluate significant system-wide service changes and proposed improvements at the planning and programming stages to determine whether the changes have a discriminatory impact on
minority and low-income populations. A Title VI Evaluation will be completed for the major bus service changes and included in the submitted Annual Transit Service Plan.

The main proposals of the Annual Transit Service Plan included here will be presented to the Transit Planning and Operations Standing Committee at its December meeting as an information item. Public outreach and community meetings will be held during January and February 2009. Advisory Committee review will be during January and February also. The final draft plan will be submitted to the Transit Planning and Operations Committee at its March 19, 2009 meeting and to the VTA Board of Directors at its April 2, 2009 meeting for approval. Implementation of changes will start on July 13, 2009.

**DISCUSSION:**

The Annual Transit Service Plan includes three main categories of proposals.

- Major changes, as categorized earlier and requiring VTA Board approval.
- Minor changes, including adding/deleting specific trips, improving connections, span of service, frequency or routing changes -- all changes that do not meet the criteria for major changes.
- Additional study and community stakeholder involvement to improve community bus services. When many community bus routes were implemented in January 2008, VTA indicated that it was committed to returning to communities to evaluate performance, explore changes in routing and service, and identify new markets and marketing opportunities to improve the performance of the routes.

No change to VTA’s light rail service is included in the Annual Transit Service Plan, as it is being studied through the Light Rail Systems Analysis. Also, while some Express bus changes are included, a more comprehensive Express Bus Study is also underway that could result in significant changes to our Express service in the future. Any service changes that result from these studies would undergo the appropriate public review and approval process in the future.

**Proposed Major Service Changes**

**Lines 14 and 17 (Gilroy Community Buses):** Routing of Line 14 would be extended to provide two-way service between the Gilroy Transit Center and medical facilities, the outlet stores, and St. Louise Hospital. The routing of Line 17 would be modified from a large one-way loop to provide two-way service between the Gilroy Transit Center and the Social Services facility on Tomkins Court on weekdays. The weekday frequency for both lines would be improved to operate every 30 minutes (instead of 60 minutes). This improved service is funded for three years from a Lifeline grant previously approved by the VTA Board. Final approval of the grant by MTC is expected in March 2009.

**Line 15 (Morgan Hill Community Bus):** This line would be discontinued due to poor ridership performance. Previous community stakeholder efforts resulted in service restructuring to this route in July 2007, when it was converted to a Community Bus route. Extensive marketing has also occurred over the past couple of years. All efforts have failed at improving ridership to meet VTA Board-adopted standards.
Line 37 (Capitol Light Rail Station to West Valley College - Community Bus): New Saturday service would operate every 60 minutes between the Capitol Light Rail Station and the Winchester Light Rail Station. Public comments and inquiries, along with good weekday performance of this route, indicate that Saturday service is warranted.

Line 45 (Alum Rock Light Rail Station to Penitencia Creek Light Rail Station - Community Bus): On weekdays and Saturdays, this line would be modified to operate every 60 minutes (instead of 30 minutes) due to low per-trip ridership.

Line 63 (Almaden Valley to San Jose State University): This line would be modified to operate every 60 minutes on Saturdays (instead of 30 minutes) due to substandard ridership performance.

Line 64 (Almaden Light Rail Station to McKee & White): This route would be modified to operate every 30 minutes on the entire line on Saturdays. Currently, extra trips that provide 15-minute service on the segment between the San Jose Diridon Transit Center and McKee & White have proven to be unnecessary for the ridership demand.

Lines 66 and 68 (Monterey Corridor): These lines would be modified to operate every 15 minutes all day over the entire route on weekdays. Currently, both line 66 and 68 provide a mixture of 15 and 30-minute service over different segments of the routes. Ridership demand on these routes has increased 15-20% over pre-January 2008 levels.

Line 88 (Palo Alto Community Bus): This line would be modified to operate every 60 minutes (instead of every 30 minutes) during peak hours due to low ridership. Special routing for one trip to Jordan Middle School would be discontinued due to low ridership. No changes are proposed to the trips serving Gunn High School, which are performing well and carrying significant student loads.

Line 89 (California Ave. Caltrain Station to Stanford Research Park): Due to high ridership, which includes transfers from Caltrain, this line would be converted from a Community Bus line to a regular bus line with standard VTA fares.

Express Lines 180 and 181 (Fremont BART to Great Mall and Downtown San Jose): On weekdays, Line 180 would be modified to operate every 30 minutes (instead of 15 minutes) between the Fremont BART Station and the Great Mall Transit Center all day. Line 181 would be modified to operate every 15 minutes, all day, in both directions (currently operates during peak hours only). Both Lines 180 and 181 would be modified to operate via Stevenson and I-880 instead of Mission Blvd. A Park & Ride lot along Stevenson is needed, as parking at the Fremont BART station has become difficult for most passengers. VTA staff is currently reviewing various parking alternatives.

Proposed Community Bus Studies
These studies would engage small groups of key stakeholders in a swift, yet thorough process to review the current route performance and recommend improvements to the route so it can...
achieve our ridership performance standards. The specific implementation timelines for these changes would depend on the community involvement process. Also, staff would likely not commence each of these studies at the same time. However expectations are that all of these studies will be completed in calendar year 2009.

Community Bus Line 11 (San Jose Market Center - Japantown - Downtown San Jose)
This new Community Bus service was implemented in January 2008 and operates every 60 minutes from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays. It has below-standard performance, with low ridership on certain segments. However, community acceptance of the route has been positive, especially amongst senior citizens.

Community Bus Line 13 (Almaden Valley - Oakridge - Ohlone/Chynoweth Light Rail Station)
This route was converted to Community Bus service in January 2008. It operates every 30 minutes in peak hours, and 60 minutes midday from 5:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. on weekdays. It has below-standard performance, with low ridership on certain segments. Student ridership is positive. There is community interest to serve some other locations.

Community Bus Line 34 (Downtown Mt. View - San Antonio Shopping Center)
This route was converted to Community Bus service in January 2008. It operates every 60 minutes midday only from 9:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on weekdays. It exhibits below-standard performance and low ridership. It primarily serves senior housing trips to access shopping and downtown. There is interest by city staff and the Mayor to study this route and the downtown Mountain View area to determine the best use of resources and to serve other locations.

New Community Bus Line (Santa Clara Kaiser to El Camino Corridor)
VTA’s service network lacks a good north-south connection along Lawrence Expressway connecting the El Camino Corridor (Local 22/Rapid 522) directly into Santa Clara Kaiser. Many public comments have been received for this service. This would provide for 1 all-day bus (12 hours per day) with 30-minute frequency service. VTA would work with Kaiser, the City of Santa Clara, and other community interests to develop this service. Funding participation from Kaiser would also be pursued, possibly to provide a free service such as with other specific shuttles VTA operates such as DASH or Great America.

Milpitas Intracity Service
During discussions on the COA, VTA and the City of Milpitas agreed to review local intracity services based on the opening of new developments in the city. New senior housing, library and Valley Health Center all on Main Street, new high density housing on Abel Street and a proposed new Senior Center on Milpitas Boulevard all impact the bus service network. The study would review current lines 33, 46, 47 for possible conversion to community bus and improved connections to main bus line 66 and light rail. This study may also be combined with a Community Based Transportation Plan effort also planned for Milpitas.

Proposed Minor Service Change
About 114 distinct changes are being proposed on 39 individual routes. Many of the changes are adding trips where ridership demand has increased and deleting or combining unproductive trips.
Other minor changes include modifying the span of service, routing or schedules to improve connections. These small changes combine to provide service-hour and bus resources that enable other service improvements proposed here to occur within existing service levels. While VTA Board approval of the individual changes is not required, the changes will be presented to the public for review and comment and included in the Annual Transit Service Plan.

**Marketing/Community Outreach Plan**

A comprehensive community outreach and marketing plan will be implemented to afford the public numerous opportunities to learn of the proposed service changes and provide input and comment. The final draft Annual Transit Service Plan presented to the VTA Board in March and April will include feedback received from the community outreach activities and plan modifications based on the comments received. An outline of the plan follows.

**Outreach to the Public**
- Hold 8 public meetings in late January, in cities that will be impacted the most by the proposed service plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time(s)</th>
<th>Main Routes of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown San Jose</td>
<td>3pm &amp; 7pm</td>
<td>11, 63, 64, 66/68, 180/181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>88, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East San Jose</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>31, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>37, 48/49, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>14/17, 15, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>15, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>7pm</td>
<td>180/181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Advertise in community newspapers throughout Santa Clara County before public meetings.
- Send media releases to community newspapers, broadcast media, multilingual media, and daily publications.
- Post meeting announcements, and specific route-by-route information on the VTA.org website.
- Provide opportunity for web viewers to submit comments by email.
- Provide city websites and access cable channel outlets with meeting announcements.
- Mail meeting announcement fliers and plan information to community organizations (Title VI list, etc.), cities, Eco Pass employers, and other stakeholders.

**Outreach to Passengers**
- Interior car cards on all bus and light rail vehicles.
- December rider newsletter article giving passengers a “heads up” and to look for more details in a “Special Take One.”
- “Special Take One” passenger flyer distribution on all VTA vehicles in the first or second week of January with information on the proposed changes and meeting times/dates.
- Include meeting announcement fliers in mailing to monthly pass holders and Eco Pass participants/employers.
- Provide information at the Downtown Customer Service Center and River Oaks.
• Brief all Customer Service Representatives.

Outreach to Media
• Issue multiple news releases in advance of meetings.
• The first, a generalized meeting announcement news release, will be timed for deadlines of weekly, community newspapers.
• The second, more policy oriented, will target radio, television, and daily publications and will be released just in advance of the first meeting.

Outreach to VTA staff
• Include information in the December/January edition of “In the Loop.”
• Include article in employee newsletter “Timepoint.”
• Electronic distribution of meeting announcement flier.

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Committee asked what constitutes "limited routes." Staff explained that limited routes use the expressway system but are not typical "Express" buses. They run in peak periods for connections along the commute corridors.

The Committee remarked about the need for constant evaluation of service in order to deploy services where they are needed, noting the shift in ridership for Line 68 is exciting. The Committee cautioned that community involvement is the key to making appropriate decisions in order to maximize our resources.

Prepared By: Jim Unites, Deputy Director, Service Planning
FOR INFORMATION ONLY

Please find attached the Semi-Annual Report for the VTP Highway Program for the period ending October 31, 2008. We look forward to your continued feedback on this report as the VTP Highway Program moves forward.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee received this item on December 18, 2008.

Prepared By: Tim Phillips, Lead Cost Engineer
Semi-Annual Report
October 2008
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SECTION 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
SECTION 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

BACKGROUND

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) for Santa Clara County was created in 1990 in response to Proposition 111. It was established as a joint powers authority with a separate governing board. On January 1, 1995, pursuant to the separation of the Santa Clara County Transit District from the County of Santa Clara, the CMP was merged with the Transit District to form the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) under a new governing Board.

The CMP is currently governed by a joint powers agreement entered into between its 16 member agencies, which are the 15 municipalities within the Santa Clara County and the County of Santa Clara. The Member Agencies are the cities of Campbell, Cupertino, Gilroy, Los Altos, Milpitas, Monte Sereno, Morgan Hill, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Saratoga, San Jose, Santa Clara, and Sunnyvale and the towns of Los Altos Hills and Los Gatos; and the County of Santa Clara. VTA serves as the managing agency of the CMP.

The CMP is responsible for development and implementation of the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP), the comprehensive long-range multimodal transportation plan for the county, and for preparing and implementing the state-mandated CMP. It is also responsible for the programming and monitoring of discretionary federal, state, regional and local funds programmed by the VTA Board of Directors, and for serving as the program manager for certain grant funds, including the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) and the Measure B Transportation Improvement Program (MBTIP) Ancillary Program. The CMP is also responsible for preparation and implementation of the Countywide Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Program and the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Plan.

The CMP is funded in part by annual fees charged to each Member Agency based on a formula adopted by the VTA governing board. The contribution formula considers each Member Agency’s share of Proposition 111 state gas tax monies, as well as employment within the County. The CMP is also funded by federal and state planning grants and other grant sources, TFCA administration fees and SB45 programmed project monitoring funds. The fiscal resources of the CMP are distinct from those of the VTA Transit Enterprise.

The VTP Highway Program includes projects from the currently approved long range countywide transportation plan for Santa Clara County. The VTP is developed by the CMP, and projects must be included in the plan as a prerequisite for eligibility to receive Federal, State, regional and local discretionary fund programming. One hundred percent of VTP Highway Program expenditures are funded by grants (Federal, State, regional or local) or agreements with the appropriate city. No VTA funds are required for these projects, except where noted.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) Highway Program consists of potentially over $1 billion of highway improvement projects currently in various phases from conceptual study to construction. The projects are located throughout Santa Clara County (and adjoining areas) and seek to improve key elements of the highway transportation system, utilizing a variety of funding sources.

Funding is a key issue for many of the highway projects. VTA, acting as the CMA for Santa Clara County, must assemble a number of funding sources in order to advance each project through its various phases to completion. As a consequence, in this report we refer to several terms associated with a project’s funding level. These terms, arranged in order of increasing certainty of funding availability, are as follows:

1. **Estimated Cost** – An estimate of the total cost of a project given the currently known scope and configuration of the project. For early stage projects, this estimate may be based on very conceptual information and, therefore, has associated with it a high level of uncertainty and a correspondingly low level of accuracy. In the individual project information sheets, we have included the “Estimate Class” in order to give an idea of the level of uncertainty associated with the estimated cost. A more detailed discussion of this topic is included in the appendix.

2. **Identified Funding** – Funding identified as being ultimately available from project funding agencies to complete the work, as of the writing of this report. Depending on the stage of the project, the identified funding may be less than the estimated cost of a project. In such cases, we use the term “To Be Determined” (TBD) funding to describe the difference between the estimated cost and identified funding.

3. **Appropriation** - The most recent Adopted Budget includes appropriations, based on an estimate of expenditures during fiscal years 2008 and 2009, for various VTP Highway Program projects. Since these projects can run beyond FY09, the appropriation amount is only a time-constrained slice of total estimated expenditures.

4. **Secured Funding** – Funding that has been committed by funding agencies and is now available to VTA for project expenditures. In many cases, secured funding is at a lower level than the appropriation in the Adopted Budget. For these projects, it is anticipated that additional funding will be secured during the FY08/09 period. It is important to note that, regardless of the level of appropriation, actual expenditures will not exceed secured funding at any time.
Figure 1.1 shows the total estimated cost of all projects contained in this report, broken down by the currently identified funding sources.

Note the large proportion of funding shown in Figure 1.1 that is designated as “To Be Determined.” Clearly, significant sources of federal, state, and/or local funding will be required to complete many of these projects. VTA’s strategy continues to be to advance a number of projects through the early (and relatively low-cost) stages of project development so that they will be ready to take advantage of funding that may become available in the future.

Figure 1.2, on the next page, shows the projects categorized by phase of development, and shows what portion of the estimated cost has been identified for each project.
Schedule is also a concern, particularly for the three projects utilizing Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) funds for construction phase work: US 101 Auxiliary Lanes – Embarcadero to Route 85, I-880 HOV Widening Project, and US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena. CMIA guidelines require VTA to follow specific schedules in order to remain eligible for this source of construction funding. These schedules are typically quite aggressive, requiring that projects proceed to the construction phase in 2010 or 2011.
Figure 1.3 shows a Summary Master Schedule of the currently-identified VTP Highway projects.

### Figure 1.3
VTP Highway Program Summary Master Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US 101 Impl. - Trimble to Mabury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Camino/Route 85/237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicon Valley Express Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>US 101 Aux Lanes (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880 HOV Widening (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 - Monterey Rd to Rt 129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 101 - De La Cruz/Trimble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charcot Avenue Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>US 101 - Yerba Buena (CMIA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<tr>
<td>Route 152/156 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 87 Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- Implementation Plan
- Environmental/PE
- Final Design (PS&E)
- Right-of-Way
- Construction
- Plant Establishment
- Funding/scope not identified/defined, schedule is tentative
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SECTION 2 - PROGRESS SUMMARY

Figure 2.1, on the next page, provides an overview map of the projects comprising the VTP Highway Program.

A. CONCEPTUAL STUDY PROJECTS

VTA has completed mapping and is currently preparing traffic studies for the **US 101 Implementation - Trimble to Mabury** project. Preliminary traffic information has been received and conceptual interchange configurations have been developed in conjunction with the City of San Jose and Caltrans. Completion of the Implementation Plan is scheduled for early 2009. The project schedule beyond the implementation plan will depend on the findings, identified priorities, and funding availability.

VTA is performing conceptual studies and preparing a Project Study Report-Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) within the limits of the **El Camino Real/Route 85/237/Middlefield** project. The footprint of the ultimate Route 85/Route 237 interchange has been determined, and the design consultant has provided a range of options for projects which could be advanced within the study area. Preliminary geotechnical information has been received, and traffic studies are ongoing. Additional traffic analysis is required due to the complexity of the project. The PSR-PDS is expected to be completed in mid 2009.

The current focus of the **Silicon Valley Express Lanes** project is to implement Express lanes on the Route 237/I-880 direct connector first. Several conceptual alternatives for Route 85 have been developed. Work is currently underway on detailed alternatives, in coordination with Caltrans and other stakeholders, and is scheduled to be finalized by December 2008. VTA embarked on a public outreach effort beginning in June 2008.

B. PROJECTS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL/PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PHASE

In December, 2007, the VTA Board authorized a second Measure A/STIP swap that will provide a total of $33.5 million in additional funding for project development and right-of-way acquisition for each of the three projects utilizing CMIA funds:

- US 101 Auxiliary Lanes - Embarcadero to Route 85 - $13.6 million
- I-880 HOV Widening - $14.9 million
- US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena Road - $5 million

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) approved the 2008 STIP in May 2008, and VTA will make these funds available to the projects based on a funding schedule driven by project phase.
Figure 2.1 – VTP Highway Program Overview Map
B. PROJECTS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL/PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PHASE (Continued)

The US 101 Auxiliary Lanes - Embarcadero to Route 85 project is in the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase, with the preparation of the Environmental Document underway. Environmental elements completed include air, noise, biological, and cultural considerations. Preliminary studies consisting of surveys, aerial mapping and traffic data collections have been completed, and the preparation of conceptual engineering drawings continues. The Draft Environmental Document is anticipated to be complete in late 2008, with the PA/ED phase expected to be completed in mid 2009. The project will require minor amounts of right-of-way acquisition.

The I-880 HOV Widening project is in Project Approval / Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase, with the preparation of the environmental document underway. Environmental elements completed include air, noise, biological, and cultural considerations. Preliminary studies consisting of surveys, aerial mapping and traffic data collections have been completed, and the preparation of conceptual engineering drawings continues. The Draft Environmental Document is anticipated to be complete in late 2008, with the PA/ED phase expected to be completed in mid 2009. This project will require right-of-way acquisition, and coordination work with the Cities of San Jose and Milpitas is in progress.

VTA is performing preliminary engineering and conceptual design for the I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements project. Current work includes traffic studies, mapping, and preparation of a Project Study Report. Conceptual design for a new off-ramp connection from Northbound I-280 to Winchester Boulevard is included in the environmental studies. Project schedule and phasing are dependent upon available funding.

VTA is preparing conceptual design and environmental clearance for the proposed US 101/Route 25 interchange and US 101 Widening from Monterey Road to Route 129. The current studies are looking at access control, freeway alignment, right-of-way, utilities, and a new US 101/Route 25 interchange. Environmental study limits have also been set and technical studies are ongoing.

Work is underway to complete a Project Study Report/Project Report and Environmental Document (State - CEQA only) for the US 101 De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road Interchange Improvements in the City of San Jose. VTA has submitted the traffic operations report to Caltrans.

Current work on the Charcot Avenue Extension project includes surveying, traffic studies, construction cost estimates, as well as environmental technical studies of air, noise, biological, cultural, and community impacts toward preparation of an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the environmental document. A combined Project Study Report / Project Report will be prepared as the project approval document. The project
B. PROJECTS IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL/PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING PHASE (Continued)

initiation phase began in September 2007 with a duration of 18 months. The scope and duration of the complete project will be determined in this initial phase.

The Project Study Report for the Calaveras Boulevard Improvements project will include three project alternatives: the “widen in,” “widen out,” and “no build” options. Both the “widen in” and “widen out” options include three lanes with auxiliary lanes. Sub-alternatives will also be studied for different variations of the connections at Main Street. VTA has received comments on the Draft PSR from Caltrans, and is preparing a response, with the final PSR anticipated for late-2008.

The Mary Avenue Extension project is currently in the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase, with the Final Environmental Impact Report circulated for public review in Fall 2008. The Environmental Impact Report and the combined Project Study Report/Project Report are expected to be finalized in late 2008. The project is planned to move into the PS&E phase following the recent approval of the FEIR by the Sunnyvale City Council. It has not yet been determined who will administer and fund the next phase of work.

C. PROJECTS IN FINAL DESIGN (PS&E)

The Mitigated Negative Declaration for the US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena Road project was signed by Caltrans on December 1, 2005. Upon project approval, VTA will file the Mitigated Negative Declaration for NEPA Environmental Clearance at the County of Santa Clara and at the State Clearinghouse. 65% PS&E was achieved in November 2008. Right-of-way engineering has commenced with only easements required and no acquisitions.

The Ramp Metering Implementation project is underway, with peak period traffic data collected and being used to develop traffic operations models that describe existing conditions for three corridors. The focus of this project through end of 2008 and into early 2009 will be the Route 87 and Route 85 corridors to develop ramp metering plans and implement these plans in the field. In parallel, ramp metering plans are being developed for the Southbound US 101 corridor, and these plans will be implemented in the field in mid 2009.

The design team for the I-880/Route 237 Planting project is preparing design submittals for Caltrans, with completion of the 65% design anticipated in late 2008. The project is anticipated to be phased to coordinate with the I-880 HOV Widening project on the same corridor.
C. PROJECTS IN FINAL DESIGN (PS&E) (Continued)

The I-880/Coleman Avenue Planting project is currently on hold pending the outcome of unresolved issues related to funding, maintenance, and design elements.

D. PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION

RGW Construction, Inc. was awarded the construction contract for the Route 152/156 Interchange project, with the first charged day on March 27, 2007. On August 28, 2008, six weeks ahead of schedule, the flyover (overpass) was opened to traffic, just in time for the busy Labor Day weekend. Work continues to complete the final roadway configuration, and to install highway planting, with construction anticipated to be complete in mid 2009.

The bid opening for the Route 87 Planting Project occurred on June 25, 2008. Two bids were received with McGuire and Hester submitting the low bid. The first charged day was August 27, 2008. The contractor is currently developing submittals and establishing a laydown area.
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VTP Highway Projects

US 101 Implementation - Trimble to Mabury/Taylor

**Estimated Cost:** $1.75 million

Estimate Class 5 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 09:** $2.0 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $1.75 million

**Year of Completion:** 2009 (Conceptual Study)

**Project Manager:** Darrell Vice

**Designer:** T.Y. Lin International

**Project Description:**

*Note:* The description and funding indicated are solely for the production of an Implementation Plan. Any project arising from the Implementation Plan will be defined and scoped separately.

Prepare an Implementation Plan for the US 101 corridor from the Trimble/De La Cruz Interchange to the proposed Taylor/Mabury Interchange. This scope of work requires traffic studies and mapping of the corridor area, and preparation of geometric concepts and phasing implementation plan for the 4th St./Zanker Road, Taylor/Mabury Road, and Old Oakland Road Interchanges. The Implementation Plan will determine which projects should be advanced to the Project Study Report phase, and the timing of the projects.

**Project Status:**

**Implementation Plan:** T.Y. Lin International has completed mapping and is currently preparing traffic studies for the project. Preliminary traffic information has been received and conceptual interchange configurations have been developed in conjunction with the City of San Jose and Caltrans.

Completion of the Implementation Plan is scheduled for early 2009. The project schedule beyond the implementation plan will depend on the findings, identified priorities, and funding availability.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,733</td>
<td>1,137</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,733</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,137</strong></td>
<td><strong>613</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Secured Funding Incurred: 65%
- Secured Funding Committed: 99%

**NOTE**: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
<th>Local 100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.75</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

---

**Existing 4th/Zanker Interchange, from existing 4th Street onramp**

**US 101 SB Traffic exiting onto Oakland Road**
VTP Highway Projects
El Camino Real/Route 85/237/Middlefield

Estimated Cost: $0.75 million
   Estimate Class 5 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 09:
   $2.0 million

Secured Funding to Date:
   $0.75 million

Year of Completion: 2009
   (Conceptual Study)

Project Manager: Darrell Vice

Designer: Nolte Associates

Project Description:

Note: The description and funding indicated are solely for the production of a Project Study Report-Project Development Support (PSR-PDS). Any project arising from the Project Study Report will be defined and scoped separately.

Perform Conceptual Studies and prepare a PSR-PDS for improvements on Route 85 and Route 237. Possible alternatives include operational improvements to the El Camino Real/Route 85 Interchange, auxiliary lanes on Route 85 from El Camino Real to the Route 85 / Route 237 Interchange, and operational improvements at the Middlefield Road / Route 237 Interchange. Additionally, investigation of a possible direct connection between Route 85 and Route 237 is included.

Project Status:

Project Study Report: Nolte Associates is performing conceptual studies within the project limits. The footprint of the ultimate Route 85/Route 237 interchange has been determined, and Nolte has provided a range of options for projects which could be advanced within the study area. Preliminary geotechnical information has been received, and traffic studies are ongoing. Additional traffic analysis is required due to the complexity of the project.

The PSR-PDS is expected to be completed in mid 2009.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSR-PDS</td>
<td>Mid 2006</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>750</strong></td>
<td><strong>748</strong></td>
<td><strong>520</strong></td>
<td><strong>230</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 69%
Secured Funding Committed: 100%

Note: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Mountain View)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified:

- 100% Local
- 0% Portion of Estimated Cost

Route 237 looking west towards Route 85
Route 85 Northbound, approaching Route 237/US 101
VTP Highway Projects

Silicon Valley Express Lanes

Estimated Cost:

Initial Study - $3 million
237/880 Express Connector - $5 million
Route 85 Express lanes - $96 million
US 101 Express Lanes - $416 million

Estimate Class 5 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 09: $14.97 million

Secured Funding to Date: $2.95 million

Year of Completion: 2015

Project Manager: Murali Ramanujam

Designer: URS Corporation

Project Description:

Convert existing carpool lanes to Express Lanes at the Route 237/I-880 direct connector, along the entire 24 mile length of Route 85 and along 34 miles of US 101 from Cochrane Road in Morgan Hill to the San Mateo County line. This will allow for:

- More effective use of existing HOV lanes
- Utilization of dynamic pricing to control congestion
- Generation of toll revenues to fund transportation and transit improvements in the Express Lane corridor
- Trip time reliability and travel time savings in the corridor

Project Status:

The current focus of the project is to implement Express lanes on the Route 237/I-880 direct connector first. Several conceptual alternatives for Route 85 have been developed. Work is currently underway on detailed alternatives, in coordination with Caltrans and other stakeholders, and is scheduled to be finalized by December 2008.

VTA embarked on a public outreach effort beginning in June 2008.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Eng &amp; PA/ED</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237/880 Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237/880 Construction</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237/880 Tolling Operational</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 85 Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 85 Construction</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 85 Tolling Operational</td>
<td>Early 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101 Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101 Construction</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US-101 Tolling Operational</td>
<td>Mid 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding not identified, schedule is tentative.
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 68%
Secured Funding Committed 98%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>US 101</td>
<td>Route 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lanes</td>
<td>Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD (STIP, Federal)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

VTA Express Lanes provide improved access and reliable travel for everyone.
- Solo drivers with a prepaid FasTrak transponder can choose to pay a toll and use the Express Lanes.
- Transit vehicles, carpools, vanpools, motorcycles, and eligible hybrids can use the Express Lanes at no charge.
VTP Highway Projects

US 101 Auxiliary Lanes – Embarcadero Rd. to Route 85

Estimated Cost: $102 million
  Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 09: $17.0 million

Secured Funding to Date: $10.6 million

Year of Completion: 2013

Project Manager: Lam Trinh

Designer: URS Corporation

Project Description:
Construct auxiliary lanes in each direction of a 3.2 mile segment of US 101 between Route 85 in Mountain View and Embarcadero Road in Palo Alto.

This project has been selected by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for construction funding through the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Proposition 1B Funding Program.

Project Status:
In December 2007, the VTA Board authorized a second Measure A/STIP swap that provides an additional $13.6 million in funding. These funds were approved by the CTC with the approval of the 2008 STIP in May 2008. VTA will make these funds available to the project based on a funding schedule driven by project phase.

Environmental/Preliminary Engineering: The project is in the Environmental/PE (PA/ED) phase, with the preparation of the Environmental Document underway. The completed environmental elements included air, noise, biological, and cultural considerations. Preliminary studies consisting of surveys, aerial mapping and traffic data collections have been completed, and the preparation of conceptual engineering drawings continues.

The Draft Environmental Document is anticipated to be complete by the end of 2008, with the PA/ED phase expected to be completed in mid 2009. The project will require minor amounts of right-of-way acquisition.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td>Late 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding (a)</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance (d = (a-c))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>10,576</td>
<td>3,412</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>8,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,600</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,436</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,557</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,043</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 24%
Secured Funding Committed 32%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$17.1</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$102.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Southbound travel times with no delay from Embarcadero Road

Matadero Creek crossing under US 101
VTP Highway Projects

I-880 HOV Widening

Estimated Cost: $95 million

Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 09:
$23.4 million

Secured Funding to Date: $8.5 million

Year of Completion: 2013

Project Manager: Lam Trinh

Designer: Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.

Project Description:

This project will add a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in each direction of 4.6 miles of Interstate 880 between US 101 in San Jose and Route 237 in the City of Milpitas.

This project has been selected by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for partial funds through the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Proposition 1B Funding Program.

Project Status:

In December 2007, the VTA Board authorized a second Measure A/STIP swap that provides an additional $14.9 million in funding. These funds were approved by CTC in May 2008. VTA will make these funds available to the project based on a funding schedule driven by project phase.

Environmental/Preliminary Engineering: The project is in the Project Approval/Environmental Document (PA/ED) phase, with the preparation of the Environmental Document underway. Environmental elements completed include air, noise, biological, and cultural considerations. Preliminary studies consisting of surveys, aerial mapping and traffic data collections have been completed, and the preparation of conceptual engineering drawings continues.

The Draft Environmental Document is anticipated to be complete by the end of 2008, with the PA/ED phase expected to be completed in mid 2009.

This project will require right-of-way acquisition, and coordination work with the Cities of San Jose and Milpitas is ongoing.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Late 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Mid 2011</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td>Mid 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding a</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs b</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs c</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>8,516</td>
<td>8,368</td>
<td>2,522</td>
<td>5,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,540</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,392</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,529</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 30%
Secured Funding Committed 98%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$23.4</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$95.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Northbound I-880

Brokaw Road Undercrossing / Coyote Creek Bridge
I-880/I-280/Stevens Creek Improvements

Estimated Cost: $130 - $150 million

Appropriation through FY 09: $8.75 million

Secured Funding to Date: $7.1 million

Year of Completion: 2013

Project Manager: Sajeeni DeAlwis-Mima

Designer: Mark Thomas & Company, Inc.

Project Description:
The project improves traffic operations, safety and access between the I-880 and I-280 freeway corridors, including modifications to the Route 17/I-280/I-880 freeway-to-freeway interchange itself, as well as to the two adjacent interchanges at I-880/Stevens Creek Boulevard and I-280/Winchester Boulevard. Specific improvements include:

• Reconfiguring the existing full cloverleaf I-880/Stevens Creek Boulevard Interchange to improve traffic flow in the interchange area by widening and realigning ramps, widening the overcrossing structure at Stevens Creek Boulevard over I-880, improving intersections, and providing enhanced access to pedestrians and bicyclists.

• Separating freeway-to-freeway traffic from local traffic by constructing a new direct connector from northbound I-280 to northbound I-880.

• Providing a new point of access by constructing a new northbound I-280 off-ramp at Winchester Boulevard.

Project Status:
Environmental/Preliminary Engineering: Mark Thomas & Company is performing preliminary engineering and conceptual design for the project. Current work includes traffic studies, mapping, and preparation of a Project Study Report. Conceptual design for a new off-ramp connection from Northbound I-280 to Winchester Boulevard is included in the environmental studies. Project schedule and phasing are dependent upon available funding.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Late 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2011*</td>
<td>Late 2013*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Late 2013*</td>
<td>Early 2014*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2013*</td>
<td>Early 2014*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding not identified, schedule is tentative.
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>4,262</td>
<td>3,804</td>
<td>1,486</td>
<td>2,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,856</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,487</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,629</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 21%

Secured Funding Committed 54%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (TBD)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Earmark)</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD (Future STIP, other)</td>
<td>105-125</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130-150</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Northbound I-280 at Northbound I-880 Junction

Southbound I-880 approaching Stevens Creek Boulevard and I-280
**VTP Highway Projects**

**US 101 Widening - Monterey Road to Route 129**

**Estimated Cost:** $370 million  
Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 09:** $5.5 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $5.5 million

**Year of Completion:** 2013

**Project Manager:** Darrell Vice

**Designer:** URS Corporation

**Project Description:**

The project proposes to widen US 101 from four to six lanes in Santa Clara and San Benito Counties to meet future traffic demands and provide access control. The project also includes widening and replacing bridge structures, improving existing horizontal curves, constructing a new interchange at the intersection of US 101 and Route 25, extending Santa Teresa Boulevard to connect to Route 25 at the Route 25/US 101 Interchange, and adding additional ramp lanes at Route 129.

The project extends approximately 2.6 miles into San Benito County and approximately 4.1 miles into Santa Clara County. VTA is in partnership with San Benito Council of Government, Caltrans District 4, Caltrans District 5, local agencies and developers to deliver the project.

The project is contemplated to be delivered in two segments after completion of the environmental/PE phase. The first segment extends from the northern limit of the project to the US 101/Route 25 interchange. The second segment extends from just south of the US 101/Route 25 interchange interchange to the US 101/Route 129 interchange.

**Project Status:**

**Environmental/Preliminary Engineering:** VTA has contracted with URS to prepare conceptual design and environmental clearance for the proposed US 101/Route 25 interchange and US 101 widening from Monterey Road to Route 129. The current studies are looking at access control, freeway alignment, right-of-way, utilities, and a new US 101/Route 25 interchange. Environmental study limits have also been set and technical studies are ongoing.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2010*</td>
<td>Late 2011*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Early 2010*</td>
<td>Late 2011*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2010*</td>
<td>Late 2013*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Late 2013*</td>
<td>Early 2014*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Late 2013*</td>
<td>Early 2014*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding not identified, schedule is tentative.*
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>5,348</td>
<td>4,702</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>2,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>4,802</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>2,305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 58%
Secured Funding Committed 87%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
<td>$4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>364.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$370.0</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified
**VTP Highway Projects**

**US 101 De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road Interchange Improvements**

**Estimated Cost:** $27 million  
Estimated Class 5 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 09:**  
$0.8 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**  
$0.7 million

**Year of Completion:** TBD

**Project Manager:** Scott Hensler

**Designer:** Rajappan & Meyer Consulting Engineers, Inc.

**Project Description:**

The project will study improvements to the US 101 - De La Cruz Boulevard/Trimble Road interchange, including:

- Replacing the existing US 101 overcrossing
- Widening De La Cruz Blvd/Trimble Road to six travel lanes through the interchange limits
- Reconstructing the southbound exit loop to a partial cloverleaf design and incorporating a new intersection on De La Cruz Boulevard
- Adding a southbound auxiliary lane from De La Cruz Boulevard to the Route 87 exit ramp, depending on results of operational studies
- Configuring ramp termini to be pedestrian and bicycle-friendly

**Project Status:**

**Environmental/Preliminary Engineering:** VTA has a contract with Rajappan & Meyer to complete a Project Study Report/Project Report and Environmental Document (State - CEQA only) for the interchange improvements in the City of San Jose. VTA has submitted the traffic operations report to Caltrans.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Beyond</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
<td><strong>417</strong></td>
<td><strong>283</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 60%
Secured Funding Committed 100%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
<td>$0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Trimble Road Southbound

Trimble Road Northbound
VTP Highway Projects

Charcot Avenue Extension

Estimated Cost: $35 million
   Estimate Class 5 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 09: $0.9 million

Secured Funding to Date: $0.8 million

Year of Completion: 2009 (Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document)

Project Manager: Michelle Jiang

Designer: Parsons Brinkerhoff

Project Description:
The Charcot Avenue Extension project proposes to extend Charcot Avenue over Interstate 880 via an overcrossing in the City of San Jose between Old Oakland Road and Paragon Drive. These improvements will provide improved east-west connectivity across the I-880 corridor in the North San Jose region.

The project scope consists of the following:

- An approximately 524 foot long overcrossing bridge over Interstate 880 that will accommodate the future widening of I-880 (one HOV lane in each direction), likely requiring a bridge pier in the median of I-880
- Roadway construction to extend and connect Charcot Avenue from Old Oakland Road to Paragon Drive in the City of San Jose
- Minor improvements on either side of I-880 only as necessary to accommodate a standard overcrossing
- Limited local roadway improvements to conform to existing roads, including the widening of Silk Wood Lane
- Elements, such as sound walls and retaining walls, necessary to complete the project
- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including a dedicated bike lane and sidewalk

Project Status:

Preliminary Engineering and Environmental Document: The current scope includes surveying, traffic studies, construction cost estimates, as well as environmental technical studies of air, noise, biological, cultural, visual, and community impacts toward preparation of an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for the environmental document. A combined Project Study Report / Project Report will be prepared as the project approval document.

The project initiation phase began in September 2007 with a duration of approximately 18 months. The scope and duration of the complete project will be determined in this initial phase.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering &amp; Environmental Document</td>
<td>Late 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>800</strong></td>
<td><strong>743</strong></td>
<td><strong>427</strong></td>
<td><strong>373</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 53%
Secured Funding Committed 93%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

## Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (San Jose)</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed overcrossing location, looking north along Otoole Ave at Charcot Ave and I-880

Looking east along Charcot Ave from the intersection at Paragon Drive
### VTP Highway Projects

#### Calaveras Boulevard Improvements

**Estimated Cost:** $77 million

Estimate Class 4 (*see appendix*)

**Appropriation through FY 09:**
$2.35 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$0.60 million

**Year of Completion:** TBD

**Project Manager:** Scott Hensler

**Designer:** Nolte Associates, Inc.

#### Project Description:

The work includes widening the existing four-lane facility to six lanes, from Town Center Drive in the east to Abel Street in the west. In addition, the work assumes auxiliary lanes will be added to the current six-lane facility between Abel Street and Abbott Avenue. The proposed widening will require widening/replacement of the bridges over Main Street and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to accommodate the proposed BART extension.

#### Project Status:

**Conceptual Engineering/Project Study Report:** The Project Study Report will include three project alternatives: the “widen in,” “widen out,” and “no build” options. Both the “widen in” and “widen out” options include three lanes with auxiliary lanes. Sub-alternatives will also be studied for different variations of the connections at Main Street.

VTA has received comments on the Draft PSR from Caltrans, and is preparing a response, with the final PSR anticipated for late 2008.

#### Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Eng/PSR</td>
<td>Late 2007</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental &amp; Beyond</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 98%
Secured Funding Committed 99%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Milpitas)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>76.40</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$77.00</td>
<td>$0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Diagram showing funding breakdown with Local 1% and TBD 99%]

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

### Images:

- Eastbound Calaveras Blvd.
- Intersection of Calaveras Blvd. & Abbott Ave. Approaching Route 237 West
VTP Highway Projects
Mary Avenue Extension

**Estimated Cost:** $72 million
   Estimate Class 4 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 09:** $4 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $1.6 million

**Year of Completion:** TBD

**Project Manager:** Sajeeni DeAlwis-Mima

**Designer:** BKF Engineers

**Project Description:**
Extend Mary Avenue across US 101 and Route 237 to improve traffic operations and circulation and improve access to the Moffett Industrial Park.

Mary Avenue runs from Homestead Road to Almanor Avenue in the City of Sunnyvale. The proposed 0.5-mile extension project will extend Mary Avenue northerly over US 101 and Route 237 to the Moffett Industrial Park area west of Mathilda Avenue.

The proposed roadway section includes four lanes, with bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides. The project will include a 0.25 mile span structure over US 101, Route 237 and the VTA Light Rail Station north of Route 237. Impacts to the freeway system are anticipated to be limited to column placements in the rights-of-way of US 101 and Route 237.

**Project Status:**

**Environmental/Preliminary Engineering:** The Final Environmental Impact Report was circulated to the public in Fall 2008. The Environmental Impact Report and the combined Project Study Report/Project Report are expected to be finalized in late 2008.

The project is planned to move into the PS&E phase following the recent approval of the FEIR by the Sunnyvale City Council. It has not yet been determined who will administer and fund the next phase of work.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2005</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Beyond</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding (a)</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs (b)</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs (c)</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance (d = (a-c))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,590</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,074</strong></td>
<td><strong>922</strong></td>
<td><strong>668</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 58%  
Secured Funding Committed 68%  

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified ($)</th>
<th>Secured ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Sunnyvale)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>70.41</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$72.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1.59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![View along 11th Avenue](image1.png)  
![Mary Avenue and Almanor Avenue](image2.png)
VTP Highway Projects

US 101 Improvements - I-280 to Yerba Buena Road

Estimated Cost: $63 million
   Estimate Class 3 (see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 09:
$12.4 million

Secured Funding to Date: $7.4 million

Year of Completion: 2012

Project Manager: Ven Prasad

Designer: HMH Engineers

Project Description:
Improve Operation on US 101 in east San Jose by adding a lane in the southbound direction from south of Story Road to north of Capitol Expressway and reconfigure the US 101/Tully Road interchange from the existing full cloverleaf to a partial cloverleaf interchange.

The balance of the operational improvements between Capital Expressway and Yerba Buena Road covered in the Environmental Document will be addressed in a future project.

Additionally, the proposed project replaces the Tully Road Overcrossing. The project fully accommodates bicyclists and pedestrians with a bike lane and sidewalks on both sides along the full length of Tully Road.

This project has been selected by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for partial funds through the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) Proposition 1B Funding Program.

Project Status:
In December 2007, the VTA Board authorized a second Measure A/STIP swap that provided an additional $5 million in funding for project development. These funds were approved by CTC in May 2008. VTA will make these funds available to the project based on a funding schedule driven by project phase.

Design (PS&E): The Mitigated Negative Declaration was signed by Caltrans on December 1, 2005. Upon project approval, VTA will file the Mitigated Negative Declaration at the County of Santa Clara and at the State Clearinghouse to meet NEPA requirements.

65% PS&E was achieved in November 2008. Right-of-way engineering has commenced with only easements required and no acquisitions.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Mid 2007</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2008</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Early 2009</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2010</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Late 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td>Late 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d = (a-c))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>6,816</td>
<td>6,162</td>
<td>4,336</td>
<td>2,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,060</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 59%
Secured Funding Committed: 85%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
<th>Local 40%</th>
<th>Federal 11%</th>
<th>State 49%</th>
<th>Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$12.0</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local (Other)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (CMIA)</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (SHOPP)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Earmark)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$63.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$7.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Southbound US 101 at Tully Road   Southbound US 101 approaching Capitol Expressway/Yerba Buena Road
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VTP Highway Projects

Ramp Metering Implementation

Estimated Cost:
$2.1 million
Estimate Class 4
(see appendix)

Appropriation through FY 09:
$3.5 million

Secured Funding to Date:
$2.1 million

Year of Completion:
2009

Project Manager:
David Kobayashi

Designer:
Mark Thomas & Company

Project Description:
Implement ramp metering along Southbound US 101 between Embarcadero Road and De La Cruz Boulevard, the entire length of Route 87, and Southbound Route 85 between Almaden Expressway and Cottle Road during the AM and PM peak periods.

This project implements ramp metering on corridors that already have existing ramp metering equipment. The project includes some minor construction activity to repair vehicular detection systems and other related equipment to ensure that the ramp metering equipment is in functional order prior to the implementation. The goals of the project are to minimize overall corridor delay by managing access at on-ramps during peak commute periods, and to minimize the impact on local street traffic resulting from the implementation of ramp metering.

Project Status:
Peak period traffic data has been collected and is being used to develop traffic operations models that describe existing conditions for all three corridors. The focus of this project through end of 2008 and into early 2009 will be the Route 87 and Route 85 corridors to develop ramp metering plans and implement these plans in the field.

In parallel, ramp metering plans are being developed for the Southbound US 101 corridor, and these plans will be implemented in the field in mid 2009.

Project Schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Early 2008</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation &amp; Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding a</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs b</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs c</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance d = (a-c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,492</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>1,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,051</strong></td>
<td><strong>962</strong></td>
<td><strong>348</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,703</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 17%
Secured Funding Committed 47%

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal (CMAQ)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

### Ramp Metering Hardware Example

(Typical One Lane On-Ramp)

Ramp Metering Schematic
VTP Highway Projects
I-880/Route 237 Planting

**Estimated Cost:** $3.75 million
  Estimate Class 2 *(see appendix)*

**Appropriation through FY 09:**
$3.75 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$3.75 million

**Year of Completion:** 2010

**Project Manager:** Stuart Bussian

**Designer:** Parsons Transportation, Orsee Design

**Project Description:**

The project consists of landscape improvements in the City of Milpitas for the I-880 / Route 237 interchange, and the McCarthy Road Median. Work will include replacement planting, a recycled-water automatic irrigation system, erosion control work, and a 3-year plant establishment maintenance period.

The initial phase includes the western half of the interchange and continues westerly along Route 237 including and ending with two medians at McCarthy Boulevard.

**Project Status:**

**Final Design (PS&E):** The design team is preparing design submittals for Caltrans, with completion of the 65% design anticipated in late 2008. In addition to Parsons Transportation and Orsee Design, the design team includes the City of Milpitas, Caltrans, and VTA.

The project is anticipated to be phased to coordinate with the I-880 HOV Widening project on the same corridor.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2008</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Establishment</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>355</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,625</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 3%
Secured Funding Committed 9%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (Milpitas)</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified: 100%

I-880/Route 237 Interchange

Typical Landscaping
VTP Highway Projects

I-880/Coleman Avenue Planting

**Estimated Cost:** $5.7 million

**Appropriation through FY 09***: $5.3 million

**Secured Funding to Date***: $0

**Year of Completion:** 2010

**Project Manager:** Ven Prasad

**Designer:** URS Corporation, City of San Jose

**Project Description:**

The Coleman Avenue/I-880 interchange is a major gateway to San Jose Mineta International Airport and downtown San Jose. The project consists of landscape improvements including replacement planting, installation of a reclaimed water automatic irrigation system, erosion control work, and a possible public art installation. In addition to the interchange area, improvements are proposed for Coleman Avenue from McKendrie Street to Newhall Drive.

Final scope will be reflective of the availability of funding and maintenance agreements.

**Project Status:**

The project is currently on hold pending the outcome of a re-scoping exercise based on availability of funding and execution of maintenance agreements.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Late 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Establishment</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Mid 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Funding/scope not identified/defined, schedule is tentative.

*Amounts shown are for highway planting scope only and exclude $80.0 million of appropriation and secured funding for highway construction.
### Cost**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000’s

### Funding (millions)**:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local (TBD - Match)</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Earmark)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (GARVEE)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD (Other)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$0.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TBD 40%**

**Federal 60%**

**Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified**

**Amounts shown are for highway planting scope only and exclude funding for highway construction.**
**VTP Highway Projects**

**Route 152/156 Interchange**

**Estimated Cost:** $36.7 million

Estimated Class 1 (see appendix)

**Appropriation through FY 09:**
$36.7 million

**Secured Funding to Date:** $36.7 million

**Year of Completion:** 2009

**Project Manager:** Ven Prasad

**Designer:** Biggs Cardosa Associates

**Contractor:** RGW, Inc.

**Project Description:**
This project will provide operational and safety improvements at the Route 152 / Route 156 intersection by grade separating the left-turn movement from westbound Route 152 to westbound Route 156 and eliminating conflicting traffic movements.

This project’s features include:
- Construction of a one-lane elevated flyover structure (overpass) for eastbound Route 152 traffic
- Construction of a ground-level eastbound Route 152 to westbound Route 156 connector ramp
- Reconstruction of the roadway between westbound Route 152 and westbound Route 156 as well as the eastbound and westbound lanes of Route 152
- Rehabilitation and restoration of landscaping within the intersection area.

**Project Status:**

**Construction:** RGW Construction, Inc. was awarded the construction contract for the project, and the first charged day was March 27, 2007.

On August 28, 2008, six weeks ahead of schedule, the flyover (overpass) was opened to traffic, just in time for the busy Labor Day weekend. Work continues to complete the final roadway configuration, and to install highway planting, with construction anticipated to be complete in mid 2009.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental/PE</td>
<td>Early 2002</td>
<td>Mid 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2004</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Late 2004</td>
<td>Late 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Early 2007</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyover Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open to Traffic</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closeout</td>
<td>Mid 2009</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>22,779</td>
<td>18,808</td>
<td>16,753</td>
<td>6,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>11,888</td>
<td>10,505</td>
<td>10,011</td>
<td>1,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,689</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,134</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,577</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,113</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred: 78%
Secured Funding Committed: 85%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas A/STIP Swap</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (RIP)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State (ITIP)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (Earmark)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$36.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Ribbon Cutting Ceremony, August 27, 2008

Completed flyover structure open to traffic
VTP Highway Projects

Route 87 Planting

**Estimated Cost:** $4.6 million
   Estimate Class 1 *(see appendix)*

**Appropriation through FY 09:**
$4.6 million

**Secured Funding to Date:**
$4.6 million

**Year of Completion:** 2010

**Project Manager:** Ven Prasad

**Designer:** BKF Engineers, Sugimura & Associates

**Contractor:** McGuire and Hester

**Project Description:**
The project consists of landscape improvements including replacement planting, automatic irrigation system, and erosion control work, with a 3-year plant establishment and maintenance period. The proposed project extends from Capitol Expressway to Julian Street in Downtown San Jose, and includes four major interchanges: Capital Expressway, Curtner Avenue, Almaden Expressway, and Julian Street.

**Project Status:**

**Construction:** Bid opening occurred on June 25, 2008. Two bids were received with McGuire and Hester submitting the low bid.

The first charged day was August 27, 2008. The contractor is currently developing submittals and establishing a laydown area.

**Project Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Start</th>
<th>End</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>Mid 2006</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planting</td>
<td>Late 2008</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Establishment</td>
<td>Mid 2010</td>
<td>Early 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost Element</th>
<th>Secured Funding</th>
<th>Oct-08 Committed Costs</th>
<th>Oct-08 Incurred Costs</th>
<th>Secured Funding Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Major Procurement</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>3,114</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor, Services and Support</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,620</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,383</strong></td>
<td><strong>166</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,454</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secured Funding Incurred 4%
Secured Funding Committed 73%

NOTE: All amounts are Year Of Expenditure dollars in $1,000's

### Funding (millions):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Identified</th>
<th>Secured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meas B Swap</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal (STP Funds)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Portion of Estimated Cost for which funding has been identified

Federal 54%
Local 46%

100%
APPENDIX – COST ESTIMATE CLASSES

Figure 1 – Cost Estimate Classification Matrix
(Adapted from AACE Skills & Knowledge of Cost Engineering, 4th ed., Chapter 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate Class</th>
<th>Level of Project Definition</th>
<th>Expected Accuracy Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>0% to 5%</td>
<td>-50% to +100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>5% to 25%</td>
<td>-30% to +50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>-20% to +30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-15% to +20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>90% to 100%</td>
<td>-10% to +15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 shows a mapping of Estimate Class to Level of Project Definition. Intuitively, estimates become more accurate and have less uncertainty as project definition increases. This table provides a rough framework to describe the accuracy of project estimated costs in this report. A discussion of cost estimate classes, in order of increasing accuracy, is presented below:

- **Class 5** (Order-of-Magnitude Estimates) – Order-of-magnitude estimates are sometimes referred to as “conceptual” or “ballpark” estimates. These estimates are made without detailed engineering data using only basic criteria such as area or distance. An estimate of this type would normally be expected to be accurate within +100 percent to -50 percent. Order-of-magnitude estimates are used to quickly screen several types of alternative designs.

- **Classes 4 and 3** (Preliminary Estimates) – Preliminary estimates are prepared once enough preliminary engineering has taken place to further define the project scope. An estimate of this type is normally expected to be accurate within +50 percent to -30 percent. Since the preliminary estimate is more definitive than the order-of-magnitude estimate, it is better suited for determining project feasibility.

- **Classes 2 and 1** (Final Estimates) – Final estimates are prepared from very defined engineering data. This data includes, as a minimum, fairly complete plans and specifications. An estimate of this type is usually expected to be accurate within +15 percent to -15 percent. The final estimate has a level of accuracy that is appropriate for setting project budgets.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

SUBJECT: Real-Time Information (RTI) Project

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Adopt the Initial Project Report for Regional Measure 2 (RM2) funds for the Real-Time Information Project (attached as Exhibit A);

2. Adopt a resolution authorizing the General Manager to execute and submit an allocation request for the RM2 funds from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for the Real-Time Information Project, (attached as Exhibit B) in the amount of $2,530,000; and

3. Authorize the General Manager to execute a contract with ACS Inc., (Affiliated Computer Services) to build the Real-Time System in an amount not to exceed a total of $5,100,000.

BACKGROUND:

In 2003, the VTA completed a $25 million upgrade of its radio and fleet management system called the Advanced Communication System (ACS). This project also included the construction of a new Operations Control Center (OCC), construction of new radio sites throughout the County, enhancement of radio communications (including four new channels and a simulcast repeater system), and installation of a global positioning system (GPS) based vehicle location system on VTA's fleet of vehicles. These improvements have not only provided for a more effective communication system, but also resulted in an enhancement of transit service.

The Real-Time Information (RTI) project builds on the ACS project, utilizing currently unused but potentially useful data acquired by the ACS system. ACS has made available to VTA a wealth of real-time data related to the location of its transit vehicles. The objective of the RTI project is to take the real-time data and package it into real-time information usable by VTA's
transit passengers. This information could be accessible to VTA's customers not only at the various transit centers, stations and stop locations, but also via the Internet and telephone. The RTI project will result in a system that provides information on transit vehicle arrivals to VTA's customers where and when they need it.

The information includes the contemporaneous location of transit vehicles and the estimated next vehicle arrival and departure times for all routes. Plans include presenting this information via the Internet, telephone, and electronic information display boards at key transit stops within Santa Clara County. These locations include major bus stops, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)/Rapid Bus stops, Light Rail Transit (LRT) stations, transit centers, and joint transit stops (i.e. those shared with other transit service providers). This information could also be distributed through MTC's 5-1-1 System and VTA's customer service centers, as well as other means.

Once such information is widely available through these means, it is planned that future projects by other entities, such as major commercial and public centers and in-vehicle information systems, would incorporate access to this real-time transit information into their projects from the conceptual stage through implementation.

**DISCUSSION:**

A. **RM2 Real-Time Transit Grant.**

MTC has approved the recommended grant award for the RM2 Real time Transit Information Grant Program in the amount of $2,530,000 (See Exhibit C). In order to have the allocation of the RM2 Grant Funds approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, VTA is required to adopt the Implementing Agency Resolution of Project Compliance and submit the Resolution, along with the Board-approved IPR, a work plan, and an estimated budget to MTC. Therefore, VTA staff recommends that the Board approve the attached IPR and adopt the attached Board Resolution authorizing the General Manager to submit an allocation request for the grant to MTC.

The RTI project funding sources are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/ITS</td>
<td>$1,572,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>$ 780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Match</td>
<td>$1,158,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM2 Funding</td>
<td>$2,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being requested from MTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Program Budget</td>
<td>$6,041,684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. **Request for Proposal and Award of Contract to ACS, Inc.**

In order to select a qualified proposer for the RTI project, VTA issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) on May 20, 2008. A Pre-Proposal Conference as held on June 5, 2008 to answer any questions and to clarify the terms and conditions of the RFP. Seven proposals were received on
August 1, 2008, from TransitVue, CMC Americas Inc., ACS Inc., ICX Transportation, iNiT Inc., and Next Bus. Selection was based on qualifications, technical approach, staffing and project organization, client care/support and cost.

VTA’s selection panel consisted of the VTA Project Manager, VTA Communications Manager, VTA Operations Manager, VTA Manager of Operations Analysis, VTA Manager of Public Affairs and Customer Information and VTA Contracts Administrator. Based upon their written proposal and interview, the selection team determined ACS, Inc., and its proposed sub-contractors, to be the best qualified to build the Real Time Information System for VTA.

The current VTA biennial budget through FY 2009 includes funding for design, development, and VTA staff activities associated with the Real Time Information Project. The RM2 funds must be appropriated in the FY 2010 capital budget. The RM2 funds can only be used for the deployment phase starting in July 2009.

VTA staff is proposing a contract with ACS, Inc. (Affiliated Computer Services) for detailed design, testing, integration and implementation of the Real Time Information Project, which is planned to start in FY 2009 and complete in FY 2010. Proceeding with the testing, integration, and implementation will allow work to progress without interruption.

The proposed contract will be structured as a fixed-firm price type contract. The value of the contract will not exceed $5,100,000.

VTA will need incremental operating resources starting in FY 2010 to maintain and operate the system. VTA staff and ACS, Inc. have estimated the yearly cost of Operating, Maintenance and support after the warranty period to be 450,000 per year.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

There are no practical alternatives to the recommended action of adopting the IPR and Resolution and submitting an allocation request to MTC if the Board of Directors wishes to receive RM2 funds for the RTI Project. The implementation of the design, procurement, and installation of the RTI project would not be practical relying only on local funds, and VTA would forfeit $4,882,842 in external funding. The adoption of the Initial Project Report and the RM2 Implementing Agency Resolution of Project Compliance is required as part of the application for the RM2 funds.

With regard to the selection of the contractor, the Board of Directors could direct staff to issue a new RFP. This alternative is not recommended because VTA has conducted an open selection process and the delay in issuing another RFP will adversely impact the delivery schedule of the Project. In addition, it may jeopardize the allocation of the the RM2 grant as the funds must be appropriated in the FY2010 capital budget.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item at the November 20, 2008
meeting attended by Director Williams, Director Casas, and Director Gage.

The directors asked, and staff responded, to a number of technical questions, funding questions, practical questions related to how the system would be used by VTA customers, and questions regarding how the new RTI assets would be protected from vandalism.

Director Gage expressed some doubts about the cost projections and whether the RTI system would improve ridership.

Director Casas requested that the powerpoint slide regarding subscription to phone and PDA notifications be clarified to show that the subscription would be free for customers.

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve the staff recommendations for this item.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

Previous appropriations of $3,513,835 have been included in the VTA Transit Program Capital Budget for the RTI project. Funding sources for the existing appropriation are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FHWA/ITS</td>
<td>$1,572,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTA Match</td>
<td>$1,158,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,513,835</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appropriation for the deployment phase funded by RM2 and the ongoing operating costs will be included in the FY2010 and FY2011 Recommended Biennial Budget.

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

Based on the identifiable subcontracting opportunities, nature of the work, and availability of the DBE's including location of DBE firms, a DBE goal of 15% has been established for this contract.

Prepared by: Gary Miskell, Chief Information Officer
Regional Measure 2
Initial Project Report (IPR)

Project Title: Real Time Information (RTI) formerly Dynamic Passenger Information (DPI)

RM2 Project No. 19.7

Allocation History:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTC Approval Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $0.00

Current Allocation Request:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPR Revision Date</th>
<th>Amount Being Requested</th>
<th>Phase Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/2/08</td>
<td>2,530,000</td>
<td>PS&amp;E, CON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Measure 2 – INITIAL PROJECT REPORT

I. OVERALL PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Sponsor / Co-sponsor(s) / Implementing Agency

MTC is the sponsoring agency
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority is the implementing agency

B. Project Purpose

It is understood that the RM2 Real-time Transit Information Grant Program is available to assist transit operators in implementing high-technology systems to disseminate real-time transit arrival information to the general public via the 511 telephone system, 511.org website, transit stop signage, and other innovative dissemination mechanisms. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is committed to the goals of this program.

VTA is currently implementing operational systems that form the foundation for real-time passenger information systems in Santa Clara County. These investments include:

- The $20 million Advanced Communications System (ACS) project that included the deployment of global positioning system (GPS) on VTA’s fleet of 524 buses. The GPS data will be instrumental for providing bus arrival times to transit passengers.

- A secure fiber optics communications system located along light rail transit (LRT) lines providing a high-speed backbone communications infrastructure with connections to VTA’s Operations Control Center (OCC) and River Oaks administration facility.

- VTA’s participation in the TransLink project, which will result in the implementation of a gigabit Ethernet communications network along the LRT corridor.

In order to capitalize upon these investments and make real-time traveler information available to transit users in Santa Clara County, VTA initiated work on its $3.1 million Real Time Information (RTI) project in the fall of 2004. Half of the funding secured for the RTI project must be used for integration activities only and cannot be used for capital procurement. Therefore, the RM2 funds that can be used for equipment procurement are an excellent opportunity for developing comprehensive real-time transit information in Santa Clara County.

In addition to these location specific deployments, the plan would include dissemination of real-time information through the 511 telephone system, the 511.org website, and portable devices such as personal digital assistants and cellular phones. The current plan envisions the selection of a system integrator for the project by the end of 2008, with system development, testing, and implementation starting in 2009.

VTA has existing Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) equipment using global positioning satellite (GPS) technology on its entire bus fleet of 524 vehicles. The proposed project would link VTA’s existing AVL equipment with signs installed at transit centers, light rail stations, BRT stations, and major bus stops to provide real-time transit information for the traveling public throughout Santa Clara County. The implementation of this project would significantly improve the desirability of
taking transit by eliminating uncertainty and reducing the time a passenger waits at transit center, bus stop or LRT/BRT station. By improving the passenger experience, an increase in ridership is also expected.

In addition, this project would improve inter-agency connections. VTA has 10 transit centers throughout Santa Clara County that are also serviced by regional commuter rail systems including Caltrain, Altamont Commuter Express (ACE), Capitol Corridor Intercity Rail (Capitols), and Amtrak.

The real-time transit information would be provided to passengers through various means including, but not limited to, the Internet, VTA.net, Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs), and cellular phones. The real-time prediction information along with configuration data would also be fed to MTC for dissemination via the 511 telephone system and the 511.org website, and to share between agencies.

The real-time prediction information along with configuration data would also be fed to MTC for dissemination via the 511 telephone system, the 511.org website, any applicable regional real-time signs, and to share between agencies.

C. Project Description (please provide details)

RM2 funds will be utilized for installation of bus signs at various bus shelters, park and ride lots, and transit centers. Currently, VTA is in PS&E, which consists of the Concept of Operations, System Requirements, and RFP (Request For Proposal).

Phases of the project include:

- PS&E includes Concept of Operations, System Requirements, Project Planning, and RFP
- PS&E consists of web integration, data collection, hardware/software procurement, Orbital/Trapeze Integration, and testing
- PS&E includes software/hardware installations and system modifications, which can take place while the system integrator installs signs on the targeted bus locations.
- RM2 funds will also be utilized in PS&E and CON, which includes installing signs at Transit Centers and Park & Rides. PS&E will also include the building a data transfer system to the regional 511 system. CON includes construction and electrical work at designated locations followed by installation of signs.
- PS&E includes integrating LR into the real time system.
- CON consists of closing out the project.

D. Impediments to Project Completion

- Light Rail integration
  - The issue is how to import LR information into the SCADA system to display on the LR VMB (variable message boards).
  - Disconnecting the VMB’s from the SCADA SONET network will break the audio announcement.
• One alternative is to import the data into GETS and let SCADA push the information to the signs. SCADA is currently performing this operation. This should be feasible with minimal modifications to an interface for the real time system.

• Confirmation of ADA requirements related to sign type, design, and placement
• Orbital System Integration
  o Need to ensure integrator works with Orbital to provide open/flexible architecture to real time solution.
• Architecture
  o Need to be an open and flexible for future needs of VTA

E. Operability

The RTI system will be located on VTA premises or at the system integrator’s data center. VTA and the system integrator have the ability to operate and maintain the system once the project is completed. The system integrator will have a maintenance period of at least 3 years with an optional 2 years. The yearly cost of Operations and Maintenance of the RTI system is estimated to be $450,000/year. Operations and Maintenance will be included in VTA’s Technology Budget following initial maintenance period.

II. PROJECT PHASE DESCRIPTION and STATUS

F. Environmental – Does NEPA Apply: ☑ Yes x No

The RTI project has been determined to be Categorically Exempt from the provisions of CEQA and Categorically Excluded from the provisions of NEPA. The project qualifies as a Categorical Exemption under Section 15301 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines and a Categorical Exclusion under 23 CFR 771.117 (c) 8.

G. Design –

VTA utilized the QFD (Quality Function Development) process to ensure all requirements were captured for the ENV phase. VTA has worked extensively with FHWA/FTA to ensure all requirements are addressed before moving to PS&E phase. VTA has also analyzed various procurement options such as design-build and firm fixed priced to ensure a solid RFP will be produced.

The QFD is discussed the following design issues:

• Identifying priorities of bus stops
• Power issues at bus shelters
• Communication links to bus stops
• Cellular service arrangements
• Integration of LR (light rail) into the design
• Investigation of response to minor/major service disruptions to the public
• System Failures and how to respond
• Sign design and technology requirements
• ADA requirements
• Integration of RTI server into VTA’s website
• National and Regional standards

Work on the RTI Project since its inception has resulted the following documents for this project:

1. SERF
2. SEMP Framework
3. Regional ITS Architecture Consistency memos
4. Transit Stops inventory spreadsheet (also to be used for cost estimating purposes)
5. Concept of Operations
6. RTI Prioritization at Bus Stops memo
7. Bus Stop Power Issues memo
8. Stakeholder Interview summaries
9. Customer Input summaries
10. ADA Issues memo
11. Communication Issues memo
12. Sign Issues memo
13. Central RTI System Software Development Issues memo
14. Quality Function Deployment (QFD) matrix
15. Traceability Matrix for Translating from QFD to System Requirements
16. System Requirements document

H. Right-of-Way Activities / Acquisition – Does not apply

I. Construction / Vehicle Acquisition – Construction will be kept to minimum requirements at selected transit centers, light rail facilities, and park and ride lots. The construction work will be to accommodate the installation of signs and electrical work within the facilities to ensure proper operation of equipment.

III. PROJECT BUDGET

J. Project Budget (Escalated to year of expenditure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Total Amount -Escalated – (Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies &amp; Preliminary Eng (ENV / PE / PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design - Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>3027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### K. Project Budget (De-escalated to current year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Total Amount Escalated – (Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies &amp; Preliminary Eng (ENV / PE / PA&amp;ED)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design - Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&amp;E)</td>
<td>3027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Activities /Acquisition (R/W)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction / Rolling Stock Acquisition (CON)</td>
<td>2864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Budget (in thousands)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,041</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. OVERALL PROJECT SCHEDULE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase-Milestone</th>
<th>Planned (Update as needed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Document</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way Activities / Acquisition (R/W)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (Begin – Open for Use) / Acquisition / Operating Service (CON)</td>
<td>7/1/2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. ALLOCATION REQUEST INFORMATION

L. Detailed Description of Allocation Request

VTA is currently in PS&E of the RTI (Real Time Information) Project. The Concept of Operations and System Requirements have been completed. Final reviews of the RFP are taking place and the RFP is scheduled to be released within the next two months. PS&E includes web integration, data collection, hardware/software procurement, building a data transfer system to the regional 511 System, Orbital/Trapeze Integration and testing. It is envisioned that RM2 funds will be used in the PS&E and CON phases. The CON phase includes software/hardware installations and system modification, which can take place as the system integrator installs signs on the targeted bus locations. The RM2 funds will be utilized in the PS&E and CON phases, which include installing signs at bus shelters. The CON Phase includes construction and electrical work at designated locations followed by installation of signs. The PS&E and CON phase includes integrating the light rail vehicles into the real time system.

| Amount being requested (in escalated dollars) | $2,530,000 |
| Project Phase being requested | PS&E, CON |
| Are there other fund sources involved in this phase? | X Yes ☐ No |
| Date of anticipated Implementing Agency Board approval the RM2 IPR Resolution for the allocation being requested | December 2008 |
| Month/year being requested for MTC Commission approval of allocation | December 2008 |

M. Status of Previous Allocations (if any)
N. Workplan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK NO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td>Software/Hardware installation, sign installation</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Sign installation at Transit Centers and Park &amp; Rides</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PS&amp;E, CON</td>
<td>Integrating light rail vehicles into real time system</td>
<td>4/22/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O. Impediments to Allocation Implementation

- Light Rail integration
  - The issue is how to import LR information into the SCADA system to display on the LR VMB (variable message boards).
  - Disconnecting the VMB’s from the SCADA SONET network will break the audio announcement.
  - One possibility is to import the data into GETS and let SCADA push the information to the signs. SCADA is currently performing this operation. This should be feasible with minimal modifications to an interface for the real time system.
- Confirmation of ADA requirements related to sign type, design, and placement
- Orbital System Integration
  - Need to ensure integrator works with Orbital to provide open/flexible architecture.
- Architecture
  - Need to be an open and flexible for future needs of VTA

VI. RM-2 FUNDING INFORMATION

P. RM-2 Funding Expenditures for funds being allocated

X The companion Microsoft Excel Project Funding Spreadsheet to this IPR is included

Next Anticipated RM-2 Funding Allocation Request
VII. GOVERNING BOARD ACTION

Check the box that applies:

☐ Governing Board Resolution attached

x Governing Board Resolution to be provided on or before: December, 2008
VIII. CONTACT / PREPARATION INFORMATION

Contact for Applicant’s Agency
Name: Keith Roan
Phone: 408-321-7109
Title: Technology Manager
E-mail: keith.roan@vta.org

Information on Person Preparing IPR
Name: Keith Roan
Phone: 408-321-7109
Title: Technology Manager
E-mail: keith.roan@vta.org

Applicant Agency’s Accounting Contact
Name: Ali Gulaid
Phone: 408-952-8947
Title: Accountant
E-mail: ali.gulaid@vta.org
Resolution No. ________
Implementing Agency: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
Project Title: Real Time Information

Whereas, SB 916 (Chapter 715, Statutes 2004), commonly referred as Regional Measure 2, identified projects eligible to receive funding under the Regional Traffic Relief Plan; and

Whereas, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for funding projects eligible for Regional Measure 2 funds, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 30914(c) and (d); and

Whereas, MTC has established a process whereby eligible transportation project sponsors may submit allocation requests for Regional Measure 2 funding; and

Whereas, allocations to MTC must be submitted consistent with procedures and conditions as outlined in Regional Measure 2 Policy and Procedures; and

Whereas, VTA is an eligible sponsor of transportation project(s) in Regional Measure 2, Regional Traffic Relief Plan funds; and

Whereas, the Real Time Information Project is eligible for consideration in the Regional Traffic Relief Plan of Regional Measure 2, as identified in California Streets and Highways Code Section 30914(c) or (d); and

Whereas, the Regional Measure 2 allocation request, attached hereto in the Initial Project Report and incorporated herein as though set forth at length, lists the project, purpose, schedule, budget, expenditure and cash flow plan for which VTA is requesting that MTC allocate Regional Measure 2 funds.

Resolved, that VTA, and its agents shall comply with the provisions of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Regional Measure 2 Policy Guidance (MTC Resolution No. 3636); and Region Measure 2 Real-time Transit Grant Conditions for Transit Agency Resolution which is attached hereto.

Resolved, that VTA certifies that the project is consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

Resolved, that the year of funding for any design, right-of-way and/or construction phases has taken into consideration the time necessary to obtain environmental clearance and permitting approval for the project.
Resolved, that the Regional Measure 2 phase or segment is fully funded, and results in an operable and useable segment.

Resolved, that VTA approves the updated Initial Project Report, attached to this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, that VTA approves the cash flow plan, attached to this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, that VTA has reviewed the project needs and has adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the project within the schedule set forth in the updated Initial Project Report, attached to this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, that VTA is an eligible sponsor of projects in the Regional Measure 2 Regional Traffic Relief Plan, Capital Program, in accordance with California Streets and Highways Code 30914(c); and be it further

Resolved, that VTA is authorized to submit an application for Regional Measure 2 funds for the Real Time Information Project in accordance with California Streets and Highways Code 30914(c); and be it further

Resolved, that VTA certifies that the projects and purposes for which RM2 funds are being requested is in compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), and with the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.) and if relevant the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 USC Section 4-1 et. seq. and the applicable regulations thereunder; and be it further

Resolved, that there is no legal impediment to VTA making allocation requests for Regional Measure 2 funds; and be it further

Resolved, that there is no pending or threatened litigation which might in any way adversely affect the proposed project, or the ability of VTA to deliver such project; and be it further

Resolved that VTA indemnifies and holds harmless MTC, its Commissioners, representatives, agents, and employees from and against all claims, injury, suits, demands, liability, losses, damages, and expenses, whether direct or indirect (including any and all costs and expenses in connection therewith), incurred by reason of any act or failure to act of VTA, its officers, employees or agents, or subcontractors or any of them in connection with its performance of services under this allocation of RM2 funds. In addition to any other remedy authorized by law, so much of the funding due under this allocation of RM2 funds as shall reasonably be considered necessary by MTC may be retained until disposition has been made of any claim for damages, and be it further

Resolved, that VTA shall, if any revenues or profits from any non-governmental use of property (or project) are collected, that those revenues or profits shall be used exclusively for the public transportation services for which the project was initially approved, either for capital improvements or maintenance and operational costs, otherwise the Metropolitan Transportation
Commission is entitled to a proportionate share equal to MTC’s percentage participation in the projects(s); and be it further

Resolved, that assets purchased with RM2 funds including facilities and equipment shall be used for the public transportation uses intended, and should said facilities and equipment cease to be operated or maintained for their intended public transportation purposes for its useful life, that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) shall be entitled to a present day value refund or credit (at MTC’s option) based on MTC’s share of the Fair Market Value of the said facilities and equipment at the time the public transportation uses ceased, which shall be paid back to MTC in the same proportion that Regional Measure 2 funds were originally used; and be it further

Resolved, that VTA shall post on both ends of the construction site(s) at least two signs visible to the public stating that the Project is funded with Regional Measure 2 Toll Revenues; and be it further

Resolved, that VTA authorizes its (General Manager, or his/her designee) to execute and submit an allocation request for the (environmental/ design/ right-of-way/ construction) phase with MTC for Regional Measure 2 funds in the amount of ($2,530,000), for the project, purposes and amounts included in the project application attached to this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, that the (General Manager, or his/her designee) is hereby delegated the authority to make non-substantive changes or minor amendments to the IPR as he/she deems appropriate.

Resolved, that a copy of this resolution shall be transmitted to MTC in conjunction with the filing of the VTA application referenced herein.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors this 8th day of January, 2009, by the following votes:

AYES: DIRECTORS

NOES: DIRECTORS

ABSENT: DIRECTORS

___________________________________
Liz Kniss, Chairperson
Board of Directors
ATTEST:

__________________________________
Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________________
Kevin D. Allmand
Acting General Counsel
RM2 Real-time Transit Grant Conditions for Transit Agency Resolutions

This attachment lists the Real-Time Transit specific conditions to which the real-time transit projects funded by the RM2 Real-time Transit Grant Program must adhere. The specific conditions are:

1. **Usable Segments**
Provide real-time information for usable segments the transit system. Usable segments are defined as routes that improve regional or intra-agency connectivity, routes that serve main arterials, express or limited-stop routes, or a subset of vehicle types within an agency (e.g. all light rail vehicles.)

2. **Performance Standards**
Provide performance standards for real-time data accuracy that have been or will be established with the real-time system vendor and are being monitored. MTC reserves the right to require that agencies receiving RM2 funds meet minimum standards for accuracy.

3. **Automated Updates of Configuration Data**
Provide an efficient, automated way to update real-time system configuration data when changes are made to the scheduling system.

4. **Data Sharing**
Provide required real-time information to a regional database for dissemination on 511 and 511.org and to other transit operators, if applicable, in an MTC-approved format at no cost, without restriction, and for the duration of the Project. Required real-time information includes predicted arrival times for every stop, a date and time stamp for each prediction, and transit agency configuration data including routes, stop ids and direction.

5. **Regional Real-time Transit TAC**
Grant recipients will be expected to participate in a regional Technical Advisory Committee of transit operators implementing real-time transit information systems.

6. **Support MTC’s RTIS**
Grant recipients must support the Regional Transit Information System (RTIS). MTC will confirm before funding allocation that the requesting agency is actively supporting and efficiently transferring information and data required to successfully and accurately offer to the public the data provided on [www.transit.511.org](http://www.transit.511.org) and the 511 TakeTransit℠ Trip Planner.

7. **Real-time Signage**
Any large format regional real-time signage that will be placed in the general pedestrian area (i.e. not at a specific bus stop) of a significant multi-agency transfer hub (i.e. train/bus station, Transit Center) must adhere to the signage standards for equipment and content developed by the Real-time Transit Technical Advisory Committee.
8. On-going Operations and Maintenance Costs
The real-time system and the data communications connection to the MTC Data Storage system shall be supported by the project sponsor, at the sponsor's expense, for a minimum of 5 years from the date of final acceptance.

9. Final Acceptance Testing
Transit agencies will allow MTC's technical advisor to participate in their final acceptance testing at no cost to the project.

10. Expiration of Project Funds
All project work must be completed within three years of the allocation of funds to the grant recipient. If any funds remain after the three-year grant period, MTC will have the authority to either extend the grant period to complete the project or reallocate unspent funds to another project.

11. Cost Overruns
The grant recipient will be responsible for cost increases beyond the amount awarded in the initial grant.

12. Non-511 Phone Systems
MTC provides real-time transit arrival/departure predictions on its 511 phone system. Consequently, no RM2 grant funds can be used to build or expand a separate real-time transit information phone system.
August 5, 2005

Carolyn Gonot  
Chief Development Officer  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
3331 North First Street  
San Jose, CA  95134-1906

RE:  RM2 Real-time Transit Grant Program Application

Dear Ms. Gonot:

Congratulations! I am pleased to confirm that on July 27, 2005 the Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved the recommended grant awards for the RM2 Real-time Transit Information Grant Program. This means that VTA will receive $2,530,000 for its real-time project detailed below.

For the Regional Measure 2 Program, in place of executing funding agreements, MTC has set up an equivalent process to encumber the funds (refer to the RM2 Policies and Procedures at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/RM2/policies_procedures.pdf). To encumber the grant, the Commission must take an action to allocate the funding based on a more detailed project work plan. This process requires submittal of various funding reports and Board authorizations, as summarized below. See http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/rm2capital.htm, for more details and timeline targets.

Step 1: Submit a draft Initial Project Report (IPR) to Melanie Choy (mchoy@mtc.ca.gov) in MTC’s Programming and Allocations section. The report can be found on MTC’s website at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/RM2/IPR_App.doc. MTC staff will review and provide comments on this. Please factor in ample time for MTC staff to comment prior to presenting the IPR to your Board for approval.

Step 2: Seek Board approval of your IPR. When approved, send a copy of the following documents to MTC staff:
  ŷ Final approved IPR
  ŷ Board Resolution and Opinion of Legal Counsel
  ŷ Work plan
  ŷ Estimated budget plan
  ŷ Environmental Documentation.

Step 3: MTC’s Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC) and Commission will consider the allocation request and take an action.
Step 4: Upon Commission approval of the allocation, your agency can begin incurring reimbursable expenses for this project. The process for submitting invoices for reimbursement and supplying quarterly progress reports are outlined in the Regional Measure 2 Policies and Procedures and on the RM2 web page, (http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/rm2.htm).

The following is a detailed description of items from your application that the RM2 Real-time Grant Program will fund:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80 signs</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 signs communications infrastructure</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support expenses</td>
<td>$1,330,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,530,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the nature of your project and previous correspondence with your staff, I understand that VTA will not ask for the funding allocation until approximately January 2007. To be considered at the January PAC and Commission meetings, your staff will need to send the draft IPR by late November/early December 2006 and the final allocation request package to MTC staff by mid December 2006.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 510-817-5714 or e-mail me at jmacrae@mtc.ca.gov.

Best regards,

Jim Macrae
511 Program Coordinator

Cc: Keith Roan, VTA
    Casey Emoto, VTA
    Melanie Choy, MTC
## ATTACHMENT – ACS Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynn Blodgett</td>
<td>President &amp; Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tas Panos</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and General Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Doherty</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Group President, ACS Government Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Burlin</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Vezina</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Group President of ACS Commercial Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Leach</td>
<td>Chief Information Security Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Kyser</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Blodgett</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Group President – Business Process Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasos Tsolakis</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Rexford</td>
<td>Executive Vice President for Corporate Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrell James</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Group President, ITO Services, ACS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skip Stitt</td>
<td>Chief Administrative Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lora Villarreal</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Chief People Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Huerta</td>
<td>Executive Vice President and Group President of ACS Transportation Solutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Real Time Information Project

- Provide VTA’s passengers with accurate and reliable real-time predictive arrival and departure times

Through a web site - By phone

Platform / bus station signs
Real Time Information Project Goals

- Provide our riders with the ultimate riding experience
  - Eliminate the unknowns when using the VTA system
  - We want the experience to improve customer satisfaction
  - A positive experience would lead to increase ridership!
Sign Display Functionality

Highly configurable by individual sign, with and without Audio

- What to display (e.g., route name or number, bus #, status, time…)
- Scroll through multiple pages to display planned arrivals
- Display simple to complex text messages (Advertising / Emergencies)
- Threshold at which the data changes (arrival time format)
SmartTraveler Plus Web

- Designed for Commuter
- User selection of date and route
- Google map of route and stop
- Arrival predictions for each stop
- Saves Customer Favorites
- Integrates with VTA.ORG extranet
- Mobile (PDA or iPhone) streamlined site
- Free Subscription access (email, SMS text messages)
Voice Solution

VTA Accessible Automated & Voice Response System – IVR

- Callers can obtain next arrival times, schedule information, route descriptions, fare information, and both route-specific and general bulletins.

511.org Solution – Phone & Web

- ON THE PHONE: Callers can hear your real-time transit departure times.

- ON THE WEB: Users can build a Bay area driving, transit, traffic camera web page & e-mail alerts.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Joseph T. Smith

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Amalgamated Transit Union Pension Plan Report

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:


BACKGROUND:

Pursuant to state law and the Administrative Code of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Company, LLP (VTD), a Certified Public Accounting Firm, conducted an audit of VTA finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008 (FY 2008). The auditors are required by audit standards to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement as well as assess whether the accounting principles used and estimates made by management are reasonable. Audited financial statements are required to be submitted to the State Controller, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, Federal and State agencies, and other parties such as the bondholders and financial rating agencies.
DISCUSSION:

FISCAL YEAR 2008 COMPREHENSIVE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE SANTA CLARA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Audit Results

VTD rendered a “clean” or unqualified opinion on VTA’s financial statements. The audit report states that VTA’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) presents fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the business-type activity, the governmental activity, each major fund, the aggregate remaining fund information of VTA as of June 30, 2008, as well as the respective changes in financial position and cash flows. There were no material weaknesses noted in the internal controls over financial reporting and operations. The Independent Auditor’s opinion addressed to the Board is on pages 2-1 and 2-2 of the CAFR.

Auditor’s Management Letter

In planning and performing the audit of VTA’s financial statements, VTD considered our internal control system and procedures. Based on their consideration, they issued the attached Memorandum of Internal Controls or Management Letter addressed to the Board. This type of memo typically includes any audit findings or observations and recommendations to address the issue(s).

An audit finding denotes a serious violation of internal control procedures, such as a significant deficiency or a material weakness, which must be addressed by the management. A significant deficiency is a control deficiency, or combination of control deficiencies, that adversely affects VTA’s ability to initiate, authorize, record, process, or report financial data reliably in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles such that there is more than a remote likelihood that a misstatement of the VTA’s financial statements that is more than inconsequential will not be prevented or detected by the entity’s internal control. A material weakness is a significant deficiency, or combination of significant deficiencies, that results in more than a remote likelihood that a material misstatement of the financial statements will not be prevented or detected by the VTA’s internal control. An observation reflects recommended improvements to existing internal controls or procedures. There were no audit findings as a result of the FY2008 audit.

Audited Financial Statements

VTA uses the fund accounting system for financial reporting to ensure and demonstrate compliance with finance-related legal requirements. A fund is a grouping of related accounts that is used to maintain control over resources that have been segregated for specific activities or objectives. VTA’s funds can be divided into three categories: proprietary, governmental and fiduciary funds.

The financial statements, related footnotes, and Management Discussion and Analysis as presented in the CAFR were prepared in accordance with the reporting requirements recommended by the Government Finance Officer’s Association (GFOA).
The GFOA awarded a Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting to VTA for its CAFR for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2007. This was the 12th consecutive year that VTA achieved this coveted award. The award provides affirmation that VTA’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Reports are prepared consistently in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and applicable legal requirements.

The CAFR reports the results of operations for:

- **Proprietary Funds**
  - VTA Enterprise - Transit Operating, 1996 Measure B Transit Rail Program, and 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program
  - Internal Service Fund - Workers’ Compensation, General Liability, and Compensated Absences programs

- **Governmental Funds**
  - Special Revenue Fund - Congestion Management Program (CMP)
  - Capital Projects Funds - Congestion Management & Highway Program and 1996 Measure B Highway Program

- **Fiduciary Funds**
  - Trust Funds - VTA Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU) Pension Plan; ATU Spousal Medical and Vision/Dental Trust; and Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust
  - Agency Funds - Bay Area Air Quality Management District and 1996 Measure B Ancillary Program

**Financial Highlights**

**Proprietary Funds**

The Proprietary Funds account for activities that are reported using the full accrual basis of accounting. VTA maintains two types of proprietary funds: Enterprise Funds and Internal Service Funds.

**Enterprise Funds**

Enterprise Funds are used to account for functions of VTA that are principally supported by user charges, sales tax and intergovernmental revenues. There are three types of activities that fall under this category: VTA Operating, 1996 Measure B Rail/Transit Program, and 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program.

**Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Fund Net Assets**

For FY2008, operating revenues (mainly from transit service fares and advertisement income) were $38.1 million, up $177 thousand or 0.5% from the prior fiscal year as a result of higher ridership. VTA’s largest revenue source for operating and capital funding - 1976 Half-Cent Sales Tax and 2000 Measure A Half-Cent Sales Tax, were almost flat compared to FY2007
reflecting a slowdown of taxable activity in the Santa Clara County. Operating expenses in FY2008 were also flat compared to prior fiscal year due mainly to savings from labor costs with vacancies, lower premiums for the workers’ compensation self-insurance program, and other expenditure controls instituted by VTA across the board. Net non-operating revenues were also $14.7 million lower from FY2007 resulting mainly from a decrease in Federal operating grants. Total Enterprise Fund net assets were $2.6 billion, an increase of approximately $257.4 million over the FY2007 balance. This can be seen on page 2-87 of CAFR.

Of the total net asset increase, $229.3 million belonged to the 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program. VTA accounts for the 2000 Measure A Transit Improvement Program as part of its Enterprise Fund. Even though the 2000 Measure A program revenues and related capital expenses are reported as part of Enterprise Fund financial statements, they are restricted for capital programs and operating activities included in the 2000 Measure A Ordinance.

Reserves

As of June 30, 2008, VTA Enterprise Fund reports a total operating reserve balance of $54.6 million (Statistical Section, Table 7, page 3-7). VTA Board has adopted a policy to maintain a target reserve balance at 15% of its operating budget to meet emergency needs that cannot be funded from any other source. This is meant to ensure that funds are available in the event of unanticipated revenue shortfalls or if unavoidable expenditures may be required. For FY2008, VTA maintained the target reserve balance of $54.6 million or at 15% of VTA’s operating budget.

The Enterprise Fund also has a restricted and designated reserve balance of $516.1 million. These funds are restricted for specific purposes bound by legally contracted agreements or Board policies. Of this amount, $278.5 million represents local share of approved capital funding that VTA must provide toward Board-approved capital projects, Measure A and B Transit Improvement Projects, and VTA Transit Fund capital projects. The remaining amount is restricted or designated for debt service payments ($22.3 million), debt reduction fund ($182.7), and Inventory, Prepaid Expenses, and Issuance Costs ($32.6 million). Details of the reserve calculation are shown in the Financial Section of CAFR, page 2-21.

Budgetary Comparison

As shown on the Budgetary Comparison Schedule for the Enterprise Funds (page 2-90 & 91), the FY2008 actual results for Enterprise Fund revenues and expenses were favorable compared to both the Adopted and Final Budget. VTA was originally projecting a net budgetary surplus of $1.5 million. Subsequently, the surplus was revised upward to $8.5 million. Based on the FY2008 actual results, VTA Enterprise Fund reported a positive net income of $40.4 million, a $31.9 million favorable variance when compared to the Final Budget.

Internal Service Funds

Internal Service Funds are set up to account for services to other funds, departments or to other governments on a cost-reimbursement basis. General Liability, Workers’ Compensation, and Compensated Absences programs are accounted for in the Internal Service Funds.
The Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Fund Net Assets (page 2-22) report a decrease in net assets of $94.7 million primarily due to a one-time transfer of $101.7 million to the Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust Fund with the implementation of Government Accounting Standard Board (GASB) Statement Number 45. In FY2007, VTA reported the retiree medical program as a Retiree Trust Fund.

Total assets are reflected in the Statement of Fund Net Assets, page 2-20, Internal Service Fund column. As of June 30, 2008, total assets amounted to $63.5 million.

**Governmental Funds**

Governmental funds are reported using the modified accrual basis of accounting. This means that revenues are recognized in the accounting period in which they become “measurable and available.” VTA’s Governmental Funds are divided in two categories: Special Revenue Funds and Capital Projects Funds.

Special Revenue Funds are set up to account for revenues from specific taxes or other earmarked revenue sources which, by law, are designated to finance particular activities of government. The Congestion Management Program falls under the Special Revenue Fund category.

Capital Projects Funds are set up to account for resources used for acquisition or construction of major capital assets by a governmental unit. VTA reports the Congestion Management and Highway Program, and 1996 Measure B Highway Program under the Capital Projects Funds category.

**Congestion Management Program (CMP)**

The CMP Special Revenue Fund is used to account for the congestion management, planning, and programming and development services for Santa Clara County. The Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Changes in Fund Net Assets (page 2-26) reports an increase in net assets of $29 thousand due to revenues exceeding expenditures in the current year. Total fund revenues, which mainly include member assessment and grants, were $4.9 million in FY2008; $1.4 million higher than the prior year due primarily to an increase in member-agency assessments, Federal Technical Studies Operating Assistance Grants, and State Operating Assistance Grants. Total expenses were $4.9 million, an increase of $0.9 million due mainly to higher salaries and benefit costs, and capital expenditures. The CMP fund balance was $1.5 million at the end of FY2008.

**Congestion Management & Highway Program (CM&HP)**

CM&HP Capital Projects Fund is used to account for the acquisition of capital assets and construction of highway projects administered on behalf of state and other local governments (other than those accounted for in the Measure B Highway Capital Projects Fund). The CM&HP administers highway projects on behalf of other agencies.

As reflected on page 2-26, the CM&HP expended approximately $38.4 million on project costs.
during FY2008. The primary expenditures were for Highway 152/156 Interchange, Coleman/I-880 improvement, and Highway 87 North HOV lanes projects. The bulk of the funding for these two projects came from the State grants. In total CM&HP received approximately $38.4 million in FY2008; $13.4 million as reimbursement from the State Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) grants, $8.7 million from the Measure A Swap funds, and, and $16.3 million from other sources.

**Measure B Highway Program**

Measure B Highway Program Capital Projects Fund is used to account for acquisition of capital assets or construction of Measure B Highway projects. The 1996 Measure B Highway projects consist primarily of widening highways and improvements that become the property of the State.

As shown on page 2-26, VTA expended approximately $7 million during FY2008 for Measure B Highway projects. Of this amount, Santa Clara County’s (County) contribution was approximately $5.3 million and the remaining balance was received from various state and local fund sources.

**Fiduciary Funds**

The Fiduciary Funds are used to account for assets held by VTA as a trustee (in a trust fund) and as an agent for others (in an agency fund). These assets cannot be used to support VTA’s own programs. VTA’s Fiduciary Funds consist of trust and agency funds. The trust funds include the VTA ATU Pension Plan, ATU Medical Trust, and the Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust. Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the Measure B Ancillary Programs are reported as agency funds.

**ATU Pension Plan**

The ATU Pension Plan Fund reports on the activities of the benefit pension plan covering VTA employees who are members of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU). The report is included as part of the CAFR in addition to being published as a separate report. The ATU Pension Plan Report is discussed further on page 8 of 8.

**Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust**

The Retirees’ Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) Trust was established by VTA to implement the GASB Statement Number 45 in FY2008. In prior fiscal years, VTA reported the retiree medical program as part of its Internal Service Funds. The Statement of Changes in Fiduciary Net Assets (page 2-94) shows a total addition of $111.2 million to the Trust in the current fiscal year. It includes one-time transfer of $101.7 million from Internal Service Funds to the OPEB Trust Fund. Total expenses of the Trust which mainly include the retiree medical premium payments were $6.8 million. As of June 30, 2008, total assets held in the OPEB Trust totaled $104.4 million. As required by GASB, VTA has also published separate financial report for the OPEB Trust.
ATU Medical Trust

The ATU Medical Trust Fund accounts for the ATU Spousal Medical Trust, which is a medical insurance benefit for eligible pensioners’ spouses, and the Vision/Dental Trust, which is a vision and dental benefit for eligible pensioners. This Plan is funded through employee contribution at a rate of 25 cents per hour paid to the Medical Trust Fund and 10 cents per hour to the Retiree’s Vision/Dental Trust Fund.

As shown on the Combining Statement of Changes in Fiduciary Net Assets for Pension Trust Funds (page 2-94), total employee contributions to Spousal Medical and Vision/Dental were approximately $917 thousand and $367 thousand, respectively. Total benefit payments made on behalf of Spousal Medical Trust Fund totaled approximately $1.3 million for FY2008. Total changes in net assets were $0.7 million lower million for the Total Medical Trust funds. Total net assets for Spousal Medical were $8.6 million and $3.5 million for Vision/Dental.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)

The BAAQMD Agency Fund accounts for the activities that relate to the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program. The TFCA is generated by a $4.00 surcharge on vehicle registrations. The BAAQMD administers these funds in the nine-county Bay Area. Funds are available for allocation to alternative fuels, arterial management, bicycle, and trip-reduction projects that reduce vehicle emissions. Assets in the BAAQMD fund are held by VTA in a custodial capacity; therefore, they are reported in the Agency Fund. As of June 30, 2008, BAAQMD’s total assets were approximately $2 million, as reflected on page 2-95.

Measure B Ancillary Program

The Measure B Ancillary Program was established to administer the 1996 Measure B funds. During FY2008, VTA received and expended County contributions for Ancillary Program projects such as highway and intersection improvements, signal synchronization, and bikeway paths. The County contribution represents funding received and passed on to other governments, commonly referred to as “pass-through” grants. As of June 30, 2008, the total assets of this program were $16.6 million (page 2-94).

Subsequent Events

The following finance-related transactions occurred after the end of FY2008 and prior to the issuance of VTA’s FY2008 CAFR:

- In September 2008, VTA redeemed $26.5 million of 1985 Equipment Trust Certificates, Series A and terminated the associated 1998 Interest Rate Swap Agreement using funds held in the Debt Reduction Fund, a designated reserve and pledged funds in a debt service reserve fund held by the Trustee, U.S. Bank, N.A.

- In September 2008, the federal grant award for the Guadalupe Platform Retrofit project was received in the amounts of $6.8 million for the Downtown Platform Retrofit and $8 million for South Line Platform Retrofit.
In September, 2008, VTA became aware of a downgrade of guarantor American International Group, Inc. (AIG), which impacted three of the four Leases to Service Contracts described in Note 20(d). Pursuant to the terms of the agreements, VTA is required to replace AIG as guarantor and payment undertaker. VTA is currently negotiating with the appropriate equity investors in order to comply with the requirements and anticipates that it will be successful.

AMALGAMATED TRANSIT UNION (ATU) PENSION PLAN REPORT

The ATU Pension Plan Fund reports on the activities of the benefit pension plan covering VTA employees who are members of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Amalgamated Transit Union (ATU). The ATU Pension Plan is 100% funded by VTA’s contribution of payroll.

Audit Results

VTD rendered a “clean” or unqualified opinion on the ATU Pension Plan Report, a component unit report of VTA’s CAFR. The audit report states that it presents fairly, in all material respects, the activities of the ATU Pension Plan for the year ended June 30, 2008, in conformity the accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. The Independent Auditor’s opinion addressed to the Board is on page 1 of the component unit report.

Financial Highlights

As shown on the Statement of Changes in the Plan Net Assets of ATU Pension Plan Report (page 6), net assets decreased $26.7 million for the year ended June 30, 2008. The decrease was due mainly to net investment losses of $22.7 million, and VTA contributions of $16.1 million less benefit payments and administration expenses of $20.1 million. As of June 30, 2008, net assets amounted to $323.2 million. Report details are shown on pages 5 & 6 of the ATU Pension Plan component unit report.

These financial statements can be viewed online at <http://www.vta.org/inside/investor/index.html>. A hard copy may be requested by contacting Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Board Secretary’s Office, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95134-1927.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION

The Audit Committee considered this item on December 11, 2008. Mr. Leonard Danna, Partner with the audit firm of Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co, LLP, gave a brief presentation. The Audit Committee unanimously accepted the FY2008 audited financial reports and recommended it to the Board of Directors for consideration at its January 8, 2009 meeting.

In his presentation, Mr. Danna reported that subsequent to June 30, 2008, the fair market value of the equity investments in the VTA’s ATU Pension Plan had declined by approximately $16 million as of September 30, 2008. He also reported that the Government Accounting Standards
Board (GASB) has issued Statement Number 53, “Accounting and Financial Reporting for Derivative Investments”. VTA is required to adopt this statement for fiscal year starting in 2010. Adoption of this statement will require VTA to record the fair value of their interest rate swaps in the financial statements. VTA may implement GASB Statement No. 53 prior to FY2010 if it chooses but an early implementation is not required. As of June 30, 2008, the Swaps had a negative value of $21.8 million. VTA is unable to predict the impact, if any, on the financial statements or bond ratings, when this Statement is required to be adopted in FY2010.

FISCAL IMPACT:

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

Reviewed and verified by: Grace Salandanan, Fiscal Resources Manager

Prepared by: Tony Sandhu, Financial Accounting Manager
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: VTP 2035 Plan Adoption

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the Valley Transportation Plan 2035 (VTP 2035) as Santa Clara County’s long-range countywide transportation plan.

BACKGROUND:

As the Congestion Management Agency for Santa Clara County, VTA has developed a long-range countywide transportation plan called Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035 (Attachment A). This is an update to VTP 2030 adopted by the VTA Board of Directors in February 2005. VTP 2035 provides programs, projects and policies for roadways, transit, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)/Systems Operations Management (SOM), bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and land use/transportation integration. VTP 2035 projects serve as VTA’s recommendations for the regional transportation plan (RTP) - Transportation Plan 2035 (T2035) - scheduled for adoption by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in March or April 2009.

At its March 2008 meeting, the VTA Board adopted the core financial elements of VTP 2035 - the program area allocations and the financially constrained and unconstrained projects lists contained in the plan. This action followed an effort that included a three-month call-for-project during fall 2007, a Board Workshop in October 2007, presentations to various VTA Committees and the Board, open house meetings throughout the County, and an interactive Web site that included the proposed project lists and a VTP survey. Since April 2008, staff has been working with MTC to ensure that the appropriate VTP 2035 project assumptions and model information are included in the development of the RTP.

It is important to note that VTP 2035 is a plan, not a programming document. It does not set
priorities or schedules for when projects will be implemented, or make assumptions regarding financing costs that may be needed to implement specific projects at specific times. Programming decisions are made by the VTA Board of Directors in separate processes. Revenues and costs included in VTP 2035 are shown in year 2008 dollars to be consistent with the funding estimates received from MTC as part of the development of the RTP.

DISCUSSION:

VTP 2035 provides a framework for making key transportation decisions, a plan for investing in our transportation system, and strategic direction for VTA’s involvement in land use, climate protection, and other livability issues. VTP 2035 core planning themes center on:

- Strengthening and expanding the transit system;
- Developing an countywide Express Lane system and exploring other pricing strategies;
- Maintaining and improving local and regional roadways, bike routes, and pedestrian facilities;
- Improving transportation systems efficiency and implementing new technologies for transportation systems management;
- Improving the relationship between land use and transportation decisions;
- Integrating all modes and re-thinking transportation engineering and design standards; and
- Developing strategies and programs to address climate change, energy use, and new funding.

VTP 2035 covers 10 Program Areas: Highway/Freeway, Expressway, Local Streets and County Roads, Transit, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)/Transportation Systems Operations (SOM) and Management (SOM), Sound Mitigation, Pavement Management, Bicycle, Landscape Restoration and Litter/Graffiti Removal, and Community Design & Transportation (CDT). Initial recommendations for Program Area allocations and project lists were approved by the VTA Board at its March 2008 meeting. The VTP 2035 Transit Program includes the 2000 Measure A transit projects. The program area allocations include a new Local Transportation Projects and Enhancements category designed to give VTA additional flexibility in future funding decisions for the ITS)/SOM, Sound Mitigation, Bicycle, Landscape Restoration and Graffiti Removal, and Community Design & Transportation (CDT) program areas.

In addition, VTP 2035 includes several new plan elements that were not in the previous plan. A new Strategic Plan element was developed to describe the function of the agency in relation to delivering the plan and the goals it has set forth in its strategic vision. A new climate change program called the Transportation Energy and Air Quality (TEAQ) Program was added to provide a planning framework for VTA to conduct research, develop initiatives, projects, and programs, to address emerging climate change and energy issues. The TEAQ Program will also provide the framework for VTA to work with partner agencies such as the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), MTC and ABAG to address new legislation such as the mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions outlined in AB 32 (Nunez) and the development of Sustainable Community Strategies called for in SB 375 (Steinberg).

The VTP planning process has been underway since May 2007. During this time input was
received from Member Agencies, partner agencies, at public open house meetings, through the VTP Web Site, public correspondence to VTA, and through VTA committees and Board of Directors. This input was incorporated in the preparation of the draft plan.

During November and December 2008, administrative and final draft versions of the plan were brought through VTA advisory, standing committees and the Board for review and comment. In addition, another round of VTP open houses was held during the first two weeks of November 2008. Staff has evaluated input received from all the meetings and has incorporated them as appropriate in the final document.

In December 2008, all four advisory committees unanimously recommended the VTP 2035 move forward to the January Board meeting for final adoption. Staff will include for the Board’s consideration at its January 2009 meeting an errata sheet (Attachment B) of any other recommended changes that could not be incorporated into the plan document before mail-out.

In summary, the Final VTP 2035 document contains:

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

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There will be no direct fiscal impact from the adoption of VTP 2035.

**STANDING COMMITTEE/DISCUSSION RECOMMENDATION:**

The CMPP approved the item to be moved forward to the Board of Directors for adoption at their January Meeting. Standing committee comments were directed toward the new state legislation on the reduction of greenhouse gases and performance measures that demonstrates how the plan will promote multimodal trips and reduce congestion. It is noted that the plan will develop a planning framework through the TEAQ program that will address issues on climate change and congestion reduction. Performance measures will be included in the final draft that will detail how the projects in the plan will be effective.

Prepared by: John Sighamony
Valley Transportation Plan 2035

Final Draft
January 2009

Provided Separately as Disc
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Under Separate Cover