BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, April 2, 2009

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

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

AGENDA

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. ROLL CALL

2. RECESS TO CLOSED SESSION

   A. Anticipated Litigation - Conference with Legal Counsel

      Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of
      Government Code Section 54956.9: (Three cases)

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

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

      Employee Organizations:
      American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees Service
      Employees
      International Union, Local 521

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

      Name of Case: Peggy Shaffer vs. Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
      WCAB #s SAL 106923, SAL 106927, SAL 108061, SAL 108062

RECONVENE TO OPEN SESSION

3. CLOSED SESSION REPORT

4. ORDERS OF THE DAY

5. AWARDS AND COMMENDATION

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

Recognize Ethan Winston, Public Communication Specialist II, River Oaks Administration and Robert Irby, Coach Operator, Chaboya Division, as Employees of the Month for April 2009; and Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager, Congestion Management Agency, as Supervisor of the Quarter for the second quarter of 2009.
6. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

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

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

- Report by VTA Federal Lobbyist, Susan Lent, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP.
- Progress Report on Joint Workforce Initiative.

8. **REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON (Verbal Report)**

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


**CONSENT AGENDA**

11. Approve the Board of Directors Workshop Minutes of February 27, 2009.

12. Approve the Board of Directors Regular Meeting Minutes of March 5, 2009.


15. **ACTION ITEM** - Approve the goals and objectives for the internal audit program at VTA, as proposed by the Auditor General.

16. **ACTION ITEM** - Ratify the nomination of Erik Larsen to the Citizens Advisory Committee, representing the South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council.

17. **ACTION ITEM** - Adopt a support position for AB 266 (Carter), which requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to do an assessment of the state's unmet transportation needs every five years.

18. **ACTION ITEM** - Authorize the General Manager to execute an agreement to continue the BART Plus multi-agency ticket program in cooperation with BART and nine other Bay Area transit agencies through December 2009 with the option to extend up to three years in annual increments.

20. ACTION ITEM - Recommend the programming of $500,000 in Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Planning Grants.

21. ACTION ITEM - Approve the programming of FY 2009/10 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager (TFCA 40%) funds to projects as shown in Attachment A.

22. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive report on Service Changes effective April 6, 2009.

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

24. ACTION ITEM - Adopt a resolution authorizing the filing and execution of grants with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for funding under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program.

REGULAR AGENDA

25. ACTION ITEM - Approve the proposed Joint Development Program policy framework.

26. ACTION ITEM - Adopt the 2009 Annual Transit Service Plan and the recommended service changes.

OTHER ITEMS

27. INFORMATION ITEM - Receive Sustainability Program Update.

28. ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION

29. MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE HISTORY MATRIX

30. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

   A. Administration and Finance Committee
   B. Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee
   C. Transit Planning and Operations Committee
   D. Audit Committee
31. **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)

32. **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

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

A. Vasona Light Rail PAB
B. Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor & BART Warm Springs Extension PAB
C. Downtown East Valley PAB
D. Highway PAB South

34. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

35. **ADJOURN**
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Administrative Officer, Bill Lopez

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

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

Ethan Winston, Public Communication Specialist II in the Marketing and Public Affairs Department at River Oaks, is the Administration Award Winner for April. Ethan has been with VTA for over 8 years. He displays a high level of professionalism in his commitment to improving VTA’s outreach efforts. Ethan was instrumental in supporting the South Line Platform Retrofit Project by organizing clear communication through bi-lingual signs and flyers, platform announcements, and ambassador training. His work ensured that VTA’s high level of service to businesses and customers was not compromised during construction. Ethan’s great attitude and attention to detail support VTA’s vision of providing effective transportation solutions for our community. Congratulations to Ethan Winston, Administration Employee of the Month for April!

Robert Irby, Chaboya Division Coach Operator, is April’s Operations Award Winner. Robert has been with VTA since 2005, and consistently meets the high performance standards of his job. Robert is an outstanding Coach Operator, bringing a calm demeanor and sense of humor to his work, while making safety and customer service his top priorities. As the smiling face of VTA, Robert was shown greeting new passengers on his bus in a VTA television commercial that encouraged the public to “Leave your car at home and take VTA.” Recognized by his supervisors for displaying exceptional courtesy and professionalism, Robert serves as an excellent role model to his fellow Operators. Congratulations to Robert Irby, Operations Employee of the Month for April!

Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager in VTA’s Congestion Management Agency, is Supervisor of the Quarter for the second quarter of 2009. Kevin joined VTA in 2004. In his current position, Kevin manages transit planning projects such as Short Range Transit Plans and the Downtown East Valley Project. Most recently, Kevin oversaw the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA), an 18-month planning effort aimed at providing a fresh look at VTA’s transit service and recommending changes to VTA’s bus service. Kevin worked effectively with VTA staff,
consultants and committees, as well as Board members and the public, resulting in the successful implementation of this critical project. Recognized by his Division leadership as a key member of the management team, Kevin is viewed as a supervisor who promotes the exchange of ideas and encourages creativity in his staff. He is clearly an asset to his Division as well as to VTA. Congratulations to Kevin Connolly, Supervisor of the Quarter!

Prepared By: Mitsuno Baurmeister
BOARD OF DIRECTORS WORKSHOP MEETING

Friday, February 27, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Workshop Meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Board of Directors was called to order by Chairperson Sandoval at 9:05 a.m. in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

1. Roll Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nora Campos</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Casas</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Caserta</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Chu</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gage</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Herrera</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Kalra</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoriko Kishimoto</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Kniss</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>9:25 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Livengood</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pyle</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>9:45 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Reed</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>10:15 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sellers</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A quorum was present.

2. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

Alice Frayne, Interested Citizen, suggested VTA broadcast a message on VTA vehicles notifying passengers to be considerate of others when using cell phones.

Jim Stallman, Interested Citizen, requested “Debt Service” item be included in VTA financial report.

Chairperson Sandoval reminded everyone to place on their calendars the opening of the Mary Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge on April 30th at 3:00 p.m.

3. **Preliminary VTA Near-Term Budget Outlook**

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, thanked everyone for their attendance. He stated how important the time is right now for VTA in setting the foundation for programs, budget and plans for the next two years. VTA staff will recommend taking a conservative and prudent approach in dealing with the Measure A program for the next two years. Increase in ridership and revenues from fares continue to be up and the Construction Division received awards for construction projects.

Mr. Burns stated the workshop will provide the following: 1) an overview of the operating budget – VTA is working to develop the budget for 2010 and 2011; 2) an update on outcome of stimulus program – the allocations that will come to VTA and plans for the allocations; 3) progress and status of the BART project – an update on 65% cost estimate; and 4) a review of Measure A financial outlook both in short and long term and staff recommendation for the two year capital budget.

Joe Smith, Chief Financial Officer, stated VTA is facing extremely challenging financial times. VTA had lost significant funding sources. The State Transit Assistance fund had decreased dramatically. Mr. Smith referenced the VTA Sources and Uses of Funds Summary Report. He reviewed the FY 2009 adopted budget approved by the Board in 2007, the projection for FY 2009 and the preliminary projection for FY 2010, 2011 and 2012.

Mr. Smith reported staff is currently working on the 2010-2011 budget process with a goal of a balanced operating budget. Staff is reviewing and will be proposing the following methods to offset the declining revenues and close the projected deficit: service reductions, headcount reductions, contracted service reductions, employee
benefit modifications, changes in fares and use of one-time revenues. This will be an on-going process through the Administration and Finance Committee. The recommended budget will be presented at the Board Workshop on April 24th with adoption for June 4, 2009.

Board Member Gage emphasized the need to maximize what we can do with the limited funds we have by planning and determining the programs that can be completed.

Board Member Kniss arrived at 9:25 a.m.

Board Member Casas questioned the use of one-time revenue in that it does not necessarily solve problems but just defers decisions. Mr. Smith responded it is very unlikely that VTA will use one-time revenue to support the operating budget.

Mr. Burns clarified there are some one-time revenues as a result of a surplus above the reserve level that has been achieved over the last couple of years. Some of the funds will be used to cover operating expenses or decisions have to be made to further find reductions in expenses.

Ross Signorino, Interested Citizen, praised Board Member Gage on his comments. He suggested cutting back on projects and increasing service.

4. **Federal Economic Stimulus Legislation: Update**

Chairperson Sandoval thanked Ex-Officio Board Member Yeager and Ex-Officio Board Member Chu for their hard work in assisting VTA at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) regarding the programming of funds for the Federal Economic Stimulus Bill.

John Ristow, Chief Congestion Management Agency Officer, provided an update on the Federal Economic Stimulus Program. The Bill was signed by President Obama on February 17th. The approval processes and funding distribution procedures are approximately the same as discussed previously. Mr. Ristow made reference to the PowerPoint presentation which highlighted the following: 1) the funding provided to mass transit, highways and bridges and multi-modal discretionary programs; 2) an illustration of funding distribution from mass transit formula grants to MTC and how MTC program the funds to transit rehabilitation projects and discretionary projects; and 3) the project list VTA submitted to MTC.

Ex-Officio Board Member Yeager commented the process worked well for Santa Clara County. He thanked VTA staff for working and speaking as one with MTC Commissioners and with some of the regional leaders as this made a difference.

Board Member Pyle arrived at 9:45 a.m.

Mr. Ristow, in response to Board Member Pyle’s query, stated the number of jobs affected by the project is not an official criteria in the selection process for funding.
Vice Chairperson Liccardo thanked Ex-Officio Board Member Yeager for his leadership at MTC and stated he was very pleased to see the coordination and cooperation between VTA and MTC delegation which helped achieved positive results from MTC.

Mr. Ristow, in response to Member Herrera, stated it has been the successful practice of VTA to move projects forward and have them ready for funding. Member Herrera stated it is very important to look at potential jobs and economic development that could work with the projects to create opportunities that work with our green goals at the city, state and federal level.

Member Kishimoto asked if there is a dollar amount attached to the Advocacy List and if the Caltrain electrification design is only limited to design. Mr. Ristow responded the list will be refined and the scope, schedule and dollar amount will be established for each project. The Caltrain electrification design will be more than the design as the Caltrain corridor will be a coordinated system with High Speed Rail.

5. **BART to Silicon Valley Project Update**

Carolyn Gonot, Chief SVRT Program Officer, provided an update on the BART to Silicon Valley project: 1) VTA had completed the 65% engineering design; 2) VTA had completed the second administrative draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and was submitted to Federal Transit Administration (FTA); 3) VTA is working with FTA in the New Starts Program submittals; 4) the Freight Railroad Relocation (FRR) activities are underway; and 5) the BART Warm Springs Extension is out to bid on their first construction package.

Ms. Gonot stated the focus of the BART project for the next 18 to 24 months will be the New Starts processing and trying to attain the full funding grant agreement. She referred to the diagram that shows the process.

Board Member Gage left his seat at 9:50 a.m.

Mark Robinson, Chief Engineering and Construction Officer, reported on the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) 65% design cost estimate. He provided a PowerPoint presentation which highlighted the following: 1) scope of SVRT cost estimate; 2) approach and method used to develop the cost estimate; 3) review of the program and cost estimates in the past; 4) estimate summary; and 5) review of where the cost estimates go forward.

Board Member Gage took his seat at 10:00 a.m.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo asked what the assumption for construction cost is and what percentage VTA is assuming per year for price escalation. Mr. Robinson responded 35% design, commodity cost and labor cost, general elements, rail elements, and vehicle costs, all within 3.5% escalation per year.
Michael T. Burns, General Manager, commented VTA should consider doing things differently in terms of executing a project to help reduce some of the support costs. He stated with the Board’s support this is an effort VTA could investigate.

Board Member Kniss asked if VTA is considering what is happening nationally in terms of best practices. Mr. Robinson responded VTA is capturing activities in the Bay area and reflecting those dollars in the estimates. He stated VTA had great success in the Freight Railroad Relocation project in terms of contract prices, competitiveness and interest in getting the work done. Activities on this project will progress the next year. This is a measured cost estimate and he is confident if authorized, VTA can deliver the project in 2018.

Mr. Burns stated the draft cost estimate will go to several review processes, including review by the FTA and their consultants. The estimate is not based on current market, but based on current trends taking into account things that happened in the course of the last 12 months.

Board Member Kniss clarified the segment VTA is working on is the Warm Springs/Berryessa and that is the project we have to compete for federal funds. She suggested looking at a “segment approach” once again to complete projects.

Ms. Gonot in response to Board Member Kniss inquiry regarding ridership projections stated ridership fluctuates. The ridership numbers are generated by the commute patterns and it changes with each projection.

Board Member Reed arrived at 10:15 a.m.

Chairperson Sandoval commented as we go forward with these projects to revise everything we are looking at, jobs are changing in the valley and in the region.

Board Member Casas stated he wants to make sure VTA is not underestimating or padding the estimated expense. VTA has a commitment to complete voter approved projects.

Board Member Kishimoto requested ridership numbers be provided to the Board and to the public. She also commented and asked questions on the discussion regarding segmenting, the light rail connection at Berryessa and the parking issue. Mr. Robinson responded the light rail connection will be at the Milpitas Station and there is no direct platform connection. Stationary planning studies are being done now that includes parking strategies and the appropriate level parking. This will be done over the next 12 months as a part of the readiness phase and will be available toward the end of the year.

Ms. Gonot stated VTA is working on each station individually and doing a full study with each of the cities. She noted we do not want to overbuild parking and we are looking at trying to do phasing.

Alternate Board Member Moylan asked questions on the consequences of overestimating versus underestimating and the issue of establishing parking needs. Mr. Robinson responded VTA takes pride in providing accurate estimates that we can
deliver with a high level of confidence. We don’t overestimate projects and we are successful at 80% to 90% of the time in bringing projects in on the budget that was established. By not overestimating, it allows for allocation of funds to other projects.

Mr. Robinson stated there is a regional model that establishes the parking needs. VTA designs the plan and generates a cost estimate based on the model. VTA works with the cities on strategies so we do not overbuild parking initially but to have the ability to increase capacity as demand requires.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo asked if it is possible to engage in advance bidding. Mr. Robinson answered yes; there is an opportunity with the Warm Springs project.

Mr. Burns added priority activities for the next 15 months would involve the environmental process and the federal New Starts Program to secure the full funding grant agreement.

Peter Skinner, representing the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, stated the Group is committed to BART and the Measure A projects. The Group also wanted to communicate their desire to maintain transit services to the community.

Ross Signorino, Interested Citizen, asked questions about ridership, the BART going to the airport project and the cost of estimate for the 5.1 miles of twin-bore tunnel. The responses are as follows: 1) Mr. Burns stated ridership is up; 2) Ex-Officio Board Member Yeager clarified it was the BART going to Oakland Airport; and 3) Mr. Robinson stated he will provide Mr. Signorino with the estimate.

6. **Measure A 2-year Capital Program**

Mr. Bob Peskin, Project Manager, AECOM Consult, Inc., provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Measure A Financial Outlook highlighting the following:

1) Recap of the Financial Planning Process – Mr. Peskin stated AECOM is supporting VTA meet its fiduciary responsibilities to apply Measure A funds appropriately to advance the proposed Measure A projects. AECOM does an analysis of what happens as costs and timing of projects change and economic conditions change. He also stated the federal government demands VTA go through a financial planning process to qualify for the full funding grant agreement for the Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) project.

2) New Data Applied in the Financial Plan – the SVRT 65% design cost estimate, new information about the grant funding other than the New Start grant funds, new information about the Capital Improvement Program.

3) Measure A ½-cent Sales Tax Revenue – Mr. Peskin provided several graphs showing the comparison of the old and the new projection.

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, commented VTA staff recommendation over the next two years is to be prudent and conservative in our expenditures and programming and that we maintain our long term vision which is to deliver the Measure A program.

Carolyn Gonot, Chief SVRT Program Officer, presented the staff recommendations for expenditures over the next two years specifically on the Measure A program. Ms.
Gonot provided a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the following: 1) Measure A Planning Approach – Ms. Gonot stated the key is to have a near-term focus assessing current conditions and recognizing long-term commitments; 2) Recent Board Actions – approval of funding for San Jose Diridon and Santa Clara Caltrain stations, approval of the State Local Partnership Program funds matching Measure A funds for the Warm Springs extension and the approval of the BART funding plan into Santa Clara County; 3) Financial Status of Measure A Program – the program sources of funds and expenditures; 4) The funds available for FY 2010 and FY 2011 – $428 million; 5) The proposed capital expenditures – $655 million; 6) The proposed budget for various projects – BART Extension, Freight Rail Relocation, Light Rail, Commuter Rail and the Bus Program. Ms. Gonot also described the different activities for each project.

Mr. Burns stated VTA is making a recommendation to continue the commitment for the entire BART project and to structure the project in a “phase approach” that is fiscally responsible, taking into account economic realities.

Mr. Peskin provided a summary of the impact of all the recommendations with regards to Measure A. He provided a PowerPoint presentation listing: 1) various projects which shows preliminary expenditures for first two years, FY10 and FY11, and the rest of the 10 years, FY 12 to FY19; 2) implications of new data on Measure A Financial Plan.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo asked why VTA did not want to incur debt at this time when interest rates and construction costs are extremely low. Mr. Peskin responded we need to minimize financing cost and preserve the most amount of revenue. We incur additional debt service expenses if we build too soon and we incur additional inflation expenses if we build too late.

Mr. Burns noted the commitment to move forward and that is tied to securing a full funding grant agreement. Advancing financing to fund advance work would not be accepted by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) until the full environmental processes is completed. It is also risky because projections are tied to sales tax revenues which will secure the debt. If sales tax revenues continue to decline, it would affect programs and operations.

Board Member Casas stated the Board needs to make a decision on what projects to move forward. He would like a clear understanding of costs versus revenues and be able to make fiscal decision that allows VTA to provide services from operational standpoint.

Board Member Sellers left at 11:45 a.m.

Board Member Reed asked if the $130 million on the bus project includes the allocation for hybrid buses. Mr. Burns responded it does not include that funding as we are focusing on Measure A projects. It includes about 2/3’s from the State infrastructure bond program and 1/3 Measure A.

Board Member Reed stated the Airport People Mover is a Measure A project. The budget projection for this project is in excess of $600 million. He urged Board to use all opportunities available and use funding from other sources to save for other projects.
Board Member Herrera asked, in terms of the federal environmental clearance for the Eastridge Light Rail Project, what does it consist of and what grants will be available for the project. Mr. Burns responded the federal environmental process will be funded through the Measure A program and takes about 12 months to complete. The only source of funding will be the stimulus funds. The Vasona Extension and the Eastridge projects are projects that are ready and VTA will position those as candidates for stimulus funding.

Board Member Herrera also asked if there is a specific grant available within the stimulus package. Mr. John Ristow, Chief Congestion Management Agency Officer, responded we have targeted the National Service Transportation Program (NSTP) in the Discretionary Program in federal stimulus. Board Member Herrera stated VTA should move Eastridge ahead. VTA need to focus resources on transit dependent population and connect that community to BART and to Downtown San Jose.

Board Member Gage commented there are projects we have committed to voters. However, we need to rethink the project if service levels do not improve. He recommended we look at levels of service before making a final decision.

Board Member Kishimoto requested information with detail budgets. Mr. Burns responded in the course of the next three months VTA will be working through both the operating and the entire capital budget. Information will be provided to the Board.

Alternate Board Member Moylan asked what on Measure A is not on the list and if VTA has ever rank prioritized the Measure A project? Mr. Burns responded each piece of the project is moving forward as a part of the budget and the Board has taken the policy direction that BART is priority.

Noel Tebo, Citizens Advisory Committee Chairperson, suggested VTA include project design which is greener, attract more riders and costs less to operate. He announced the Advance Transit Association of the United States is sponsoring a “Carbon Free Mobility Conference” in Oakland on March 6, 2009.

Ross Signorino, Interested Citizen, stated the Eastridge Light Rail project is not a priority at this time as is too expensive. He suggested letting the project wait for a while.

Chairperson Sandoval thanked Mr. Burns and his staff for a great presentation and thanked the Board for being engaged throughout the meeting.

7. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Board of Directors’ Workshop Meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Yolanda Cruz, Assistant Board Secretary
VTA Board of Directors
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

Thursday, March 5, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Board of Directors was called to order by Chairperson Sandoval at 5:33 p.m. in the Board of Supervisors’ Chambers, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nora Campos</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Casas</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Caserta</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Chu</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gage</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Herrera</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ash Kalra</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoriko Kishimoto</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Kniss</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Livengood</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pyle</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Reed</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sellers</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shirakawa</td>
<td>Alternate Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Yeager</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolly Sandoval</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Alternates do not serve unless participating as a Member.

A quorum was present.

2. RECESSED TO CLOSED SESSION at 5:34 p.m.

A. Anticipated Litigation--Conference with Legal Counsel

   Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54956.9: (Three cases)

B. Conference with Labor Negotiators

   [Government Code Section 54957.6]
VTA Designated Representatives:
Joseph Smith, Chief Financial Officer
Bill Lopez, Chief Administrative Officer
Robert Escobar, Human Resources Manager

Employee Organizations:
American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees
Service Employees International Union, Local 521

C. Public Employee Performance Evaluation

[Government Code Section 54957]
Title: General Manager

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

3. CLOSED SESSION REPORT
A. Anticipated Litigation--Conference with Legal Counsel

Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54956.9: (Three cases)

There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.

B. Conference with Labor Negotiators

[Government Code Section 54957.6]

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

Employee Organizations:
American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees
Service Employees International Union, Local 521

There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.

C. Public Employee Performance Evaluation

[Government Code Section 54957]
Title: General Manager

There was no reportable action taken during Closed Session.

4. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Chairperson Sandoval indicated the following item was removed from the Agenda;
Agenda Item # 25, Approve a revision to the Board of Directors Meeting Schedule rescheduling the May 7, 2009 Board of Directors meeting to April 30, 2009.

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

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

1) Employees of the Month for March 2009

Chairperson Sandoval recognized Dennis Mellon, Senior Systems Design Engineer, River Oaks Administration; Tami San Agustin, Coach Operator, Cerone Division; and Westin Fay, Transit Mechanic, Cerone Division, as Employees of the Month for March 2009.

She also recognized Adam Burger, Transportation Planner III, Administration Award Winner for February, who could not be present at the February Board meeting.

2) Employees of the Year 2008

Chairperson Sandoval recognized Olga Perez, Office Specialist II, River Oaks Administration; Susan Yates, Coach Operator, Chaboya Division; and Augustine Marquez, Transit Mechanic, Chaboya Division, as Employees of the Year for 2008; and Lewis Laptalo, Transportation Superintendent, Chaboya Division, as 2008 Supervisor of the Year.

Chairperson Sandoval indicated two employees and one retiree passed away recently. Vahid Payrovi, Roy Solidium, and Charles ‘Chuck’ Justice were remembered and condolences offered to family and friends. She noted the meeting will be adjourned in their honor.

6. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

7. REPORT FROM THE GENERAL MANAGER

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

- VTA system-wide average weekday ridership for January 2009 increased by 9.4 percent as compared to January 2008. Bus average weekday ridership increased by 10.4 percent and light rail average weekday ridership increased by 5.9 percent compared to the same period last year. VTA transit partners Dumbarton Rail Corridor, Highway 17 Express, and Monterey Service experienced increases in weekday ridership of more than 20 percent, Caltrain boarding increased 8 percent, Capitol Corridor increased 1 percent, and Altamont Commuter Express experienced a decrease of 5 percent.

- VTA hosted an event in honor of Black History Month and welcomed Tuskegee Airman, Lester “Les” Williams as the honored guest and keynote speaker. Mr. Williams shared his personal story of events leading to his enrollment into the Tuskegee Institute. The celebration is one of three diversity events held each year and is something that will continue despite economic difficulties. Special thanks were given to Julia Jones, Senior Management Analyst, and Camille Williams, Accessible Services Program Manager, who co-chaired the event.
• Congestion Management Association of America, Northern California Chapter honored VTA with their 2009 Project of the Year award for infrastructure for the light rail Southline Platform Retrofit project. In addition to being awarded for its importance to community, the project was completed three months ahead of schedule, 13 percent below budget, and with minimal affect to passengers. This is the third award in three months received by the engineering and construction division.

• Caltrain celebrated the completion of the California Avenue and Palo Alto Station retrofit project. The improvements at the California Station eliminated the hold out rule, allowing more than one train at a time to safely occupy the station. The Palo Alto station improvements allow greater access for all passengers and addressed boarding issues facing the disabled community.

• At the February Board Workshop, VTA staff provided an update on the BART project which the Board has established as the priority project in Measure A. VTA will be moving forward in a financially prudent manner and is looking at phasing the project due to economic downturn. Alternative delivery strategies are being considered to bring the project to fruition faster and at a lesser cost. The current schedule for completion is 2018.

• Chairperson Sandoval is one of the 100 women selected to receive a Women of Influence in Silicon Valley award. The 2009 Women of Influence honorees exercise power within their industry and throughout the valley and serve as role models for future generations of leaders for both women and men.

Eugene Bradley, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding possible fare hikes or service cuts destroying ridership gains VTA has made.

8. REPORT FROM THE CHAIRPERSON

Chairperson Sandoval congratulated Bill Kindricks, Business Relations Manager, who was recognized at the Annual Human Relations Awards Breakfast as one of the recipients of an award for his hard work and commitment for the betterment of individuals throughout the county and the state. Mr. Kindricks has helped raise more than half a million dollars with the 100 Black Men of Silicon Valley.

Chairperson Sandoval thanked Board Members for attending and participating in the Board Workshop.

Eugene Bradley, Interested Citizen, expressed concern with the BART project noting that VTA will only be able to build to Berryessa due to a lack of funding.

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

Noel Tebo, CAC Chairperson, provided a report from the February 11, 2009 CAC meeting highlighting the following: 1) CAC is aware of the disturbing news of cuts from the State budget and shares concern with the effects on VTA’s operating budget and will do the best to provide feedback as the issues become clearer; 2) CAC is participating in
the Advisory Committee Task Force and is appreciative of the invitation to help to make the committees more effective and efficient; and, 3) Measure A Watchdog Committee is working with independent auditors to see if there are any policy changes necessary to guarantee Measure A funds are available when needed.

10. **Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairperson’s Report**

Margaret Abe-Koga, PAC Chairperson, provided a report from the PAC meeting on February 12, 2009 highlighting the following: 1) Chairperson Sandoval attended the February PAC meeting and provided an update and preview of the year; 2) Received an update from staff regarding the Association of Bay Area Government’s (ABAG) projection assumptions for future growth in the county for 25 years. Staff expressed concern with conflicts and discrepancies with the numbers, and several PAC members who are also members on ABAG will follow up on the issue; 3) Reviewed and provided input on the revised joint development policy and will be receiving the framework and providing a recommendation to the Board in April; 4) Received updates on the State Route 237/I-880 Express Lanes and the EcoPass Project; and, 5) PAC is working with Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) process to provide recommendations to make some improvements.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to approve the Consent Agenda.

11. **Regular Meeting Minutes of February 5, 2009**

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

12. **Fiscal Year 2009 Quarterly Statement of Revenues**

M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to review and accept the Fiscal Year 2009 Quarterly Statement of Revenues and Expenses for the period ending December 31, 2008.

13. **Financial Policy Statements Summary Version**

M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to reaffirm VTA financial policies by approving a summarized version of financial policy statements for adoption and use in various VTA financial documents such as the biennial adopted budget book.

14. **Real Estate Consultant Services**

M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to authorize the General Manager to establish a list of thirty-one qualified firms for the various categories of real estate consultant services as reflected on the attachment Exhibit "A" including title and escrow, acquisition and eminent domain, relocation, real property appraisal, goodwill appraisal and appraisal review services. The list will be for a five-year period. The General Manager is authorized to enter into contracts of up to five years with an aggregate value not to exceed $14,000,000. The specific value for each contract executed will be determined in accordance with an
approved budget for the relevant capital project that requires the contracted services.

15. **San Jose Diridon Caltrain Station Parking Lot**

   M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to authorize the General Manager to execute a Second Amendment to the Cooperative Parking Agreement with the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) and San Jose Arena Management, LLC (SJAM) extending for an additional five years SJAM's management of the San Jose Diridon Caltrain Station parking lot for HP Pavilion (Arena) event parking.


   M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) 1) to confirm the Deferred Compensation Committee’s selection of International City Management Association - Retirement Corporation (ICMA-RC) as VTA’s 457 Deferred Compensation Plan and 401(a) Money Purchase Plan Provider; 2) to adopt ICMA-RC’s model plan documents for the 401(a) Plans and adopt a resolution confirming the pre-tax deferral of participant contributions to the 401(a) Plans; 3) to amend the 401(a) Plan for the General Manager to add the General Counsel to the Plan; and, 4) to authorize staff to amend the Plan Documents whenever ICMA amends its model plan to ensure compliance with Internal Revenue Service regulations and changes in tax law.

17. **Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report**

   M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to receive the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for October to December 2008.

18. **East San Jose Community Based Transportation Plan.**

   Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, expressed his support for continuing the light rail extension to Eastridge project.

   M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to accept the memorandum Providing an Update on the East San Jose Community Based Transportation Plan.

19. **Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines**

   M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to recommend adoption of the updated Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines as described within this memorandum and per the attached document.

20. **Federal Economic Stimulus**

   M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to recommend the VTA Board adopt the distribution strategy for Federal Economic Stimulus local streets and roads funding as described in the following memorandum, and adopt the list of Local Streets and roads projects shown in Attachment A.

21. **SR237/I-880 HOT Express Connector and Hybrid Bus Replacement**

   M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to adopt a resolution certifying that VTA is an eligible and
22. **Agua Caliente Creek Culvert**  
M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to authorize the General Manager to execute a Cooperative Funding Agreement with the Alameda County Flood Control District for engineering design services related to the Agua Caliente Creek Culvert. The proposed agreement will be for $300,000, of which VTA’s share is not to exceed $150,000.

23. **2000 Measure A Semi-Annual Report**  
M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to receive the 2000 Measure A Semi-Annual Report.

24. **1996 Measure B Progress Report**  
M/S/C (Caserta/Pyle) to receive the 1996 Measure B Transportation Improvement Program Progress Report for December 2008.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

25. (This Item was removed from the Agenda.)

Approve a revision to the Board of Directors Meeting Schedule rescheduling the May 7, 2009 Board of Directors meeting to April 30, 2009.

**OTHER ITEMS**

26. **California High Speed Rail Project**  
Steven Fisher, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview and PowerPoint Presentation of the California High Speed Rail Project which included a map of the system and information of the entire project. The high speed rail line will run from San Diego to Sacramento. The initial line will run from Los Angeles to San Francisco. The estimated cost of the entire project is $45 billion and is expected to be completed in 2030. Stops in Santa Clara County will include Gilroy and San Jose Diridon Station. There will be an additional station in the mid-peninsula that has not yet been identified. Gary Kennerley and Tim Cobb, representatives from the High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA), were in attendance to provide additional information and comments.

Michael Burns, General Manager, indicated Caltrain will be utilized as the overall coordinating agency noting the importance of having a single point of coordination in this effort to provide some management. This does not diminish participation by VTA, individual cities, or TAC and PAC work groups.

Board Member Liccardo indicated residents expressed concern with the project not being in the right-of-way (ROW) and questioned if any property south of Diridon Station will be taken.
Mr. Fisher indicated there are no definitive engineering documents outlining the property impacts. Mr. Kennerley noted the goal will be to stay within the ROW in the Caltrain Corridor and switching over to Monterey Highway adjacent to the Union Pacific Rail Road (UPRR) to avoid any property takings.

Member Liccardo questioned the probability of the San Francisco to San Jose Corridor being the first segment built. Mr. Fisher indicated portions of the Bay Area and Los Angeles will probably be in a strong position to grab a major chunk of the initial funds and will enjoy visible progress.

Member Kishimoto requested a copy of the draft Caltrain and HSRA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). She indicated there was an interest in having the cities coalition participate in the discussions. She suggested combining TAC and PAC workgroups from VTA and Caltrain for better coordination. Board Member Kishimoto noted there was fear of the peninsula being split down the middle due to urban design and the meetings should place an emphasis on the issue. She questioned the use of the $26.4 Million from the high speed rail bonds.

Board Member Gage left his seat at 7:05 pm.

Mr. Fisher indicated the funds are undesignated at this time and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) will be outlining the criteria and providing guidance. He noted VTA will have to submit a grant application to receive the funds.

Board Member Kishimoto indicated interest has been expressed in two other alternatives; Looking at the 101 option as a side by side comparison and the option of stopping the high speed rail in San Jose and doing a cross platform transfer to an enhanced Caltrain. She noted more information should be provided to keep residents involved and keep the project on track.

Board Member Sellers indicated a viable option in Morgan Hill would be running the High Speed Rail along Highway 101 and requested information on other alternatives.

Mr. Kennerley indicated the Caltrain corridor is the preferred alternative, but with the information received from UPRR, it will be necessary to meet with cities of Gilroy and Morgan Hill and take another look at running the rail along Highway 101.

Board Member Sellers questioned the degree of possibility to negotiate with UPRR. Mr. Kennerley indicated they perceive more liability issues and more than one alternative is needed that does not use their property.

Board Member Casas questioned should Palo Alto choose not to have a high speed rail station would VTA lobby to consider Mountain View since it will have impact on VTA buses and light rail, and Caltrain.

Mr. Fisher indicated the possibility had not been addressed and if Mountain View wants to be considered, it will require revision to the program level EIR and needs to be stated
in the scoping document. VTA is writing a scoping letter based on interaction with Caltrain and facilities and everyone impacted should be responding.

Board Member Herrera questioned the top speed of an Electrified Caltrain and the advantages of using the high speed rail versus Caltrain through the peninsula.

Chairperson Sandoval requested the information be sent via email to the Board.

Board Member Kalra indicated sacrifices have to be made to get the High Speed Rail finished and indicated frustrations from community members who don’t want to lose one to two lanes of Monterey Highway because UPRR doesn’t want to give up the ROW.

Board Member Chu indicated there are a number of grade separations and 46 street crossings that must be addressed in the Diridon North Section. He questioned the number located in Santa Clara County and the process in determining how they will be handled.

Mr. Fisher indicated about one-third of the grade separations are in Santa Clara County. Mr. Cobb noted that process will start as soon as the scoping process is complete and indicated there are only a few different ways to handle them which will control the look of the final design.

Board Member Chu indicated there was a pedestrian under crossing planned under the Caltrain section in the Sunnyvale/Mountain View region which was set aside due to lack of funds and questioned if this is the time to reintroduce it for possible funding.

Mr. Cobb indicated he is not sure about the funding aspects but the time to discuss it with the HSRA is now so it can be accounted for while there is a need to make modifications to get from one platform to the other.

Board Member Chu questioned the expected grade levels separations at existing Caltrain stations. Mr. Cobb indicated it will be driven by the vertical alignment of the rail line.

Board Member Chu requested the HSRA have meetings with individual cities. Mr. Kennerley indicated they would be more than happy to send a representative.

Board Member Herrera left her seat at 7:30 pm.

Michael Ludwig, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding street closures and the impact it would have on traffic due to grade separations.

**On order of Chairperson Sandoval** and there being no objection, the Board received a presentation from VTA staff on California High-Speed Rail Project.

27. **ITEMS OF CONCERN AND REFERRAL TO ADMINISTRATION**

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.

Board Member Pyle left her seat at 7:32 pm.
28. MONTHLY LEGISLATIVE HISTORY MATRIX

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

29. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Administration and Finance Committee

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

B. Congestion Management Program and Planning Committee

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

C. Transit Planning and Operations Committee

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

28. REPORTS (UNAPPROVED MINUTES) FROM ADVISORY COMMITTEES

A. Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA)

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

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

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

C. Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)

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

D. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

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

E. Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

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

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

A. Peninsula Corridor JPB

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

B. Capitol Corridor JPB

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the Summary Notes from the Capitol Corridor JPB were accepted as contained on the dais.

C. Dumbarton Rail Corridor Policy Committee

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

D. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)

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

E. Sunol Smart Carpool Lane Joint Powers Authority

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

30. REPORTS FROM VTA POLICY ADVISORY BOARDS (PABs)

A. Vasona Light Rail PAB

There was no report from the Vasona Light Rail PAB.

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

C. **Downtown East Valley PAB**

There was no report from the Downtown East Valley PAB.

D. **Highway PAB South**

There was no report from the Highway PAB South.

31. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Announcements

32. **ADJOURNMENT**

On order of Chairperson Sandoval and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m. in memory of three valued VTA employees; Vahid Payrovi, Roy Solidium, and Charles ‘Chuck’ Justice.

Respectfully Submitted,

Menominee L. McCarter, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
    Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief Financial Officer, Joseph T. Smith


Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:


BACKGROUND:

Measure A, approved by Santa Clara County (County) voters in November 2000, is a 30-year half-cent sales tax devoted to transit improvement projects within the County. The Measure A ballot requires an annual audit of the 2000 Measure A Program (Program) be conducted by an Independent Auditor to ensure that the Program’s sales tax revenues are spent in accordance with the intent of the Measure. Vavrinek, Trine, Day and Company LLP (VTD), a certified public accounting firm has audited the Program's financial statements for FY2008. The Citizen's Watchdog Committee (CWC) has also engaged the services of Macias, Gini, and O’Connell LLP, another independent audit firm to conduct a “compliance audit” to ensure the Program projects and activities are in compliance with the Measure A ballot. Their report will be presented to the CWC in April 2009.

DISCUSSION:

VTD has audited the Program’s FY20008 financial records and financial statements. VTD has issued a “clean” or unqualified opinion on the Program’s financial statements. The audit report states that the Program’s financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the Program as of June 30, 2008, and the changes in financial position of the Program for the year then ended in conformity with principles generally accepted in the United States of America. There were no reportable conditions or material weaknesses in internal control procedures. The Independent Auditor’s Report, the Program’s financial
statements, and notes to the financial statements are contained in the Financial Section of the report.

At the July 2007 and November 2007 meetings of the CWC, the Committee expressed a desire to include total expenditures from inception of the Program in future annual reports. In FY2007, Program Reports, Section 2 of the report contained supplemental schedules that identify the revenues and expenditures for the Program, by year, from inception through FY2006. Those prior year revenues and expenditures are combined with the FY2008 results to provide Program inception-to-date totals on pages 20-21.

Section 3 of the report includes information for each project including expenditures to date, description, status, and activities this fiscal year.

These financial statements can be viewed online at <http://www.vta.org/inside/investor/index.html>. A hard copy may be requested by writing to Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Fiscal Resources Division, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95134-1927. For more information and questions contact VTA Public Affairs and Community Outreach at (408) 321-7575, TDD only (408) 321-2330, or email community.outreach@vta.org.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

The 2000 Measure A Citizen Watchdog Committee considered this item on February 11, 2009. Mr. Leonard Danna, Partner with the audit firm of Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co, LLP, gave a brief presentation. There were no comments on the presentation. The Committee Members requested that staff distribute the financial reports in advance of the meeting to allow the members to review them. The Committee unanimously received and accepted the 2000 Measure A Financial Report.

**AUDIT COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Audit Committee unanimously received and accepted the 2000 Measure A Financial Report at its March 5, 2009 meeting.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

Reviewed by: Ali Hudda, Deputy Director, Accounting

Prepared by: Tony Sandhu, General 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


Policy-Related Action: No

Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:


BACKGROUND:

The Joint Powers Agreement for the administration of the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires an annual audit of the CMP accounts and records to be conducted by an independent Certified Public Accountant. Vavrinek, Trine, Day and Company LLP (VTD), a certified public accounting firm, has audited CMP’s financial records for the period July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008.

The CMP’s audited financial statements were prepared in accordance with the requirements of generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) in the United States of America as promulgated by the Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB). The CMP’s audited financial statements are part of Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority’s (VTA) Comprehensive Annual Financial Report.

DISCUSSION:

VTD has issued a “clean” or unqualified opinion on the CMP’s financial statements. The audit report states that CMP’s financial statements present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the CMP Special Revenue Fund and the Agency Fund as of June 30, 2008, and the changes in financial position of the Special Revenue Fund for the year then ended in conformity with principles generally accepted in the United States of America. There
were no reportable conditions or material weaknesses in internal control procedures. The Independent Auditor’s Report and Financial Statements are included on page 1 of the report.

These financial statements can be viewed online at <http://www.vta.org/inside/investor/index.html>. A hard copy may be requested by writing to Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, Fiscal Resources Division, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95134-1927. For more information and questions contact VTA Public Affairs and Community Outreach at (408) 321-7575, TDD only (408) 321-2330, or email community.outreach@vta.org.

AUDIT COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Audit Committee unanimously received and accepted the FY2008 Congestion Management Program audited financial report at its March 5, 2009 meeting.

FISCAL IMPACT:

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

Reviewed by: Ali Hudda, Deputy Director, Accounting

Prepared by: Tony Sandhu, General Accounting Manager
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Auditor General, Pat Hagan

SUBJECT: Internal Audit Program Goals and Objectives

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the goals and objectives for the internal audit program at VTA, as proposed by the Auditor General.

BACKGROUND:

At the January 8, 2009, meeting, the VTA Board of Directors authorized the General Manager to execute a task order contract with Deloitte & Touche, LLC, to provide Auditor General Services. Under the initial task order, the Auditor General was charged with executing the first two tasks within the contracted scope-of-services: (1) develop and recommend goals and objectives for the internal audit program; and (2) develop and recommend an annual internal audit plan.

DISCUSSION:

The Auditor General has developed a comprehensive definition for the internal audit program. The program components include objective, scope, accountability, responsibilities, authority, and standards, as described in greater detail below.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of the VTA Internal Audit function is to provide independent, objective assurance and audit services designed to add value to and improve VTA operations. The Internal Audit function will help VTA accomplish its objectives by bringing a systematic, disciplined approach to evaluating and improving the effectiveness of risk management, control, and operational processes.
**SCOPE**

The scope of work of the Internal Audit function encompasses the following:

- Reviewing the reliability and integrity of significant financial, managerial, and operating information and the means used to identify, measure, classify and report such information;
- Reviewing the systems established to ensure compliance with policies, standards, procedures, and applicable laws and regulations which could have a significant impact on operations;
- Reviewing and assessing whether resources are acquired economically, used efficiently, adequately protected, and properly accounted for;
- Reviewing operations or programs to ascertain whether they are being carried out as planned and whether results are consistent with stated goals and objectives, and
- Reviewing the processes used to appropriately identify and manage enterprise risk.

Opportunities for improving management control, efficiency, and VTA’s image may be identified during audits. They will be communicated to the appropriate level of VTA management and/or the Audit Committee.

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

The Auditor General is charged with directing the Internal Audit function and shall be accountable to the VTA Board of Directors through the Audit Committee, with an administrative reporting relationship to the VTA General Manager. The Audit Committee will approve the annual audit plan proposed by the Auditor General, including the associated resource plan and budget. The Internal Audit function will cooperate with VTA management in a joint effort to accomplish the organization’s objectives; however, the auditors will maintain organizational independence in order to render impartial and unbiased judgments essential to the proper conduct of audits.

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Internal Audit function’s responsibilities include:

- Develop an annual audit plan using appropriate risk-based methodology, considering any risks or control concerns identified by VTA management, and submit this plan to the Audit Committee for its review and approval;
- Conduct audits in the approved annual audit plan in accordance with professional standards;
- Communicate findings with appropriate individuals throughout the audit as it is conducted; develop written preliminary audit findings promptly and review the findings with the appropriate levels of VTA management;
- Solicit VTA management response to preliminary audit findings, develop a draft audit report that incorporates VTA management’s response to findings and review it with VTA management;
- Create a final report for each audit and review it with VTA management and the VTA Audit Committee;
• Periodically follow up on the status of audit recommendations and report on corrective actions implemented by VTA management;
• Provide and review quarterly status reports on audit activities to the VTA Audit Committee;
• Recommend revisions to the approved internal audit plan as appropriate, and
• Assist in the investigation of significant issues, including suspected fraudulent activities, within VTA and notify the General Manager, the General Counsel and the Audit Committee of the results.
• Perform supplemental or special audits, as directed by the Audit Committee.

**AUTHORITY**

The Internal Audit function is authorized to:

• Have unrestricted access to all functions, activities, records, property, information systems, and personnel necessary to conduct approved audit activities;
• Have full and free access to the members of the Audit Committee;
• Obtain the necessary assistance of personnel in the departments of VTA where they perform audits.

The Internal audit function is not authorized to:

• Perform any management or operational duties for VTA;
• Initiate or approve accounting transactions;
• Engage in any activities that Internal Audit would normally be expected to review or appraise, such as writing policies and procedures for VTA use;
• Activities that would create a conflict of interest or appearance of conflict of interest; or
• Activities not approved by the Audit Committee.

**STANDARDS OF AUDIT PRACTICE**

The Internal Audit services will be performed in accordance with the Statement on Standards for Consulting Services issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The Audit Committee could reject the recommendation of the Auditor General and direct that the program be redefined.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**
The Audit Committee considered this item on March 5, 2009. The Auditor General clarified the process for resolving disagreements with management on factual evidence prior to presenting findings and recommendations to the Audit Committee. The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

Prepared by: Auditor General
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:

Ratify the nomination of Erik Larsen to the Citizens Advisory Committee, representing the South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council.

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, as well as specified community stakeholder groups with an interest in transportation. Five positions represent Business and Labor organizations. 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 concurrently hold an elected public office. Committee members cannot be VTA staff or employed by the city they represent. The committee membership term is indefinite, and CAC members serve 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 South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council (SBLC). The SBLC has nominated Erik Larsen as its new CAC representative to replace its former representative, Judy Kirkham, who has resigned and relocated out of state.

Mr. Larsen, who lives in Milpitas, currently works as a Community Organizer for the city of San José. He has a Bachelors Degree in Leadership and Union Administration from the National Labor College in Silver Springs, Maryland. He is active in the local community, serving as a lay preacher at Sunny Hills Methodist Church and as a Boy Scout Leader. He is also a member of the San Jose Convention and Visitors’ Bureau. Mr. Larsen is the former president of AFSCME Local 101 and a graduate of Leadership Santa Cruz, a project of the Santa Cruz Chamber of Commerce.

Based on Mr. Larsen’s qualifications and local community involvement, staff recommends that the Administration and Finance Committee appoints, and the Board ratifies Mr. Larsen's nomination to this position.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

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

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

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

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Administration & Finance Committee considered this item as part of its March 19, 2009 Consent Agenda and approved it unanimously.

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 External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Bill Position: AB 266 (Carter)

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a support position for AB 266 (Carter), which requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to do an assessment of the state's unmet transportation needs every five years.

BACKGROUND:

AB 266 requires the CTC to develop an assessment of: (a) the unfunded costs of programmed state and federally earmarked transportation projects in the state; and (b) available funding for transportation purposes and unmet transportation needs on a statewide basis. Under the provisions of this bill, the assessment also must include recommendations on how the state and regional/local agencies may address the transportation funding shortfalls and unmet needs that are identified. Results from the initial assessment must be submitted to the Legislature by March 1, 2011. Thereafter, the CTC would be required to do this assessment every five years.

DISCUSSION:

AB 266 is consistent with a 2004 recommendation by the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO), which stated, “The first step in identifying a solution to a problem is identifying the scope of the problem. Yet, when it comes to transportation, there is currently no requirement that Caltrans or any other state entity assess and report on the state’s overall transportation needs on a regular basis. While Caltrans and regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs) must regularly update funding and scheduling documents, such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), these documents provide no information about unfunded needs. Similarly, RTPAs are required to adopt long-range planning documents under both state and federal law, but these documents are
not compiled to provide a view of the state’s needs as a whole.”

In 1999, the CTC released its “Inventory of Ten-Year Funding Needs for California’s Transportation System, which was completed in response to the passage of SR 8 (Burton). This study noted, “The report demonstrates substantial unfunded need for reinvesting in California’s existing transportation systems. It also demonstrates the substantial funding requirements to expand those systems, both through lower cost operational improvements and through more costly capacity increases. These costs, while substantial, reflect the challenges of aging transportation systems and ‘catching up’ with three decades of population growth that out-paced highway and roadway capacity increases by a factor of over two, and growth in vehicle miles of travel that out-paced population by a factor of nearly three.”

The CTC indicated that in compiling the SR 8 study, it contacted nearly 1,000 transportation agencies in the state through questionnaires and individual inquiries. From this information, it computed that California’s 10-year funding need for transportation purposes was close to $120 billion. However, the commission emphasized, “The report is essentially limited to a compilation of surveys. It does not offer a tightly integrated, prioritized, planning exercise. The various surveys have not been normalized for compatibility. Rather, the responses from all respondents have been summarized and assembled.”

In light of: (a) the shortcomings of the 1999 report and the fact that is was done close to 10 years ago; (b) the diversion of significant amounts of transportation dollars to shore up the General Fund, which became a common practice on the part of the Governor and Legislature this decade; (c) the continued serious shortfalls in transportation funding; and (d) the continuing deterioration of California’s transportation infrastructure, the CTC should update its needs assessment of the state’s transportation network as soon as possible. AB 266 would accomplish this purpose, as well as ensure that such an assessment is done on a regular basis so that policymakers have current information about the state’s unmet transportation funding needs. Therefore, we recommend that the Board of Directors support this legislation.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board of Directors could decide to adopt a position for AB 266 that is different from the one being recommended, or it could opt to take no position on this bill at this time.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item on March 19, 2009, and unanimously recommended that the Board of Directors support AB 266. In response to a question from Director Chuck Reed, staff pointed out that the CTC’s outreach for the SR 8 study was broad-based, and included state agencies, regional transportation planning agencies (RTPAs), councils of governments (COGs), congestion management agencies (CMAs), public transit operators, cities, and counties from all parts of California.

This item also was presented to the Citizens Advisory Committee on March 11, 2009.
committee strongly encouraged the Board of Directors to support AB 266.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact associated with this recommendation.

Prepared by: Kurt Evans
ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Authorize the General Manager to execute an agreement to continue the BART Plus multi-agency ticket program in cooperation with BART and nine other Bay Area transit agencies through December 2009 with the option to extend up to three years in annual increments.

BACKGROUND:

The BART Plus program began in April, 1991 with the purpose of facilitating fare payment by transit riders whose travel patterns require them to use both BART and local transit, typically bus services.

Each month, BART Plus offers a special series of BART tickets pre-encoded with fixed amounts of BART ticket value. Each BART Plus ticket is honored as a “flash pass” on board participating bus operators for a half-month period. There are “A” versions of the tickets for the first half of the month and “B” versions of the tickets for the second half of the month. For trips on BART, the amount of BART ticket value is reduced for each trip taken during the half-month period and for five days after the end of the period, at which time the remaining BART value, if any, expires.

Pricing of BART Plus tickets is based on the amount of pre-encoded BART ticket value plus a fixed additional dollar amount that is shared among the bus operators. The bus operator share is allocated among the bus operators based on a usage survey. VTA has a very small share of the program, about 1.8%.

The most recent BART Plus program agreement was executed in 2006 for a two year term, and
this was subsequently extended through December 2008. Besides VTA and BART, other operators included in this agreement were Samtrans, SFMTA, Union City Transit, Central Contra Costa Transit Authority, Eastern Contra Costa Transit Authority, Western Contra Costa Transit Authority, Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority, the City of Benicia, and the Dumbarton Bridge Service Consortium (which includes VTA, AC Transit, Samtrans, Union City Transit, and BART). The program is administered by BART with administrative costs charged against program revenues.

DISCUSSION:

In November 2008, BART staff initiated discussions regarding extending the BART Plus program agreement for 2009. In response to an SFMTA proposal to increase revenues for the bus operators, it was determined that a new agreement rather than an amendment should be executed. A new agreement has now been drafted based on the 2006 agreement but with a ticket price increase for the "bus share" from $48 per month to $58 per month effective July 2009. Also, Benicia will no longer be a part of the program but the City of Rio Vista will join for the first time.

Term of the new agreement is through December 2009, with optional extensions up to three years in one year increments.

ALTERNATIVES:

VTA could choose not to participate in the continuation of the BART Plus program.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Administration and Finance Committee considered this item at its March 19, 2009 meeting and approved it unanimously without comment.

FISCAL IMPACT:

VTA received $22,115 from the BART Plus Program for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2008.

Reviewed and verified by Ali Hudda, Deputy Director of Accounting

Prepared by: David Sausjord, Revenue Services Manager
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 (Part 1):** A list of the projects reviewed by the Congestion Management Program and Development Review Program with relevant VTA comments.

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

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 respective agency’s responses to VTA’s comments and recommendations. A glossary of abbreviations and acronyms used in the quarterly report is included at the end of Part 2 to assist the reader.

**STANDING COMMITTEE AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE/DISCUSSION RECOMMENDATION:**

This item was on the consent agenda at the March CAC, BPAC, TAC and PAC meetings. Staff made brief comments on this item at BPAC, TAC and PAC noting that progressive Conditions of Approval were included with several of the approved projects. At BPAC a clarifying question
was raised about tracking Conditions of Approval. At TAC, a comment was offered emphasizing that some of the progressive conditions of approval were the result of extensive consensus-building among multiple parties including the cities and the County. At PAC, a question was raised about how cities can provide feedback to VTA when developments are considered (focusing primarily on service planning).

The CMPP received the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Project Quarterly Status Report on the consent agenda at its March meeting. Staff made brief comments noting the progressive Conditions of Approval included with several of the approved projects and briefly summarizing the advisory committee comments. Two members commented that the report is helpful in keeping up with VTA's activities in congestion management and land use/transportation coordination. Other comments related to how this ties in with recent city initiatives and possible future VTA outreach or education activities.

Prepared By: Robert Swierk
Comments on Selected Projects Reviewed by VTA
VTA Comments Provided during October, November and December of 2008
February 18, 2009

<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 Campbell</td>
<td></td>
<td>CM0801</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10/14/2008</td>
<td>11/10/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Winchester Boulevard Master Plan**

**Winchester Boulevard from northern limits to Camden Avenue**

**Description**: Expansion of the Upper South Winchester Area Plan to include and coordinate public improvements and private development standards for the area; renamed the Winchester Boulevard Master Plan.

**VTA Comments:**

VTA commends the City for including many elements that will foster the creation of a vibrant, mixed-use corridor which supports alternative transportation modes including walking, bicycling, and transit. We strongly support the inclusion of standards that shift parking to the rear, side or below buildings; the use of bulb-outs at pedestrian crossings; the provision of bicycle lanes; and the use of pedestrian-oriented street lighting in the central portion (Area 2) of the corridor. These elements are consistent with the spirit of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual, which highlights best practices for integrating transportation and land use.

Regarding the Plan’s recommendation to explore the use of bulb-outs at intersections, we note that this concept is complementary with the vision of providing enhanced transit along Winchester Boulevard. At key intersections, pedestrian bulb-outs can be extended to provide room for enhanced transit stops/waiting areas, which could include attractive canopies, seating, information displays, and other urban design amenities. Locating transit stops at bulb-outs on the far side of signalized intersections can help ensure that transit vehicles can move efficiently through the corridor, making transit more time-competitive with the automobile and a more attractive travel option.

This Master Plan effort represents a significant opportunity for VTA and the City to work together to consider the optimal location of transit stops in along the corridor. Together we can identify locations that can maximize ridership and benefit to the community while ensuring compatibility with the existing land uses and street features.

VTA would also like to note that this portion of Winchester Boulevard is included in VTA’s countywide Cores, Corridors and Station Areas scheme that was developed in coordination with the City of Campbell and the other municipalities in Santa Clara County in 2002 and 2003. This designation allows the City to compete for planning and capital grants under VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Program.

We would be happy to discuss our comments on the Winchester Boulevard Master Plan with you, and look forward to working together with the City as the Master Plan is adopted and implemented in the coming months.
City of Cupertino

Main Street Cupertino
Northwest corner of Stevens Creek Boulevard and Tantau Avenue

Description: Two development scenarios involving a mix of retail, office, hotel and housing uses on an 18.7-acre site.

VTA Comments:

Transit Planning and Site Design

Land Use and Site Design:
VTA supports the proposed land use mix and site design within walking distance of Stevens Creek Boulevard, a significant transit corridor. The proposed mix of land uses, the inclusion of a significant residential component, the pedestrian orientation of the development, and the inclusion of ground-floor retail along many of the building frontages are consistent with the principles in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use.

Intersection Level of Service Impacts and Mitigation Measures - Impact on Bicycle Safety:
The Draft EIR text states that one of three measures could be used to mitigate the level of service impact of the project at the Wolfe Road/Vallco Parkway intersection (MM TRAN - 7.1). VTA recommends against implementing option 2 (adding a second, westbound right-turn lane) because it would adversely impact bicycle access and safety. Instead, we suggest that the City require the adoption of option 1 or 3 as a mitigation measure. For more information on best design practices to avoid conflicts between bicycles and vehicles at intersections, please refer Section 5.1.4 of VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines (BTG). This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Impacts and Mitigation Measures:
VTA supports requiring the project applicant to provide pedestrian crosswalk improvements at Finch Avenue & Vallco Parkway and at the project’s eastern driveway & Vallco Parkway, as discussed on page 61 of the DEIR. VTA also supports requiring the project applicant to provide Class I and Class II bicycle parking spaces per the City’s Municipal Code. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities.

Transit Facilities Impacts and Mitigation Measures:
The Traffic Impact Analysis in Appendix C notes that the proposed project may impact plans for a future transit corridor being planned for Stevens Creek Boulevard; however, this language is not included in the body of the DEIR. VTA requests that the DEIR discussion on Transit Facilities Impacts (MM TRAN - 7.1) be modified to include language about plans for enhanced transit services along Stevens Creek Boulevard. The DEIR should note that VTA is currently developing a strategic plan for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service which could include service along Stevens Creek Boulevard, and it should note that the City of Cupertino’s General Plan and VTA have also identified a potential transit station in...
the Vallco area. We request that the City coordinate with VTA to ensure that any changes proposed for the project’s frontage on Stevens Creek Boulevard do not conflict with future VTA plans along this corridor.

Current Bus Service:
There are two existing bus stops on Stevens Creek Boulevard located adjacent to this development. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA staff recommends that the project include the following improvements:

Bus Stop on Stevens Creek Boulevard, west of Tantau Avenue:
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (see attached VTA standards for articulated buses)
* A large 10’ X 75’ PCC bus stop pavement pad for future articulated buses or BRT
* Locate trees or planter strips outside the bus loading area

Stevens Creek Boulevard, west of Finch Avenue:
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (see attached VTA standards for articulated buses)
* A large 10’ X 75’ PCC bus stop pavement pad for future articulated buses or BRT
* Locate trees or planter strips outside the bus loading area

Transportation Impact Analysis

CMP Intersections:
Upon selection of a preferred alternative (scheme), VTA recommends early consultation with the County of Santa Clara and VTA staff on the final selection and design of the proposed mitigation measures, including identification of fair-share contribution opportunities, for the impacted CMP intersections as identified in the DEIR:
* CMP ID 5625 Lawrence Exp / Homestead Rd.
* CMP ID 5633 Lawrence Exp / Bollinger Rd / Moorpark Ave
* CMP ID 5636 Lawrence Exp / Calvert Drive (I-280 on-ramp)

Parking:
The parking study indicates that 1,658 parking spaces would be needed for Scheme 1 and 1,963 parking spaces for Scheme 2. VTA supports the proposed reduced parking supply (based on City of Cupertino’s parking supply rates) of 1,790 parking spaces for Scheme 2. VTA strongly encourages shared parking and implementation of transportation demand management programs that encourage use of alternate modes of transportation.

Freeway LOS:
The freeway analysis indicates impacts of additional trips exceeding 1% of capacity along segments of I-280 between Lawrence Expressway and I-880. VTA suggests early coordination with the appropriate agencies in identifying potential mitigation measures and fair-share contribution opportunities based on VTP 2030 projects in the project area.
Transportation Demand Management (TDM):
In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests the city to require implementation of a comprehensive TDM program as a condition of approval or mitigation measure. Effective TDM programs include:

* City-Carshare
* Parking Cash-Out
* Direct or Indirect Payments for Taking Alternate Modes
* Transit Fare Incentives such as Eco Pass and Commuter Checks
* Employee Carpool Matching
* Preferentially Located Carpool Parking
* Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks
* 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

We request that the City coordinate with VTA in the identification of appropriate measures to be included in the comprehensive TDM program.
<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 Fremont</td>
<td></td>
<td>FR0704</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>11/19/2008</td>
<td>12/17/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cisco Field & Ballpark Village Project**  
Adjacent to and west of I-880, south of Auto Mall Parkway

**Description:** Specific Plan to allow 900kSF 32k seat baseball stadium, up to 200kSF ancillary space, up to 540kSF retail, 80 room hotel, up to 3,150 residential units, up to 300kSF office/R&D, 7.5 acre auto dealership, school, open space, circulation & infrastructure.

**VTA Comments:**

We have a number of specific comments on the scope and content of the environmental information to be addressed in the EIR which are summarized below.

**Project Location and Alternatives:**
Given the current available information, VTA believes that the Ballpark Off-Site Alternative has greater potential to attract transit ridership, is more compatible with the proposed BART extension to Warm Springs and into Santa Clara County, and has greater opportunity to reduce Vehicle-Miles-Traveled (VMT) than the proposed project. We request that the Ballpark Off-Site Alternative be studied thoroughly and be given equal consideration in the EIR, including the analysis of transportation, circulation and air quality impacts of both alternatives. We also suggest that the EIR analysis of both alternatives include consideration of the potential to create a vibrant transit-supportive development around the ballpark in the Off-Site Alternative. Such a development may be possible given the land around the proposed station site and the support of BART and other agencies for Transit-Oriented Development at the new station.

**Access and Circulation - Shuttles:**
In the NOP and the Revised Conceptual Site Plan and Revised Mitigation Measures, the applicant indicates that they plan to provide shuttle services from the Plan Area to BART and VTA. The EIR should include a thorough analysis of the logistics and impacts of providing shuttle services necessary to achieve connections to rail transit, for both the proposed project and the Ballpark Off-Site Alternative. This analysis should include consideration of the timing of the planned ballpark opening, the opening of the Warm Springs BART station, and the start of service on the BART extension to Santa Clara County.

For the proposed project, the applicant does not indicate a location(s) within the Plan Area where the shuttle service will drop-off and pick-up attendees. For transit to be an effective piece of the Plan Area’s access and circulation, this location(s) will be critical and should be located in areas that conveniently connect attendees to the ballpark, close to main entrances, without an extensive walk. Approximate pick-up and drop-off locations should be indicated in future revisions of the site plans, and discussed in the EIR.

For any alternative that includes shuttle service to VTA light rail, the EIR should indicate which light rail station(s) in Milpitas would be served. It also should include an analysis of anticipated usage of the shuttles and VTA bus and light rail services, operational capacity for shuttles at the relevant VTA light rail stations, passenger capacity on the light rail vehicles, and any other associated operational impacts. This analysis should account for peak demand before and after games, particularly during weekday commute periods.
Access and Circulation - Relationship to VTA’s Freight Railroad Relocation Activities:
The Mission/Warren Truck Rail Program (Part of VTA’s Freight Railroad Relocation Activities) should be considered when determining vehicle circulation routes, specifically from/to Interstate 680. The timing of construction in this area could potentially affect circulation to the Plan Area. This project is being conducted in conjunction with several agencies, including Caltrans and Alameda County Transportation Authority. The relationship of the project circulation plan to VTA’s Freight Railroad Relocation Activities should be addressed in the EIR for both the proposed site and Ballpark Off-Site Alternative. For more information on VTA’s Freight Railroad Relocation Activities, please contact Silicon Valley Rapid Transit (SVRT) Program Engineering.

Traffic Impact Analysis and VTA Congestion Management Program:
The Transportation impact analysis of the proposed ballpark should include relevant segments of freeways and intersections in Santa Clara County, including those in VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP). The freeway segments and intersections analyzed should be determined according to the VTA TIA guidelines, and would include those meeting the following thresholds:
* Freeways: If the project is expected to add traffic equal to at least one percent of the freeway segment’s capacity.
* Intersections the proposed ballpark is expected to add 10 or more peak hour vehicles per lane to any intersection movement.

The traffic impact analysis should address conditions for both single-event and multiple event scenarios (i.e., doubleheaders) and consider both weekday and weekend conditions.

In addition, VTA recommends the usage of Changeable Message Sign (CMS) boards to provide traffic information to ballpark patrons and Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) to monitor traffic conditions. Implementation of these ITS measures would provide tools to the traffic management center staff to better manage the flow of traffic during events at the ballpark. The traffic impact analysis should address the potential for use of these ITS measures. The traffic impact analysis and EIR should include consideration of mitigation measures to minimize the potential impact of the new ballpark on I-880 traffic operations during the PM peak hours.

<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>

**Creekside Landing**
West of I-880 and north of Dixon Landing Road

**Description:** Construction of 524,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses.

**VTA Comments:**
The current site plan layout is not a transit-supportive land development pattern. VTA recommends that vehicular parking be oriented towards the freeway, and commercial uses be located on Fremont Boulevard adjacent to the planned wide sidewalk and street trees. Significant detail has been paid to landscaping and pedestrian amenities, however, the investment of landscaping and sidewalks along Fremont Boulevard should be used to facilitate pedestrian use, including potential future transit access.
The Campus at McCarthy Ranch  
Northwest corner of McCarthy Blvd and Ranch Road

Description: Retain existing buildings and parking lot and construct six new office buildings totaling 951,000 SF bringing the site to a total of 1,415,800 SF on 65 acres.

VTA Comments:

Site Design and Land Use Density:
VTA supports the proposed increase in development intensity on the project site to the FAR of 0.50 allowed by the current General Planning and zoning designations. This aspect of the design is consistent with the principles of VTA's Community Design & Transportation Manual, which encourages compact development along corridors served by transit. We concur with the assessment in Section 3.0 (page 12) of the DEIR that "the project would intensify jobs in an established job center near housing and transit, which is consistent with the goals of the CMP."

Transportation Demand Management:
VTA supports the measures to encourage alternative modes of transportation that are proposed in Section 4.8.3.11 of the DEIR. We encourage the City of Milpitas to require these measures and other related Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures as a condition of approval of the project. In addition, VTA suggests that the City consider requiring the project applicant to provide financial incentives to take transit (for instance through the EcoPass program) as a condition of approval.

VTA supports the inclusion of bicycle storage and changing rooms on site as a part of the effort to achieve LEED Silver certification, as noted in Section 2.0 of the DEIR.

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures [Section 4.8.2.2 - Project Impacts of Transportation and Circulation section and Appendix E - Final Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Report]:

VTA recommends early coordination in the planning process between the Lead Agency and the affected adjacent jurisdictions, specifically VTA and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), in addressing the identified significant and unavoidable traffic impacts to the Congestion Management Program (CMP) and Caltrans intersection and roadway facilities.

VTA supports the City of Milpitas’ current policy that requires developers to pay their fair share of the improvement costs to mitigate the anticipated cumulative impact of traffic from new developments on future deficient roadways as cited on Page v of the Final TIA Report. In addition, VTA also supports the City of Milpitas in their development of a city wide deficiency plan to identify local and regional transportation improvements as stated on page vi of the Final TIA.

Bus Service:
There are two existing bus duckouts, along McCarthy Ranch Boulevard, which were conditioned as part of the original roadway plan for the area and should be maintained as part of this project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Agency File #</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>Document Received</th>
<th>VTA Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td></td>
<td>ML0808</td>
<td>Tentative Map,</td>
<td>9/26/2008,</td>
<td>10/15/2008,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**McCandless Project**

**Great Mall Parkway and McCandless Drive**

**Description:** Construction of 1,573 units, 75,838 SF retail on 23 acres.

**VTA Comments:**

**Bus Service:**
VTA provides bus service along McCandless Drive in the vicinity of the project. There are two bus stops just south of the development on a bridge. Both bus stops are substandard and do not meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. In order to provide improved connectivity to rail, the Great Mall/Main Transit Center, and the future Milpitas BART Station, VTA staff recommend that the bus stops be relocated to the project site with the following improvements (see also attached marked-up plans):

**Northbound McCandless, north of Street D**
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (see attached VTA standards)
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see attached VTA standards)
* An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
* Locate trees or planter strips outside of the bus/deboarding area
* Install pedestrian crossing at intersection

**Southbound McCandless, south of Street C**
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (see attached VTA standards)
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see attached VTA standards)
* An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
* Locate trees or planter strips outside of the bus/deboarding area
* Install pedestrian crossing at intersection

**Pedestrian Bridge:**
Sheet TN-14 (Conceptual Offsite Improvements) shows a pedestrian bridge "by others" at the northwest corner of the property closest to Great Mall Parkway and the existing railroad tracks. It appears that the location of this landing is intended to match up with the entrance to the Great Mall Parkway/Main Light Rail Station in the median of Great Mall Parkway. This pedestrian bridge should be included as part of the development project for improved transit connectivity to light rail, the Great Mall/Main Transit Center, and the future Milpitas BART Station.

**Site Design, Land Use Mix and Density:**
VTA commends the project sponsors for a site design that is compact and pedestrian-friendly, incorporates ground-floor retail along several frontages, and proposes a gross residential density of 69 dwelling units/acre within one-quarter mile of a VTA light-rail station and transit center, and close to a number of bus routes and the planned Milpitas BART station. These design features are consistent with the principles of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual, including intensifying land use activities, providing a diverse mix of uses, and focusing on existing
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areas. In addition, VTA supports the pedestrian scale of the design, the proposed pedestrian crossing treatments, the use of on-street parallel and angled parking, and the provision of plazas and public spaces throughout the development.

Bicycle Parking:
This Tentative Map set does not appear to address provisions for bicycle parking. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Comments on Notice of Intent to Adopt of Mitigated Negative Declaration, 12/10/2008:

We previously commented on the Tentative Map plan set in a letter dated October 15, 2008. Since we understand that this environmental document mainly addresses the project density (including the 25% transit oriented density bonus sought by the project proponent), we will repeat our previous comments regarding the project Site Design, Land Use Mix and Density for reference here:

Site Design, Land Use Mix and Density:
VTA commends the project sponsors for a site design that is compact and pedestrian-friendly, incorporates ground-floor retail along several frontages, and proposes a gross residential density of 69 dwelling units/acre within one-quarter mile of a VTA light-rail station and transit center, and close to a number of bus routes and the planned Milpitas BART station. These design features are consistent with the principles of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual, including intensifying land use activities, providing a diverse mix of uses, and focusing on existing areas. In addition, VTA supports the pedestrian scale of the design, the proposed pedestrian crossing treatments, the use of on-street parallel and angled parking, and the provision of plazas and public spaces throughout the development.

The Initial Study states that no Site Development Review for architecture is included as part of the current Mitigated Negative Declaration, but it is anticipated that this review will occur subsequently and independently. However, Section 4.15 (Transportation) of the Initial Study for the Mitigated Declaration briefly addresses Transit Impacts and Impacts to Pedestrian or Bicycle Facilities of the project. Therefore, we will include comments on these topics for reference here.

Bus Service:
VTA provides bus service along McCandless Drive in the vicinity of the project. There are two bus stops just south of the development on a bridge. Both bus stops are substandard and do not meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. In order to provide improved connectivity to rail, the Great Mall/Main Transit Center, and the future Milpitas BART Station, VTA staff recommend that the bus stops be replaced on the project site with four new bus stops with the following improvements (see also the attached marked-up plans which show the bus stop locations):

* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (per VTA standards)
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (per VTA standards)
* An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
* Locate trees or planter strips outside the bus/deboarding area
Pedestrian Bridge:
Sheet TN-14 (Conceptual Offsite Improvements) shows a pedestrian bridge "by others" at the northwest corner of the property closest to Great Mall Parkway and the existing railroad tracks. It appears that the location of this landing is intended to match up with the entrance to the Great Mall Parkway/Main Light Rail Station in the median of Great Mall Parkway. This pedestrian bridge should be included as part of the development project for improved transit connectivity to light rail, the Great Mall/Main Transit Center, and the future Milpitas BART Station.

Bicycle Parking:
This Tentative Map set does not appear to address provisions for bicycle parking. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

VTA requests that the Mitigated Negative Declaration acknowledge the above concerns regarding transit impacts and pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, and recommends that the City require the project proponent to implement the above improvements as mitigation measures or conditions of approval of the project. We look forward to an opportunity to review the Site Development Permit and focused TIA for the project when they become available.
McCarthy Ranch Mixed Use  
N. McCarthy Boulevard between SR 237 and Dixon Landing Road

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

**VTA Comments:**

**Transportation/Traffic - Transit Services:**
VTA supports the inclusion of pedestrian and bicycle provisions as well as local and regional transit provisions in the Transportation/Traffic impact analysis, as discussed in Section 4.15.a of the Initial Study Checklist. We suggest that the project proponent and the Lead Agency work in coordination with VTA to determine the feasibility of shuttle, local bus, and/or community bus services in reducing the transportation impacts and improving mobility options in the proposed development. The VTA Transit Sustainability Policy & Service Design Guidelines is a useful reference in considering the addition or extension of transit services. As noted in this document, provisions can be made for local agencies and private organizations to develop a financial partnership to fund community or local bus service. VTA encourages the City of Milpitas to consider requiring the Lead Agency to contribute funding towards the operation of a shuttle, local bus and/or community bus as a condition of approval of the proposed development.

It should be noted that VTA provides bus service (line 33) to the McCarthy Ranch Shopping Center located south of this development. There are also bus stops located along McCarthy Boulevard in the project area that were installed but have not yet been used. These bus stops should be preserved for future use when bus or shuttle service runs service in this direction along McCarthy Boulevard.

**Transportation/Traffic - Site Design:**
Section 4.15g of the Initial Study Checklist notes that the EIR will address how the project’s circulation features and transit provisions may or may not be in compliance with adopted City policies and standards in support of alternative transportation modes. VTA supports this topic being addressed in the EIR. In addition, we request that the EIR and accompanying site planning and design specifically consider how the commercial development on Parcel C will accommodate transit vehicle circulation (whether for shuttles, local buses or community buses). VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual is a valuable reference regarding how to incorporate transit accommodations into the site design, as well as other transit, pedestrian and bicycle-friendly design guidelines.

Please forward a copy of the Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) when it is prepared for the Draft EIR. VTA is also interested in the project schedule when it becomes available.
### Milpitas Square Mixed Use Development

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

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

**VTA Comments:**

**Bus Service:**
VTA provides bus service in the project vicinity. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA staff recommends that two new bus stops be established with a duckout as shown in the attached photo. The bus stops would be located on both sides of Barber lane with the following improvements:

- A bus duckout (per VTA standards)
- An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
- Crosswalk to provide safe access to bus stops, since these are mid-block bus stops.
- Place all trees outside of bus stop areas to avoid blocking views of the bus stop or waiting passengers
- Traffic calming devices to maintain low vehicle speeds on Barber Lane since there is diagonal parking.

**Site Design, Land Use Mix and Density:**
VTA commends the project sponsors for a site design that is compact and pedestrian-friendly, incorporates a mix of land uses, and includes substantial residential density on a VTA bus line and within two-thirds of a mile of a VTA light-rail station. These design features are consistent with the principles of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual, including intensifying land use activities, providing a diverse mix of uses, and focusing on existing areas. In addition, VTA supports the pedestrian scale of the design, the incorporation of ground-floor retail, use of on-street parallel and angled parking, and provision of plazas and public spaces throughout the development.

**Shuttle Access:**
VTA commends the project sponsors for including shuttle service to the nearby I-880/Milpitas light-rail station. VTA suggests that future site plans and circulation diagrams be revised to show the location of shuttle stops and how the shuttle would circulate through the site.

**Bicycle Parking:**
The site plans do not currently appear to address bicycle parking. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.
VTA’s Congestion Management Program (CMP) requires a Transportation Impact Analysis for any project that is expected to generate 100 or more new peak-hour trips. Based on the information provided on the size of the project, a TIA will be required. VTA’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines should be used when preparing the TIA. These guidelines include the analysis of bicycle facilities, parking, site circulation and pedestrian access, as well as roadways.

It appears from the discussion of automobile parking on Sheet A0.11 that the commercial parking quantities were based mainly on the existing usage surveys rather than the MXD3 zoning district parking requirements. VTA suggests that the project sponsor consider reducing the amount of commercial parking to more closely match the amount required by the zoning ordinance. Such a reduction in parking ratios would be justified by the mixed land uses (which will result in on-site trip capture), capture of walking trips from nearby hotels, access to VTA bus service, and shuttle access to the VTA light-rail station. A reduction in the residential parking ratios should be considered as well. These measures may allow the project to justify reductions in trip generation rates in the TIA process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Agency File #</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>Document Received</th>
<th>VTA Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>MV0806</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>12/10/2008</td>
<td>12/16/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Target at Showers Drive**  
**Bounded by Latham Street, California Avenue, and Showers Drive**  
**Description:** Planned Community Permit, Development Review Permit for demolition of existing 112,125 SF Target to construct a new Target of 148,457 SF

**VTA Comments:**  
VTA provided comments on this referral on September 26, 2008. We have the following comments on the revised proposal.

**Bus Service:**  
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:

*10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad according to VTA standards (attached).*

**Land Use Mix/Site Design:**  
VTA recognizes that the current Planned Development permit is being amended to remove the free-standing commercial building along Showers Drive from the project scope. We would like to express our support for such a building being ultimately developed, whether as a later phase of this development or in a separate project. The addition of another retail building fronting directly on Showers Drive would help improve the pedestrian environment by creating another active use facing the street. This type of development would be consistent with VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual and would help complement the transit passenger activity nearby.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Agency File #</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>Document Received</th>
<th>VTA Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>173-03-TOD; 207-03-AA</td>
<td>MV0301</td>
<td>TOD Permit</td>
<td>10/20/2008</td>
<td>10/28/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Whisman - The Quad**  
**369/465 Whisman Road and 464 Ellis Street**

**Description:** Construction of two additional office buildings totaling 183,000 SF and two 4-story parking structures at an existing office complex

**VTA Comments:**

**Bicycle Parking:**

Sheet A1.1 states that the project applicant will provide 10 Class I bicycle parking spaces (lockers) and 4 Class II bicycle parking spaces (racks) in this development. As noted in our June 26, 2008 comment letter, VTA recommends that the project applicant be required to provide 22 Class I spaces and 7 Class II spaces, per VTA's Bicycle Technical Guidelines. At a minimum, the applicant should be required to provide spaces equal to 5% of the net new automobile parking spaces being added (487 stalls) which would mean the addition of 24 bicycle parking spaces (18 Class I spaces and 6 Class II spaces).

**Pedestrian Accommodations and Preferred Pedestrian Environment:**

VTA commends the project applicant for providing extensive pedestrian walkways through the project site, including the new north-south connection along the eastern edge of the project site. However, the lack of variation or articulation in the facades of proposed Building 8 and proposed Garage B (as shown in Sheets A4.1 and A4.4) creates a monotonous pedestrian environment emphasizing the relatively long walking distances. VTA suggests that the applicant consider creating more variation and articulation in the eastern facades of these two structures to improve the pedestrian environment. This can help encourage the use of alternative modes for lunch trips and trips to and from the nearby light rail stations.
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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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Castro Station
100-200 West Evelyn Avenue

Description: Amendment to the Evelyn Avenue Precise Plan - Support Commercial Area to increase the building height and FAR to accommodate a 3-story office building of 55,696 SF of office space and 91,857 SF parking garage

VTA Comments:

Site Design and Development Density:
VTA commends the project proponent for proposing a site design that is compact and redevelops an existing surface parking lot with a new land use including underground rather than surface parking. We recognize that the proposed density of the new development is substantially greater than that of the existing two buildings on the site, and brings the density of the entire site to a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.70. VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use includes development density recommendations for transit- and pedestrian-supportive communities. The CDT Manual recommends a FAR of 2.0 or higher in Regional Station Areas as well as 2.0 or higher in County Cores (such as downtown Mountain View). VTA recommends that the project proponent consider increasing the density on the site, if possible, given its prime location next to a regional transit station.

Bicycle Parking:
VTA notes that the plan set shows a Secure Bicycle Parking area (Class 1 parking) on the 1st floor of the proposed office building. However, the plan set does not appear to show any other bicycle parking facilities, such as Class 2 bicycle racks, or note the quantity of bicycle parking that is proposed. We recommend that the plan set show the location of both Class 1 and Class 2 bicycle parking facilities, and note the proposed quantities of each.

VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the development. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting, and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Potential Impact of High-Speed Rail:
The project proponent should be aware that the planned California High-Speed Rail alignment has the potential to affect the proposed project, as well as existing uses such as surface parking on the project site. While the High-Speed Rail project has only advanced to the level of an approved Program EIR/EIS for the Bay Area to Central Valley segment, and thus no detailed engineering or design work has been completed, it has the potential to impact the proposed project site. It is possible that the proposed alignment may require additional Right-of-Way width, and the profile of the alignment may need to be raised to achieve grade separation from existing roadways and crossings. With the passage of Proposition 1A in November 2008, activity on the California High-Speed Rail project will continue to advance, and the project proponent is advised to monitor the High-Speed Rail project closely for its potential impacts on the proposed development project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Agency File #</th>
<th>CMP ID</th>
<th>Type of Document</th>
<th>Document Received</th>
<th>VTA Response Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td></td>
<td>PA0804</td>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>9/30/2008</td>
<td>10/23/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**801-875 Alma Street Mixed Use**

North side of Alma Street, between Homer Ave. and Channing Ave.

**Description:** Construction of 50 multi-family housing units and 16,030 s.f commercial

**VTA Comments:**

**Land Use Mix and Development Density:**

VTA supports the land use mix and density of the proposed project on a site within close proximity of a regional multi-model transit hub. The proposed density of approximately 100 dwelling units per acre for the two projects is consistent with the guidelines in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual for residential development within 1/3 mile of a regional core or regional station area. The inclusion of ground-floor commercial space will help improve on-site trip capture and reduce single-occupant automobile use.

**Transportation Demand Management:**

VTA requests that the EIR address Transportation Demand Management measures in its analysis of Transportation/Circulation impacts of the project. In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the Lead Agency and project applicant consider a comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program in conjunction with the approval of this project.

Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the project include:

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

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.
Edgewood Plaza
Channing Avenue and Edgewood Drive

Description: Redevelopment of an existing shopping center on a 3.58 acre site; project includes demolition of 2 of 3 existing buildings and construction of approx. 29,000 s.f. of retail and up to 24, two-story residences.

VTA Comments:
Transportation Demand Management:
VTA requests the EIR address Transportation Demand Management measures in its analysis of Transportation/Circulation impacts of the project. In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the Lead Agency and project applicant consider a comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program in conjunction with the approval of this project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the project include:
- Transit fare incentives such as Eco Pass and commuter checks
- Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks
- Showers and Clothes Lockers for Bicycle Commuters
- On-site or walk-accessible employee services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
- On-site or walk accessible restaurants
- Parking for car-sharing vehicles

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.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations:
VTA requests that the EIR address Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations in its analysis of Transportation/Circulation impacts of the project. VTA suggests that the EIR address how pedestrian connectivity between Embarcadero Road (including the Embarcadero Shuttle) and surrounding neighborhoods be preserved when the project is developed. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.
<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>PD08-071</td>
<td>SJ0825</td>
<td>PD Permit</td>
<td>12/22/2008</td>
<td>12/31/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Santana Row Parcel 6B**
Northwest corner of Olin Avenue and Hatton Street

**Description:** PD Permit for 120 condominiums and 10 townhomes on 1.5 acres.

**VTA Comments:**

- **Site Density and Site Design:**
  VTA supports the proposed site density (85 du/acre) on a site located within ¼ mile of two corridors with substantial transit service (Stevens Creek Boulevard and Winchester Boulevard), and adjacent to an activity center (Santana Row/Valley Fair) which is designated as a County Core in VTA’s countywide Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework. VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Cores, Corridors and Station Areas framework shows VTA and local jurisdiction priorities for supporting concentrated development in the County.

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

- **Bicycle Accommodations:**
  VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from [www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes](http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes). For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.
<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>PD05-063, PT05-081</td>
<td>SJ0533</td>
<td>PD Rezoning</td>
<td>12/1/2008</td>
<td>12/9/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arcadia Homes, 10th Street**  
**Southeast corner of East Mission Street and North 10th St.**

**Description:** Construction of 62 single-family homes on a 3.2-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**

Site Design and Development Density:
The proposed development lies just over ½ mile from a VTA light rail station, adjacent to several existing VTA bus routes, and within a few blocks of the Japantown area, which is designated as a Local Core in VTA’s county-wide Cores, Corridors and Station Areas scheme, which was developed in coordination with the City of San Jose and the other municipalities in the County in 2002 and 2003. VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual includes recommendations for development densities in these areas.

The development density of the proposed project, at just under 20 du/acre, is at the low end of the recommended densities in VTA’s CDT Manual for this type of site. We urge the project proponent to consider a higher development density for the project, particularly the portion of the site along 10th Street, away from the existing single-family neighborhood to the east. Such a development could help meet the City’s housing needs and contribute to the revitalization of the surrounding neighborhood.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Access:
VTA commends the project proponent for establishing a new east-west pedestrian connection through the project site, as indicated in the Land Use Plan. VTA recommends that this connection be open to the general public, in addition to residents of the new development. Such a connection will help improve the pedestrian connectivity in the neighborhood and prevent the creation of a super-block of development.

VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.
**Evergreen-East Hills Development Policy Update**

**South of Story Rd, east of US 101, north of US 101/Hellyer Interchange**

**Description:** Draft Supplemental EIR for update to development policy, to allow in the policy area 500 residential units, 500,000 s.f. of commercial, and 75,000 s.f. of office.

**VTA Comments:**

The City of San Jose recently requested Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) staff input on the Evergreen-East Hills (EEH) Development Policy Update. Previously VTA staff provided by email a discussion of the general types of bus transit-related improvements that VTA would like to see in the EEH area, as well as comments on draft language related to Transportation Demand Management measures for the Draft Environmental Impact Report.

Following up on our past discussions, VTA staff has prepared a brief summary of the bus service and stops within the EEH Development Policy area, including a summary of potential bus stop-related improvements in the area that VTA would like to implement in coming years. It is our hope that this memo will help inform City staff as the Development Policy Update is completed and development proposals are subsequently brought to the City. With this foundation, we hope that the City and VTA can work together to request improvements as conditions of approval of developments that would make transit and alternative transportation modes a more viable option in the EEH area.

**VTA Bus Service in EEH Area:**


Ridership on these routes (average daily boardings for the entire routes, as of August 2008) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>16,158</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7,132</td>
<td>4,811</td>
<td>3,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,335</td>
<td>2,810</td>
<td>2,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>5,715</td>
<td>3,958</td>
<td>3,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2,574</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>6,382</td>
<td>4,261</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In January 2008, VTA implemented a significant restructuring of its bus network as a result of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) that was completed in 2007. The route and ridership information above reflects the changes introduced in January 2008. VTA continues to evaluate service and will make adjustments to meet the customer needs when feasible.

VTA Bus Stops in EEH Area (Existing Conditions & Potential Improvements):

VTA maintains an extensive database of its bus stops and other transit infrastructure elements across Santa Clara County. VTA staff periodically updates this database to reflect current conditions and changes to the system.

The following is a summary of existing conditions and potential improvements at bus stops in the EEH Development Policy Area:

* There are a total of 181 bus stops in the EEH area.
* Of these stops, 96 have average daily boardings of 20 or higher.

Of these high-volume stops, the following is a summary of the existing conditions and potential improvements needed at these stops:

- 49 stops are missing PCC bus pads
- 34 stops have waiting pad widths or other features that are less than required by the ADA
- 10 stops have no lighting
- 4 stops have no sidewalks leading to the stops
- 33 stops have no pad on which a shelter could be placed

VTA strives to improve the infrastructure at and near bus stops, including bus pads, lighting, sidewalks, shelter pads, benches and shelters, as budgets permit and as developments occur. We would be happy to provide more detailed information as the need arises or as specific development proposals are brought to the City. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Subsequent VTA comments on 10/14/2008:

Intersection LOS:
Section 2.1.1.2 states that CMP standard is used for CMP intersections. However, in Table 2.1-3 existing LOS for PM peak for CMP intersections 13, 14 and 21 do not match with the 2006 VTA CMP Monitoring and Conformance Report.

Establishment of Traffic Fee Impact Program:
Section 1.6 of the SEIR states that this project is proposing the establishment of Traffic Impact Fee Program. Since the development would cause significant increases in traffic volumes on nine directional freeway segments, VTA recommends the Traffic Impact Fee program to pay a fair share contribution towards improvements identified at US 101/Capitol Expressway improvement projects and other freeway improvement programs such as ramp metering, widening of HOV bypass lanes.

Mitigation Measures - Bus Stop Improvements:
Section 2.1 of the SEIR does not mention bus stop improvements as a potential mitigation measure for the transportation impacts identified in the SEIR. Section 2.3 of the SEIR (specifically Section 2.3.3.4) identifies new bus stops as a potential mitigation measure for air quality impacts by stating that "New bus stops shall be constructed at convenient locations with pedestrian access to the project sites." VTA supports the inclusion of bus stop improvements as a potential mitigation measure that should be required as a condition of approval of specific development projects in the EEH Development Policy Area.
Currently, VTA operates 12 bus routes in the EEH Development Policy Area: Lines 12, 22, 25, 26, 31, 39, 43, 70, 71, 77, 103, and 522. There are a total of 181 bus stops in the EEH area at present. Of these stops, 96 have average daily boardings of 20 or higher, 38 have average daily boardings of 100 or higher, and 9 have average daily boardings of 500 or higher (including several locations at the Eastridge Transit Center).

VTA strives to improve the infrastructure at and near bus stops, including bus pads, lighting, sidewalks, shelter pads, benches and shelters, as budgets permit and as developments occur. VTA suggests that the discussion of mitigation measures in the SEIR be amended to include improvements at existing bus stops such as those described above. We suggest that these be required as a condition of approval of specific development projects in the EEH Development Policy Area, and that the SEIR reference coordination between the City of San Jose and VTA on specific improvements as developments are proposed.

Mitigation Measures – Transportation Demand Management:
Section 2.3.3.4 of the SEIR mentions several Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures as mitigation that would apply to development allowed by the proposed Evergreen Development Policy revision. Among the measures discussed are bicycle amenities, shuttle bus service, ride-matching programs and guaranteed ride home programs. VTA suggests that a more extensive list of TDM measures be included in the SEIR and be included as mitigation measures for the development allowed by the policy revision.

Effective TDM programs include:
* Parking Cash-Out
* Direct or Indirect Payments for Taking Alternate Modes
* Transit Fare Incentives such as Eco Pass and Commuter Checks
* Employee Carpool Matching
* Vanpool Program
* Preferentially Located Carpool Parking
* Bicycle Lockers and Bicycle Racks
* Showers and Clothes Lockers for Bicycle Commuters
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Employee Services (day-care, dry-cleaning, fitness, banking, convenience store)
* On-site or Walk-Accessible Restaurants
* Guaranteed Ride Home Program
* Carsharing

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.
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**2112 Monterey Highway**

**Description:** General Plan Amendment for high density residential uses on a 2.88-acre site

**East side of Monterey Highway approximately 700 feet northerly of Tully Road**

**VTA Comments:**

**Land Use and Development Density:**

VTA supports the land use and development density of the proposed project on a site within close proximity of a travel corridor with significant bus service (including Lines 66 and 68) and the potential for future enhanced transit service. The Monterey Highway corridor is included the Cores, Corridors, and Station Areas scheme in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual. As noted in the manual, these areas are the most likely to benefit from intensification and represent key opportunities for providing multi-modal transportation alternatives that can serve the needs of both new and existing residents and workers.

**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.

**Development Design:**

The VTA Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Manual, the VTA Pedestrian Technical Guidelines, and the VTA Bicycle Technical Guidelines should be used when designing this development. These documents provide guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design, and bicycle parking provisions. All three documents are available upon request to agency staff. For more information, please call the Development & Congestion Management Division.
Ohlone Mixed Use  
Southwest corner of West San Carlos St. and Sunol St.

**Description:** PD Rezoning from HI Heavy Industrial Zoning District to A(PD) Planned Development Zoning District to allow up to 825 multi-family residences and 50,000 SF of commercial use on an 8.25-acre site.

**VTA Comments:**
VTA has reviewed the proposed Planned Development Rezoning in which the Project proponent requests the rezoning of an 8.25 gross acre site at the southwest corner of West San Carlos and Sunol Street so as to allow up to 825 multi-family residences and 50,000 square feet of commercial use. Before we discuss our comments and concerns regarding the proposed Project, we wish to highlight several facts relevant to our involvement on this Project.

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

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

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

* VTA supports the proposed density and mix of uses on a site within close proximity to two significant transit corridors, the West San Carlos corridor and the Vasona light rail corridor. Both of these corridors are included in VTA’s countywide Cores, Corridors and Station Areas scheme, which shows VTA’s priorities for supporting concentrated development in the County. The Cores, Corridors and Station Areas scheme was developed in coordination with the City of San Jose (the "City") and the other municipalities in the County in 2002 and 2003.

* VTA strongly encourages the Project applicant to design the proposed development according to the principles of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation ("CDT") Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use, as well as VTA’s Pedestrian Technical Guidelines.
and Bicycle Technical Guidelines.

* One area of concern based on our review of the General Development Plan for the Planned Development Rezoning is pedestrian connectivity and preservation of public space on the site. It appears from the General Development Plan that the building footprint will occupy nearly the entire site between Sunol Street and the new north-south internal roadway on the west side; no pedestrian through-connections are shown on the plan. Such a design would create a super-block of development that would be impermeable to east-west pedestrian movement, which is undesirable from the perspective of promoting walkability. We encourage the Project proponent to consider alternative site designs that provide better pedestrian connectivity through the site.

This development represents a significant opportunity for the applicant, the City and VTA to work together to promote a transit-oriented development that can help meet the City’s housing needs and contribute to the revitalization of the Midtown area. This Project also has the potential to embody the principles and goals laid out by our legislators in the recently enacted California Senate Bill 375.

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

We would be happy to discuss our comments on this Planned Development Rezoning with you, and look forward to working together with the City as this development progresses through the entitlement process in the coming months.
**FMC Site Rezone**

**West of Newhall Street, south of Coleman Avenue**

**Description:** PD rezoning for 92.5-acre site to allow all permitted uses of Ind Park zoning district, all permitted uses of Commercial Pedestrian zoning district, and (on portions of site) car rental facilities, commercial parking, car sales, and drive-thru restaurants.

**VTA Comments:**

VTA commends the City of San Jose for recognizing and supporting a planned Santa Clara BART station, planned within walking distance of the FMC site, and future BART maintenance facility, through the Land Reservation Setback language. VTA has the following comments and concerns regarding the Planned Development Rezoning of the FMC site.

Comments Related to BART Extension:
The Background and Description section of page two, describes the site as being "bordered on the southwest by a Union Pacific Railroad switching yard facility." VTA recently purchased the UP Yard for the planned BART Yard and Shops facility.

VTA does not support the commercial land uses proposed under the rezone. Car rental facilities, commercial parking, car sales, and drive-through restaurants are not considered transit-supportive uses, do not contribute to a "tight urban fabric," and are not consistent with the transit oriented development intent of the Santa Clara Station Area Plan. VTA recommends that these uses be located outside the one half-mile radius depicted as a walking distance to/from the planned Santa Clara BART station. The setback requirements for Coleman Avenue (40' with 20' front yard) are not consistent with section E Coleman Avenue Frontage Phasing Requirement to provide a "strong street frontage."

The rezone has eliminated a 106' wide landscape median for the private street, and in exchange required a 20' landscaped pedestrian paseo along the public southwestern boundary street. VTA supports the intent of this change "to facilitate a strong east-west pedestrian connection from the site to the planned Santa Clara BART station." However, under the section Modifications to Building Setbacks, allows "the Planning Director to approve variations in sidewalk and landscape dimensions as part of the Planned Development review process." VTA recommends that the City not jeopardize the requirement and maintain the 20' pedestrian paseo as the primary pedestrian circulation corridor from the FMC site to the planned Santa Clara BART station.

VTA supports the Off-Street Parking and Loading Standards, including the 25 percent reduction of off-street parking requirements, which would support transit use. VTA also supports the Traffic Mitigation Measures outlined in the rezone, however we recommend the use of LEED standards for carpool parking (5 percent of on-site spaces) and low emission vehicles (5 percent of on-site spaces) as a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measure. TDM strategies have environmental benefits and support alternative modes of transportation.

VTA also requests ongoing communication by the FMC PD Rezone project manager with VTA and SVRT Program Office staff during project development.
Comments Related to Bus Service:
VTA provides bus service along Coleman 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 the following improvements:

Bus Stop on Coleman Avenue, east of and opposite of Aviation Avenue
* Bus stop to be maintained in current area
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout (per VTA standards)
* An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (per VTA standards)
* Locate trees or planters or obstacles outside the bus stop area

Bus Stop on Coleman Avenue, mid-block old FMC Driveway
* Bus stop and duckout to be relocated further east, closer to Newhall Avenue but remain west of the intersection
* A 22-foot curb lane or bus duckout
* An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad
* Locate trees or planters or obstacles outside the bus stop area
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**Gallery at Central Park Project**  
**South of Kaiser Drive and west of Kiely Boulevard**

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

**VTA Comments:**

**Transit Service and Site Design**

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

Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures - Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities:
The proposed pedestrian circulation system described in Section 4.12.4.4 and shown in Figure 3.0.7 provides good access from the project site to Kiely Boulevard and Kaiser Drive, but provides poor access to Pepper Tree Lane and areas to the west. Maintaining and enhancing pedestrian connectivity from neighborhoods to the west (for instance, along Pepper Tree Lane) is important to support transit use, walking and bicycling through the project site and surrounding neighborhoods. Encouraging use of these alternative transportation modes is an important way of reducing the number of automobile trips generated by the project and their associated negative impacts on air quality, congestion, and energy use.

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

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

Bus Stop Improvements:
As mentioned in the Draft EIR, the bus stop adjacent to the project site on Kiely Boulevard should remain at its present location. In addition, there should be no tree wells or obstacles in the bus loading area.
Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures - Trip Generation and Operational Impacts:
VTA suggests that the City and the project applicant consider adding a small component of ground-floor retail into the project on the Kiely Boulevard frontage. This would allow residents of the new development as well as the surrounding neighborhood to accomplish some errands by walking, biking or transit and reduce the number of automobile trips generated by the project.

Transportation System Planning and Design

CMP Intersections:
VTA recommends inclusion of three CMP intersections to the list given in the TIA notification form for analysis:

* CMP ID 1211 Lawrence Expressway (North) / Stevens Creek Blvd
* CMP ID 1212 Lawrence Expressway (South) / Stevens Creek Blvd
* CMP ID 1214 Lawrence Expressway / El Camino Real

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

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

Freeway Segments:
VTA recommends including a list of freeway segments as part of the traffic analysis. In addition, VTA recommends using the latest 2007 Monitoring and Conformance Report for the freeway and expressway analysis. This report summarizes the existing conditions level of service (LOS) data for freeways, expressways in Santa Clara County. The document may be downloaded from http://www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/mcreport2007/. For more information please call the VTA CMP.
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**San Tomas Business Park Campus**  
**2600 San Tomas Expressway, 2800 San Tomas Expressway, and 2400 Condensa Street**

**Description:** Construction of up to 1.95 million SF of office space on 35.6 acres.

**VTA Comments:**

* Transportation System Planning and Design*

**Evaluation of Project Conditions:**  
Looking at the size of the development, VTA recommends doing a long-term analysis for a horizon year of at least 2030.

**Vacant Development:**  
According to VTA TIA guidelines 2004 page 18, "if the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site with development rights, the number of trips originally associated with that development may be included in the background conditions." Or "if the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site without development rights, all trips generated by the proposed project would be project trips." Please indicate that this development has development rights. If not existing land use trips reductions cannot be taken into consideration.

**Traffic Volumes:**  
Traffic volumes for the existing and project conditions are not balanced - intersections 57 and 58. Please see that the volumes are balanced.

**Existing Intersection Levels of Service (LOS), Freeway LOS:**  
Delay and LOS for some intersections do not match with the VTA 2006 Monitoring and Conformance report. Please verify and re-evaluate the background and project conditions where required.

**Ramp metering Analysis:**  
It is recommended to include the analysis of on and off ramps that includes examining the operating conditions of existing and future ramp meters.

**Transportation Demand Management:**  
The impacts identified on the freeway segments are considered significant and unavoidable.  
In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests the city to require implementation of a comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program as a condition of approval or mitigation measure. Effective TDM programs include:

* City-Carshare  
* 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 allows for more frequent and convenient use of these clean air vehicles.

CMP Intersections:  
VTA recommends the inclusion of the following 4 CMP intersections in the TIA:

* 5801 Montague Exp./Old Oakland Rd  
* 5802 Montague Exp./Trade Zone Blvd  
* 5803 Montague Exp./Capitol Ave.  
* 5804 Montague Exp./Milpitas Blvd

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

Project-Specific Mitigation Measures:  
VTA supports the project proposal to pay a fair share contribution toward improvement programs currently approved and funded by the County and/or City of San Jose.

Bike and Pedestrian Facilities:  
The proposed development project should address existing and future pedestrian and bicycle trips to the site. Existing access for bikes and pedestrians should be analyzed and improvements to existing bike and pedestrian impediments for accessing the site should be recommended. The bike and pedestrian circulation with the proposed project should be an improvement over existing conditions. Proposed mitigation for automobile impacts should not adversely affect bike or pedestrian access and safety. For example the following mitigations should be avoided: double right turn lanes, eliminating or narrowing sidewalks.

On-site System Planning and Design

Development Design:  
The VTA Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Guidelines and the VTA Pedestrian Technical Guidelines should be used when designing these developments. These documents provide guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. Both Guidelines are available upon request to agency staff. For more information, please call the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division at 408-321-5725.
Parking:
The project is exceeding City’s parking requirement by 550 parking stalls. The project is proposing an additional 550 parking stalls. VTA recommends a reduction in the number of parking spaces that is less than or at the least equal to that established by the City of Santa Clara code.

Bicycle Parking:
The project does not address about provisions for bicycle parking. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the development 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 provide guidance for estimating supply, siting, and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division at 408-321-5716.

Bus Service

VTA provides bus service and maintains a bus stop along the project site on San Tomas Expressway, north of Walsh Avenue. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the developer be conditioned to retain the existing bus stop and provide the following improvements:

* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (per VTA standards)
Camino Medical Group Office Project  
South Sunnyvale Avenue, Old San Francisco Road & Kenny Court

**Description:** Replace existing 72,000 square foot medical office bldg with a 150,000 square foot medical office building, and replace an existing surface parking lot with a four-level, above-ground parking structure.

**VTA Comments:**

**Bus Service:**
VTA provides bus service on old San Francisco Road and maintains two bus stop adjacent to the project site. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA staff recommends that the City condition the project to provide the following improvements:

- **Bus stop on Old San Francisco Road, west of Carroll Street**
  - Widen the sidewalk to 8 feet at the bus stop

- **Bus stop on Old San Francisco Road, west of Bayview Avenue**
  - A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (see attached VTA standards)
  - An 8’ X 40’ passenger waiting pad

**Potential Environmental Effects of the Project - Transportation:**
VTA suggests that the EIR should include more specific analysis of potential environmental impacts of the project in the area of Transportation. 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, land use/site design measures such as building orientation and automobile parking locations and ratios, and bicycle accommodations. The following sections provide more specific comments and suggestions in these areas.

**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 Camino Medical Group Medical Office Project offers an excellent opportunity to request the implementation of such a program, particularly given its close proximity to several high-frequency VTA bus routes (including Lines 22 and 522) and the Sunnyvale Caltrain Station. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the proposed project 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.

Land Use/Transportation Integration and Site Design:
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 Camino Medical Group Medical Office Project supports these goals by locating substantial new development in close proximity to established transit corridors. We hope the project will result in a dense office complex that encourages the use of a multi-modal mix of transportation choices.

VTA previously commented on the Draft Traffic Impact Analysis for this project in a letter dated June 20, 2008. In that letter we recommended a reduction in the number of parking spaces to an amount that is less than or at least equal to that established by the City of Sunnyvale code. Such a reduction would provide an incentive for employees to use alternative transportation modes to travel to and from the site. Given the information in the NOP, we cannot tell whether the amount of parking has been reduced from the previously planned 920 spaces. We request that the EIR consider the impact of the proposed parking ratios on the project trip generation, in light of our previous letter.

Bicycle Accommodations
VTA requests that the EIR address Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations in its analysis of Transportation impacts of the project. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.
Foothill College Facilities Master Plan
Foothill College, 12345 El Monte Road in Los Altos Hills

Description: Master Plan to accommodate approximately 2,839 students at the Foothill College campus.

VTA Comments:

Roadway Improvements and Pedestrian/Bicycle Accommodations:
VTA commends the District for proactively planning to meet projected additional student needs with a multi-modal approach. We believe that the improvements strike a good balance between improving auto flow and improving bicycle/pedestrian access, and we commend the project for integrating principles from VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual such as designing for pedestrians and creating a multi-modal transportation system. The improved lighting, guard rails, crossings, and curbs all demonstrate a focus on creating a safer, more pedestrian and bicycle-friendly roadway system on the campus. They also complement other improvements that are occurring nearby off-site, such as the El Monte Road/Moody Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Project.

The Draft EIR does not address provisions for bicycle parking. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division at (408) 321-5716.

Parking:
As mentioned in the Draft EIR, the additional students will undoubtedly generate additional need for parking. However, effective parking management policies can help deter auto use while promoting alternative transportation methods. We support the project’s efforts to minimize the number of additional parking spaces and to largely improve existing lots rather than build new ones. We also applaud the integration of pedestrian improvements such as the pedestrian footbridges, demonstrating a focus on multi-modal access.

Transportation/Circulation Impacts & Transportation Demand Management:
While the Draft EIR establishes that the new vehicle trips generated by the project would not cause a significant impact in terms of roadway congestion, it does not adequately address potential Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures other than certain pedestrian and bicycle accommodations. In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the Community College District consider a comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program in conjunction with the approval of this project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the College include:

* Charging employees and/or students for parking
* Parking cash-out
* Transit fare incentives such as Eco Pass and commuter checks
* Employee carpool matching
* Vanpool program
* 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

The District could give its employees and students financial incentives not to drive to work, as is done by Stanford University with its parking cash-out program. This location provides a good opportunity to implement a parking cash-out program as the site is along two bus lines.

Air Quality - Greenhouse Gas Emissions:
VTA commends the District for locating the proposed new buildings within the existing developed areas of the campus and along a transit corridor. As noted in Table IV.B-9 of the Draft EIR on Air Quality - Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the location of the project promotes fuel conservation through pedestrian activity and nearby access to public transportation. This helps improve transportation energy efficiency and helps address greenhouse gas emissions. The compact, transit- and pedestrian-friendly site design of the proposed new buildings is also consistent with the principles in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual such as intensifying land use activities and focusing on existing areas.

<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>Metropolitan Transportation</td>
<td>MTC0801</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>10/31/2008</td>
<td>11/21/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation 2035 Plan**

**Description:** Draft EIR for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transportation 2035 Plan

VTA Comments:
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) staff have reviewed MTC’s request for input regarding potential mitigation measures for the Transportation 2035 Plan. We have the following comments:

VTA encourages MTC to work cooperatively with the counties and Congestion Management Agencies in identifying appropriate mitigation measures in the areas of air quality, energy, and greenhouse gas emissions/climate change. It is difficult to offer specific comments on mitigation strategies at this point until additional draft materials from the Regional Transportation Plan and accompanying Draft EIR are made available. In the interim, VTA requests that MTC make the counties and CMAs aware of any substantive changes in mitigation strategies for the Transportation Plan 2035 DEIR, as compared to the Transportation Plan 2030 EIR.

VTA requests that there be continuous coordination throughout the development process of the Regional Transportation Plan. Elements such as the Regional Express Lane Network require input from all Congestion Management Agencies to fully ensure that congestion pricing principles are implemented appropriately.
San Jose City College Facilities Master Plan Update 2021
Bounded by I-280, Moorpark Ave, Rexford Way, Kingman Ave, Fruitvale Ave, Laswell Ave, and South Bascom Ave.

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

**VTA Comments:**

Transportation Impacts & Transportation Demand Management:
The Subsequent Environmental Impact Report should address potential Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures in the analysis of Transportation/Traffic impacts. In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the Community College District consider a comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program in conjunction with the approval of this project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the College include:

* Charging employees and/or students for parking
* Parking cash-out
* Transit fare incentives such as Eco Pass and commuter checks
* Employee carpool matching
* Vanpool program
* 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

The District could give its employees and students financial incentives not to drive to campus, as is done by Stanford University with its parking cash-out program. This location provides a good opportunity to implement a parking cash-out program as the site is along multiple bus lines.

Transit Access:
The Subsequent Environmental Impact Report should consider the role that transit can play in reducing single-occupant automobile trips to the campus. Consideration should be given to existing bus services as well as potential shuttle service to the nearby Mountain View-Winchester light rail line.
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. VTA recognizes that this SEIR builds upon the Prior Plan EIR that was certified in August 2000, but notes that substantial changes in the transportation system, transit network, traffic conditions, and the proposed project have occurred since that time which will require new or updated analysis.

Bus Service:
VTA recommends that the project include the following bus stop improvements for the existing bus stops on Leigh Avenue (south of Moorpark Avenue) and on Leigh Avenue (opposite Kingman):

* 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (per VTA standards)
Foothill-De Anza Community College District

Foothill College Facilities Master Plan
Foothill College, 12345 El Monte Road in Los Altos Hills

Description: Master Plan to accommodate approximately 2,839 students at the Foothill College campus.

VTA Comments:

Comment VTA-1: Roadway Improvements and Pedestrian/Bicycle Accommodations:
VTA commends the District for proactively planning to meet projected additional student needs with a multi-modal approach. We believe that the improvements strike a good balance between improving auto flow and improving bicycle/pedestrian access, and we commend the project for integrating principles from VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual such as designing for pedestrians and creating a multi-modal transportation system. The improved lighting, guard rails, crossings, and curbs all demonstrate a focus on creating a safer, more pedestrian and bicycle-friendly roadway system on the campus. They also complement other improvements that are occurring nearby off-site, such as the El Monte Road/Moody Road Bicycle/Pedestrian Path Project.

The Draft EIR does not address provisions for bicycle parking. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the project. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development and Congestion Management Division.

Comment VTA-2: Parking:
As mentioned in the Draft EIR, the additional students will undoubtedly generate additional need for parking. However, effective parking management policies can help deter auto use while promoting alternative transportation methods. We support the project’s efforts to minimize the number of additional parking spaces and to largely improve existing lots rather than build new ones. We also applaud the integration of pedestrian improvements such as the pedestrian footbridges, demonstrating a focus on multi-modal access.

Comment VTA-3: Transportation/Circulation Impacts & Transportation Demand Management:
While the Draft EIR establishes that the new vehicle trips generated by the project would not cause a significant impact in terms of roadway congestion, it does not adequately address potential Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures other than certain pedestrian and...
bicycle accommodations. In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests that the Community College District consider a comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program in conjunction with the approval of this project. Effective TDM programs that may be applicable to the College include:

* Charging employees and/or students for parking
* Parking cash-out
* Transit fare incentives such as Eco Pass and commuter checks
* Employee carpool matching
* Vanpool program
* 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

The District could give its employees and students financial incentives not to drive to work, as is done by Stanford University with its parking cash-out program. This location provides a good opportunity to implement a parking cash-out program as the site is along two bus lines.

Comment VTA-4: Air Quality - Greenhouse Gas Emissions:
VTA commends the District for locating the proposed new buildings within the existing developed areas of the campus and along a transit corridor. As noted in Table IV.B-9 of the Draft EIR on Air Quality - Greenhouse Gas Emissions, the location of the project promotes fuel conservation through pedestrian activity and nearby access to public transportation. This helps improve transportation energy efficiency and helps address greenhouse gas emissions. The compact, transit- and pedestrian-friendly site design of the proposed new buildings is also consistent with the principles in VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Manual such as intensifying land use activities and focusing on existing areas.

City/County Response

Response VTA-1: Roadway Improvements and Pedestrian/Bicycle Accommodations:
This comment supports the District for its multi-modal approach to meet student needs. Bicycle racks are provided within the Foothill College Campus near the Theatre Building, at Parking Lot 1, and at the Library. In addition, the proposed Project includes circulation and parking improvements to the Loop Road that would reduce traffic conflicts and improve bicycle safety. Section IV.F (Transportation/Circulation) of the Draft EIR includes a detailed description of these improvements.

Response VTA-2: Parking:
This comment supports the District's efforts to improve existing parking lots and for its multi-modal approach to meet student needs. The Project proposes to improve various existing parking lots by repairing, resurfacing, and restriping parking spaces.

Response VTA-3: Transportation/Circulation Impacts & Transportation Demand Management:
The District will consider a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the Project.

Response VTA-4: Greenhouse Gas Emissions:
This comment supports the design of the proposed new buildings within the existing developed areas of the campus and along a transit corridor consistent with the principles of VTA's Community Design and Transportation Manual.
<table>
<thead>
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<th>Lead Agency</th>
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<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>SCH# 2000092027</td>
<td>ML0102</td>
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**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:**

Comment D-1: 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.
* An 8’ X 10’ passenger waiting zone.
* Locate trees or shrubs outside the bus loading area.

Comment D-2: 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.

**City/County Response**

Response D-1: Bus Service

The existing VTA bus stop on southbound Main Street just south of Great Mall Parkway will be maintained. The project proposes restriping and minor median island modification work on this section of Main Street. The opportunity to request bus pad construction was during the preparation of off-site improvements for the Centria project. This request did not occur and, therefore, the City and the VTA missed the opportunity to request a bus pad at this bus stop.

The City did require the Centria project to provide a bus shelter at this bus stop and it will be installed as part of their off-site improvements, which also include new decorative sidewalks, street trees and streetlighting. Construction of these improvements will commence in August 2008.

Response D-2: Impacts to Transit Service

This comment is noted. The comment does not change the conclusions of the SEIR. For these reasons, revisions to the SEIR text are not necessary.
Landmark Tower Mixed-Use Development

600 Barber Lane, about halfway between SR-237 and Tasman Drive, adjacent to the west side of I-880.

Description: Construction of an 18-story mixed-use residential building with 148,805 SF of retail, 8,000SF food court, 48,960 SF of office uses, and 375 residential condominiums above up to three levels of below grade parking and an attached 8-story parking garage.

VTA Comments:

Comment C-1: Bus Service:
We understand that the Milpitas Square development will be providing a new bus stop with a duckout just north of the Landmark Towers project. Assuming this bus stop improvement is provided, VTA will not request bus stop improvements for the Landmark Towers project.

Comment C-2: Mitigation Measures:
VTA agrees with the requirement for the project to make a fair-share contribution towards the East/West Corridor Study, Calaveras Boulevard (SR 237) Widening, and Montague Expressway improvements projects.

Comment C-3: Bicycle Parking:
The 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 the development. Bicycle parking facilities can include bicycle lockers for long-term parking and bicycle racks for short-term parking. VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines provide guidance for estimating supply, siting, and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact VTA’s Development and Congestion Management Division, Bicycle Program Coordinator.

City/County Response:

Response C-1: Bus Service
The comment is noted. As stated in Section 4.2.2.1 Bus Service in the Draft EIR, Bus Route 33 operates on Barber Lane adjacent to the project site. The existing bus stop will be reconstructed to provide a bus pad and duc-out to complement the planned bus stop improvements of the Milpitas Square development.

Response C-2: Mitigation Measures:
The comment supports the analysis in the EIR. No further response is necessary.

Response C-3: Bicycle Parking
The proposed project includes bicycle racks and lockable bicycle storage rooms. Bicycle racks are proposed near the entrance to the retail uses and on the first, second and third floors of the above-grade parking garage. The lockable bicycle storage rooms are proposed on the second and
third floors of the above-grade parking garage. The lockable bicycle storage rooms would provide a total of approximately 60 Class I bicycle parking spaces and the bicycle racks would provide a total of approximately 43 Class II bicycle parking spaces. According to VTA's Bicycle Technical Guidelines, the recommended bicycle parking supply is approximately 133 Class I and 46 Class II bicycle parking spaces. Although the number of bicycle parking spaces proposed by the project does not meet VTA's recommendations, the proposed supply is considered adequate because it substantially exceeds the bicycle parking space requirement in the City of Milpitas Zoning Code (See Table XI-10-38.06 Off-Street Parking) for mixed-use developments. Per the Zoning Code, a total of 37 bicycle parking spaces is required for the 375 residences (223 one-bedroom units, 132 two-bedroom units, and 20 three-bedroom units) proposed by the project.

Section 4.2.3.2 Parking in the Draft EIR has been revised to include the above information (refer to Section 4, Text Revisions, of the Final EIR).

San Tomas Business Park Campus  
2600 San Tomas Expressway, 2800 San Tomas Expressway, and 2400 Condensa Street

Description: Construction of up to 1.95 million SF of office space on 35.6 acres.

VTA Comments:
 Comment F1: Transportation System Planning and Design
 Evaluation of Project Conditions:
 Looking at the size of the development, VTA recommends doing a long-term analysis for a horizon year of at least 2030.

Comment F2: Vacant Development:
 According to VTA TIA guidelines 2004 page 18, "if the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site with development rights, the number of trips originally associated with that development may be included in the background conditions." Or "if the proposed project involves a vacant or underutilized site without development rights, all trips generated by the proposed project would be project trips." Please indicate that this development has development rights. If not existing land use trips reductions cannot be taken into consideration.

Comment F3: Traffic Volumes:
 Traffic volumes for the existing and project conditions are not balanced - intersections 57 and 58. Please see that the volumes are balanced.

Comment F5 (numbering system in FEIR skips): Existing Intersection Levels of Service (LOS), Freeway LOS:
 Delay and LOS for some intersections do not match with the VTA 2006 Monitoring and Conformance report. Please verify and re-evaluate the background and project conditions where required.
Comment F6: Ramp metering Analysis:
It is recommended to include the analysis of on and off ramps that includes examining the operating conditions of existing and future ramp meters.

Comment F7: Transportation Demand Management:
The impacts identified on the freeway segments are considered significant and unavoidable. In order to reduce the number of single occupant vehicle trips generated by the project, VTA requests the city to require implementation of a comprehensive transportation demand management (TDM) program as a condition of approval or mitigation measure. Effective TDM programs include:

- City-Carshare
- 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 allows for more frequent and convenient use of these clean air vehicles.

Comment F8: CMP Intersections:
VTA recommends the inclusion of the following 4 CMP intersections in the TIA:

* 5801 Montague Exp./Old Oakland Rd
* 5802 Montague Exp./Trade Zone Blvd
* 5803 Montague Exp./Capitol Ave.
* 5804 Montague Exp./Milpitas Blvd

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

Comment F9: Project-Specific Mitigation Measures:
VTA supports the project proposal to pay a fair share contribution toward improvement programs currently approved and funded by the County and/or City of San Jose.

Comment F10: Bike and Pedestrian Facilities:
The proposed development project should address existing and future pedestrian and bicycle trips to the site. Existing access for bikes and pedestrians should be analyzed and improvements to existing bike and pedestrian impediments for accessing the site should be recommended.
bike and pedestrian circulation with the proposed project should be an improvement over existing conditions. Proposed mitigation for automobile impacts should not adversely affect bike or pedestrian access and safety. For example the following mitigations should be avoided: double right turn lanes, eliminating or narrowing sidewalks.

Comment F11: On-site System Planning and Design
Development Design:
The VTA Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Guidelines and the VTA Pedestrian Technical Guidelines should be used when designing these developments. These documents provide guidance on site planning, building design, street design, preferred pedestrian environment, intersection design and parking requirements. Both Guidelines are available upon request to agency staff. For more information, please call the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division.

Comment F12: Parking:
The project is exceeding City’s parking requirement by 550 parking stalls. The project is proposing an additional 550 parking stalls. VTA recommends a reduction in the number of parking spaces that is less than or at the least equal to that established by the City of Santa Clara code.

Comment F13: Bicycle Parking:
The project does not address about provisions for bicycle parking. VTA supports bicycling as an important transportation mode and thus recommends inclusion of conveniently located bicycle parking for the development 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 provide guidance for estimating supply, siting, and design for bicycle parking facilities. This document may be downloaded from www.vta.org/news/vtaemp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact the VTA Development & Congestion Management Division.

Comment F14: Bus Service
VTA provides bus service and maintains a bus stop along the project site on San Tomas Expressway, north of Walsh Avenue. In order to provide convenient access to transit service, VTA recommends that the developer be conditioned to retain the existing bus stop and provide the following improvements:
* A 10’ X 55’ PCC bus stop pavement pad (per VTA standards)

City/County Response:
Response F1: Evaluation of Project Conditions:
It is not clear from this comment what would be the purpose of preparing such an analysis. The EIR includes a TIA prepared in conformance with CMA guidelines, including a cumulative analysis that factors in traffic from nearby jurisdictions and traffic impacts within three cities (see text revision on page 15 and Section VI of this FEIR).

The CEQA guidelines (Section 15130) do not require or recommend a long term horizon for a cumulative analysis. The use of known projects instead of modeled projections is consistent with the level of specificity of the proposed project and conforms to CEQA and the CEQA guidelines.

Response F2: Vacant Development:
The entire project site is developed with usable buildings (see the aerial photograph in Figure 5 on page 15 of the DEIR). Some are occupied. All could be occupied with no discretionary approval required.
Response F4 (numbering system in FEIR skips): Traffic Volumes:
The traffic volumes at intersection 57 (Saratoga Avenue and I-280 NB Ramps) and intersection 58 (Saratoga Avenue and I-280 SB Ramps) do not balance because there is an off-ramp from NB I-280 that connects to NB Saratoga Avenue mid-block, adding traffic between the study intersections.

Response F5: Existing Intersection Levels of Service, Freeway LOS:
The analysis of the CMP intersections was conducted using the same traffic count data used in the VTA 2006 Monitoring and Conformance Report. The differences in delay and LOS found at some intersections are the result of updates and corrections to the intersection geometry. The existing intersection geometrics contained in the DEIR have all been field checked for accuracy.

Response F6: Ramp Metering Analysis:
The analysis of the freeway systems was conducted following the methodology prescribed by the approved CMP methodology. Since that methodology is based on the operation of mainline freeway segments, there are no significance criteria for evaluating potential impacts based on conditions on freeway ramps. Nevertheless, an evaluation of freeway ramp volumes is provided for informational purposes. The analysis includes ramps at the US 101/Bowers Avenue interchange and the US 101/San Tomas Expressway interchange at which the project would add trips. The analysis shows that the proposed development (including the incremental site-generated trips associated with the reoccupancy of the existing vacant office space as well as the net project trips) would not cause the freeway ramp volumes to exceed the ramp capacity. Please see page 56 of Section VI of the document for the proposed text revisions.

Responses F7: Transportation Demand Management:
TDM measures proposed by the project to reduce peak hour trips, vehicle miles traveled, and encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation are listed on pages 71 and 84 of the DEIR. The proposed TDM measures include:
1. Provide on-site physical improvements, such as sidewalk improvements, landscaping and bicycle parking that would act as incentives for pedestrian and bicycle modes of travel.
2. Connect individual sites with regional bikeway/pedestrian trail system.
3. Provide on-site transit information kiosk.
4. Implement a carpool/vanpool program, e.g., carpool ride-matching for employees, assistance with vanpool formation, provision of vanpool vehicles, etc.
5. Develop a transit use incentive program for employees in the project area, such as on-site distribution of passes and/or subsidized transit passes for local transit systems.
6. Provide preferential parking for carpool.
7. Provide a guaranteed ride home program.
8. Implement a flextime policy.
9. Provide on-site services such as ATMs, dry cleaning facilities, exercise room, cafeteria, etc.
10. Provide or contribute to a shuttle system for employees to access local transit services within the City.
11. Provide showers and lockers for employees bicycle or walking to work.
12. Provide secure and conveniently located bicycle parking and storage for workers.

The only VTA recommended TDM measures not included in the project are the City-Carshare and the parking cash-out program. The project does not propose to provide preferentially located electric vehicle parking with charging stations.
Response F8: CMP Intersections:
The intersections listed in the comment were not analyzed because the proposed development is expected to add fewer than 10 peak-hour trips per land per hour to any movement.

Response F9: Project-Specific Mitigation Measures:
This comment is acknowledged.

Response F10: Bike and Pedestrian Facilities:
Existing transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the project area are discussed on page 52 and Appendix E of the DEIR. On page 71 of the DEIR, the TDM measures include sidewalk improvements and connection of the site with the regional bikeway/pedestrian trail system to better facilitate bicycle and pedestrian movement on and around the site.

Response F11: Development Design:
The VTA Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Guidelines and the VTA Pedestrian Technical Guidelines will be referenced during the final design of the aforementioned bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

Response F12: Parking:
As stated on page 70 of the DEIR, a parking study was completed at the existing NVIDIA campus (located directly across San Tomas Expressway from the project site at 2701 - 2777 San Tomas Expressway) to determine the amount of parking required by the project. The study confirmed that the parking demand on the NVIDIA campus is higher than the City code requirement. NVIDIA has stated that this is due to their business model which includes shared work spaces, resulting in more employees per square foot than a standard office space.

NVIDIA is currently implementing a TDM program comparable to the one proposed by the project at their existing facility, and the two sites have comparable access to alternative transportation modes. The parking demand on the existing campus continues to be higher than the City code requirements even with a program in place to encourage employees to use alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the City of Santa Clara has determined that the proposed 7,050 parking spaces at full build out for the project are warranted.

Response F13: Bicycle Parking:
As stated on page 71 of the DEIR, the TDM measures proposed by the project include secure and conveniently located bicycle parking and storage for on-site workers.

Response F14: Bus Service:
The City of Santa Clara will require the aforementioned bus stop improvement as a condition of approval for the proposed project.
**Luminaire/Lawrence Station Road Project**  
1275 and 1287 Lawrence Station Road, at SR 237

**Description:** GPA & Rezoning to develop 338 condominium units and 16,000 square feet of commercial/office space on a 6.63-AC site

**VTA Comments:**

Comment 3.1: 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.

Comment 3-2: 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/vtacmp/Bikes. For more information on bicycle systems and parking, please contact VTA's Development & Congestion Management Division.

**City/County Response**

Response 3.1: Appendix C: Traffic Impact Analysis:
The trip reduction values from the VTA Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, December 2006, which are posted on the VTA's website, were used to calculate new project trips. It is acknowledged that the 2006 guidelines have not been formally adopted by VTA. While these guidelines have not been adopted yet, they provide more recent data than the VTA Congestion Management Program Transportation Impact Guidelines, March 2004.

The difference between the trip credit using the VTA guidelines from 2004 rather than from 2006 is two percent of additional project traffic (which is about four peak hour trips) and would not change the results of the TIA or the resulting impacts and mitigation measures of the project.

Response 3-2: Bicycle Parking:
The text has been added to the Draft EIR on page 86 to include an avoidance measure that requires the project to comply with VTA bicycle guidelines (refer to Section 5.0 Revisions to the Text of the Draft EIR).
### PROACTIVE QUARTERLY STATUS REPORT

#### GLOSSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agriculture Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABAG</td>
<td>Association of Bay Area Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>Across Barrier Connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Acre(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>Altamont Commuter Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(PD)</td>
<td>Planned Development Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>Bay Area Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMPs</td>
<td>Best Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRT</td>
<td>Bus Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTG</td>
<td>Bicycle Technical Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDT</td>
<td>Community Design &amp; Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>Commercial General Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI/C</td>
<td>Combined Industrial/Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Congestion Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>Construction Staging Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUP</td>
<td>Conditional Use Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWC</td>
<td>Citizen Watchdog Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH</td>
<td>Downtown Area Shuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Downtown Commercial Zoning District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIR</td>
<td>Draft Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSM</td>
<td>Deep Soil Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU/AC</td>
<td>Dwelling Units Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>Environmental Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR</td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIR</td>
<td>Final Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTF</td>
<td>Future Transit Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>General Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR</td>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOV</td>
<td>High-Occupancy Vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR</td>
<td>High-Speed Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITR</td>
<td>Industrial to Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Intelligent Transportation System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Light Rail Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU/TD</td>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCR</td>
<td>Monitoring and Conformance Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MND</td>
<td>Mitigated Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVHDR</td>
<td>Multifamily Very High Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Negative Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOI</td>
<td>Notice of Intent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollution Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC</td>
<td>Portland Concrete Cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDR</td>
<td>Planned Development Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPOS</td>
<td>Public Park/Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>Pedestrian Technical Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUD</td>
<td>Planned Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D</td>
<td>Research &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-M</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td>Right-Of-Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVHD</td>
<td>Residential Very High Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RZ</td>
<td>Rezoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAR</td>
<td>Site and Architectural Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCVWD</td>
<td>Santa Clara Valley Water District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Site Development Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Square Foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFR</td>
<td>Single Family Residences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Specific Plan Amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRR</td>
<td>Southern Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRT</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVRTC</td>
<td>Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCE</td>
<td>Temporary Construction Easement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCR</td>
<td>Transit Corridor Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>Transportation Demand Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>Transportation Impact Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA NF</td>
<td>Transportation Impact Analysis Notification Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Tentative Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD</td>
<td>Transit-Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UB</td>
<td>Utility Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPRR</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: CDT Planning Grant Awards

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend the programming of $500,000 in Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program Planning Grants.

BACKGROUND:

The Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program is designed to provide information, tools, and planning, technical and design assistance to member agencies to influence a proactive land use planning and development process intended to support multimodal travel, transit usage and efficient roadway operations. During the development of the CDT Program, member agencies also expressed the need for VTA to provide financial resources to assist in implementing the CDT Program.

The CDT Program consists of two distinct grant programs—one for the planning of projects and one for capital projects. The Local Program Reserve program was designated the source of funds for planning grants, while capital grant funds typically come from either the Transportation Enhancement (TE) or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program.

At the VTA Board of Directors meeting on March 2, 2000, $1,408,000 Local Program Reserve funds were allocated for the CDT Planning Grants Program. Then, at its June 3, 2004 meeting, the VTA Board of Directors adopted policies and criteria for a CDT Planning Grants Program to assist member agencies with implementing the concepts, principles, practices, and actions outlined in VTA’s CDT Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use.

During the first cycle of Planning Grants in August 2004, $475,000 was programmed for projects. For the first Capital Grants cycle in July 2006, approximately $5,843,000 was
programmed, followed by a second cycle in February 2007 for $3,430,000.

In particular, CDT Planning Grants are intended to help the cities, towns, and County of Santa Clara develop, refine, and build on promising ideas, and prepare those plans, projects, and policies for implementation. Moreover, they are intended to help member agencies incorporate transit-and-pedestrian-friendly design into all aspects of the planning and development process.

They are also intended to prepare projects for implementation by member agencies, and to compete for VTA CDT Capital Grants, as well as MTC Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) grants. Member agencies may apply for planning grants in two categories:

1) **Policy Planning Projects** that revise existing or create new policies, codes, ordinances, or enforceable design standards that encourage changes in community form that result in multi-modal, pedestrian-friendly streets and transit-oriented, compact, mixed-use developments along major transportation corridors, and core areas such as downtowns, main streets, commercial nodes, and station areas. *Up to $150,000 per project will be available to assist with policy creation or revision projects.*

2) **Capital Planning Projects** that integrate high-quality, pedestrian and multimodal transportation design elements into a public street, corridor, commercial node or station area. *Up to $75,000 per project will be available for capital planning projects.*

**DISCUSSION:**

On October 31, 2008, VTA issued a call for CDT Planning Grants project proposals. Seven projects were submitted with six proposals qualifying for consideration. One project only qualified for the Capital Grant Program and was returned. On January 26, 2009 projects were reviewed and evaluated by a Scoring Committee based on the policies and criteria adopted by the VTA Board on June 3, 2004. The Scoring Committee was composed of VTA staff, and Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Working Group members representing the County of Santa Clara, the Cities of Santa Clara, San Jose, Campbell, Sunnyvale and Milpitas.

The Scoring Committee scored the projects as shown in Table 1. VTA staff recommends that the VTA Board program grant funds to the four highest scoring projects. Those projects that were below the cut-off line were encouraged to resubmit more comprehensive proposals during the next call for projects. The proposals recommended for grant funding are presented in greater detail in Attachment A-CDT Planning Grants Program Cycle 2 Project Descriptions. The CDT Planning Grant Program Eligibility and Criteria information is provided as Attachment B.
**Table 1.**
Community Design & Transportation Planning Grant Program
Final Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Grant Request</th>
<th>Grant Recommended</th>
<th>Cumulative Grant Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Lawrence Station Transit Village Study</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Portals Project-Campbell Ave Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements under SR 17</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>El Camino Real Multi-Modal Design Guidelines</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-Off Line</td>
<td>Bicycle Blvd. Network</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>Downtown Gateway Streetscape</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board may select other projects for programming.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact as a result of this action. As the CDT Program Manager, VTA distributes the grant funds directly to the project sponsors. The source of these grants is Board approved Local Program Reserve Measure B funds.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee met on March 19, 2009 and commented on the following:
- eligibility requirements for these projects
- lack of more projects submitted
- strive for larger response in the next call for projects

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Technical Advisory Committee met on March 12, 2009 and without comment unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

Prepared by: Celeste Fiore
## ATTACHMENT A - CDT Planning Grants Program Cycle 2 Project Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Lawrence Station Transit Village</td>
<td>CDT funding will facilitate the development of a detailed Station Area Plan (SAP) with such key elements as a land use component, street enhancements, parking supply and demand, open space requirements, and urban design enhancements to the streetscape. Lawrence Station Transit Village incorporates all areas in the jurisdictions of Sunnyvale and Santa Clara within a half-mile radius around Lawrence Caltrain station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Portals Project - Campbell Ave Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>This innovative study will evaluate the feasibility of providing future portals/walkways under or through the State Route 17 Underpass abutment walls with the main goal to improve pedestrian conditions at that location. It may also provide a preliminary conceptual design of the portals/walkway. Further, the project will evaluate a key access point to Downtown Campbell, a core area and link to a station area-the Downtown Campbell Light Rail Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>El Camino Real Multimodal Design Guidelines</td>
<td>Coordinated with the Grand Boulevard initiative pursued by Caltrans and communities neighboring this regional corridor, this project creates multimodal design guidelines with the main policy objective to maintain and enhance the capacity of the road to accommodate motorized traffic, while providing improved facilities for non-motorized traffic such as pedestrians and bicyclists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Pedestrian Master Plan</td>
<td>The City will create a comprehensive pedestrian policy document that will propose projects for the City’s future Capital Improvement Program. Areas of concentration are the major connections to transit, community activity centers, and schools, with special focus along the North Whisman Light Rail Corridor, downtown Mountain View and the San Antonio Station. Additionally, the City will design access improvements and bus facilities for Bus Rapid Transit along El Camino Real.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligible policy-related planning projects include:

- **General Plan amendments or updates** intended to implement key concepts, principles, and practices similar to those outlined in the VTA Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program, *Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use*.

- **Visioning or Strategic Planning studies** that define the future form and function of a jurisdiction or district by implementing concepts, principles, and practices similar to those outlined in VTA’s CDT Manual, with the intent to codify those changes into future plans, codes, ordinances, standards, regulations or procedures.

- **Comprehensive zoning code revisions** designed to encourage the implementation of the concepts, principles, and practices outlined in VTA’s CDT Manual of Best Practices.

- **Changes to Member Agency codes, ordinances, street design standards or Level-of-Service (LOS) Standards** designed to encourage the implementation of the concepts, principles, and practices outlined in VTA’s CDT Manual of Best Practices.

- **Specific Plans, Precise Plans, Station Area Plans**, or other targeted area plans that employ design standards or guidelines which involve comprehensive changes to zoning codes and ordinances for areas near transit. Areas near transit are typically defined as within 1/3 to 1/2 mile of a light rail, Caltrain, (future) BART station, or major bus transit/transfer facilities. These plans would implement the concepts, principles, and practices outlined in VTA’s CDT Manual of Best Practices.

- **Pedestrian or Streetscape Master Plans** would prepare jurisdictions to program for individual projects and move those projects into the capital planning and implementation phases.

- **Urban and Architectural Design Guidelines** that the Member Agency intends to adopt and incorporate through Council or Board action and use in the daily planning and development practices of the city/town/county.

- **Environmental Impact Analysis and Report** work associated with the planning projects listed above.
CAPITAL PLANNING

Capital Planning Projects produce plans with sufficient feasibility analysis, scoping and design guidance to allow the Member Agency/Project Sponsor to program for the project or to apply for capital grant funds through VTA’s CDT Program, MTC’s Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Capital Grant or other fund sources. All projects must have a pedestrian or transit component. Eligible capital-related planning projects may include but are not limited to:

- **Pedestrian projects such as:**
  - Improved pedestrian connections with bus stops, transit centers, or train stations
  - Bus stop, transit center, or station area amenity or enhancements
  - Pedestrian over crossings and bridges
  - Pedestrian connections between transit facilities and residential areas or major activity centers
  - Sidewalk enhancements such as widening, special paving or provision of pedestrian amenities
  - Sidewalk gap closure projects

- **Streetscape/Corridor enhancements including:**
  - New sidewalks
  - Sidewalk widening
  - Closing gaps in the pedestrian network
  - Street trees, landscaping, and street furniture
  - Small parks and public areas

- **Pedestrian-oriented streets or alleys, plazas, paseos & pocket parks related to transit facilities or multimodal streets:**
  - Conversions to pedestrian only street
  - Conversions to multimodal street (e.g., sidewalk enhancements, bike lanes, and transit stop/station enhancements, and transit priority treatments)
  - Enhancements of small urban public spaces with surrounding uses and activities and landscaping enhancements

PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA

For the purposes of this evaluation, “project” relates to the planning project proposed to be funded under the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Planning Grant Program, and "overall-project" refers to the policy, standard, guideline, ordinance, program or other implementing tool being addressed, or the capital investment that can be implemented.

By their intrinsic nature, Policy Planning Projects and Capital Planning Projects have different objectives. As such, separate evaluation criteria have been developed for each.
POLICY PLANNING

• CDT CONCEPTS AND PRINCIPLES (40 PTS)

The project supports the key concepts and principles outlined in Chapters 1 and 2 of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Program (CDT) Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use. Please provide a list of the Key Concepts and Principles the project addresses, which implement the practices and actions outlined in Chapters 3 and 4.

Does the project codify CDT-like principles in the Member Agency’s guiding policies for land use, transportation, housing and urban form as expressed in its General Plan? If so, site the location or Element(s) in the General Plan.

The project pertains to a major transportation corridor, core area, or station area as defined in VTA’s CDT Manual.

• PROJECT OUTCOMES (30 PTS)

The overall-project pertains to a specific policy or policies that influence the type, location, and design quality of development in a major transportation corridor, core area, or station area.

The project is intended to result in changes that will enable the implementation of projects or recommendations that result in well-designed, compact, amenity-rich developments that encourage transit use and walking.

The overall-project will have identifiable and likely synergistic effects; that is, the provision of one intended benefit will likely induce additional benefits. Examples include:

A. The creation of policies that facilitate the implementation of well-designed, mixed-use, amenity-rich, compact developments with proximity to major transit facilities or multimodal streets.

B. Policies or policy changes that induce an increase in housing supply or employment densities in the project area that in turn encourage transit, bicycling, and pedestrian trips.

C. Changes to General Plans that allow for more compact, amenity-rich, pedestrian-oriented development.

D. Council/Board adopted architectural or urban design guidelines that stimulate high-quality transit-and pedestrian–oriented design in the identified core, corridor and station areas.
CDT Planning Grant Program
Attachment B

• SPONSOR COMMITMENT (20 PTS)

The project supports other efforts adopted by the Member Agency to create well-designed, compact, amenity-rich developments that encourage transit use and walking.

To what extent will the project sponsor 1) pursue the project recommendations, including subsequent planning, community involvement, or programming activities, and 2) pursue the overall-project to the greatest extent feasible?

• PROJECT INNOVATION AND CREATIVITY (10 PTS)

To what degree does the project set standards or policies that encourage design practices as called for in the CDT program? To what degree does the project demonstrate innovation in project purpose, approach, or community involvement techniques? To what degree does the project approach differ from that of other candidate projects?

CAPITAL PLANNING

• CDT CONCEPTS AND PRINCIPLES (40 PTS)

The project supports the key concepts and principles outlined in Chapters 1 and 2 of VTA’s Community Design & Transportation Program (CDT) Manual of Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use. Please provide a list of the Key Concepts and Principles, the project addresses and a brief description of how the project fulfills those concepts and principles.

To what degree does the project set standards or policies that encourage design practices as called for in the CDT program? To what degree does the project demonstrate new ideas in project purpose, approach or community involvement techniques? To what degree does the project approach differ from that of other candidate projects?

• PROJECT OUTCOMES (30 PTS)

The overall project will have identifiable and likely synergistic effects; that is, the provision of one intended benefit will likely induce additional community benefits.

The project involves a collaborative planning process with community stakeholders (e.g. residents, businesses, property owners, local agencies, neighborhood associations, the project sponsor(s) and the Member Agency(s)).

The project will result in a discrete and clear work product, which will guide the overall project to the next level of development, and/or form the basis to compete for funding for the overall project.
CDT Planning Grant Program
Attachment B

• PROJECT LOCATION (15 PTS)

The project pertains to a major transportation corridor, core area, or station area as defined in VTA’s CDT Manual.

The project relates to a physical setting where deficiencies exist, or are expected to exist, that if corrected will provide significant community benefit. Such benefits may be enhanced walkability; safety and security; traffic calming; enhanced economic activity; protection of community heritage, historic, or environmental resources; public transit access or amenity; parking design, streetscape design; gap closure of an essential pedestrian/ bicycle route or network, and access to services that meet daily needs.

The project pertains to a defined physical location - or – the project pertains to a specific type (function), location, and quality of development.

The project is in an infill, brownfield, or redevelopment area, or addresses specific urban design goals established by the Member Agency.

• PROJECT NEED AND SIGNIFICANCE (15 PTS)

A. Can the project proceed without the CDT Planning Grant award? Does the project complete a critical path step needed before other projects can proceed?

B. Project Significance. How significant is the overall impact of the project to the Member Agency? Does the project establish a new direction within the jurisdiction regarding transit integration and/or pedestrian and transit friendly development?

QUESTIONS

For questions about which category your project belongs or general questions regarding the application process, please contact the CDT Program Manager, John Sighamony at (408) 321-5767, john.sighamony@vta.org or Celeste Fiore at (408) 321-5693, Celeste.Fiore@vta.org
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: 2009 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager Fund

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

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

BACKGROUND:

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

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

At its August 3, 2000 meeting, the VTA Board of Directors designated half of the annual TFCA allocation to bicycle projects in the Countywide Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) for a ten-year period. On December 9, 2004, the VTA Board extended the TFCA commitment to the bicycle program until 2030.

In previous years, due to a shortage of eligible BEP projects submitted, money set aside for BEP projects has been loaned to the competitive program. Over time, this has resulted in the competitive program "owing" the BEP over $2 million. Therefore, staff gave priority in the...
2009/10 TFCA program to BEP and ongoing (since 2006) operating projects. These will henceforth be referred to as "priority projects."

**DISCUSSION:**

There is a total of $2,205,472 available for TFCA 40% projects this year. VTA received 13 applications from project sponsors requesting a total of $3,036,912. One project was withdrawn following discussions with BAAQMD staff and the project sponsor because staff determined that the project, as proposed, did not meet the cost-effective criteria per BAAQMD policy. Of the remaining 12 applications, six were for priority projects and six were in the competitive program. Staff recommendations for the entire FY 2009/10 TFCA program are discussed below and summarized in Attachment A.

**Priority Projects:**

As discussed above, staff gave priority in the 2009/10 TFCA program to BEP and ongoing operating projects. This year, project sponsors submitted six priority projects, five of which are BEP projects. The total grant request of these six projects $1,297,500. Staff recommends funding all six priority projects.

**Competitive Program:**

The total grant request for the six competitive projects was $1,591,412, well in excess of the $907,972 remaining available funds. On February 3, 2008, a scoring subcommittee of the Technical Advisory Committee's Capital Improvement Program Working Group met to evaluate the competitive applications, which are ranked below in Attachment A. This chart presents staff's entire recommended FY 2009/10 TFCA 40% program, incorporating the scoring subcommittee's project funding recommendations for competitive projects. These are based on BAAQMD's TFCA Program Manager Fund Expenditure Program Guidance and the VTA Board of Directors' TFCA 40% Policies and Criteria as revised on February 1, 2007. Staff recommends funding four competitive projects as shown in Attachment A.

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board may request other programming alternatives. All projects submitted for consideration in the TFCA program must adhere to BAAQMD policies, including cost-effectiveness requirements.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no direct fiscal impact as a result of this action. As the program manager for Santa Clara County, VTA distributes the TFCA 40% grant funds directly to the project sponsors. The grant revenue for the Light Rail Shuttles project for which VTA is the project sponsor, will be reflected in the FY10 Recommended VTA Transit Enterprise Operating Budget.

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**
The Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee met on March 11, 2009 and made the following comment:

- Member agencies should consider submitting Safe Routes to School projects to the TFCA program.

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

The Policy Advisory Committee considered this item on March 12, 2009 and made the following comments:

- In the future, group the Light Rail Shuttles Program with the competitive projects.
- List BEP projects separately.

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

**STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:**

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee considered this item on March 19, 2009 and made the following comments/requests:

- In the future, the shuttles should be evaluated with the competitive projects.
- Signal timing projects should not degrade transit operations or bicycle and pedestrian traffic.
- Requested details of traffic signal locations.

The Committee unanimously recommended that the Board approve this item.

Prepared by: Bill Hough
## Attachment A
Santa Clara County FY 2009/10 TFCA 40% Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Eligible Grant Request</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Local Match %</th>
<th>TFCA Cost per Ton</th>
<th>Grant Recommended</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SC County</td>
<td>County Expressways Signal Timing**</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$54,130</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Citywide Bicycle Racks</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$22,491</td>
<td>$7000</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Homestead Road Signal Improvements**</td>
<td>$360,000</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
<td>$108,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$29,024</td>
<td>$252,000</td>
<td>$427,000</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Traffic Signal Synchronization Project**</td>
<td>$4,199,972</td>
<td>$480,972</td>
<td>$3,719,000</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>$10,482</td>
<td>$480,972</td>
<td>$907,972</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Unfunded Competitive Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Eligible Grant Request</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Local Match %</th>
<th>TFCA Cost per Ton</th>
<th>Grant Recommended</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Shoreline Boulevard Traffic Signals</td>
<td>$755,000</td>
<td>$655,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$41,279</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>Diesel Truck Retrofit</td>
<td>$47,400</td>
<td>$28,440</td>
<td>$18,960</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>$89,954</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Competitive:** | $5,612,372 | $1,591,412 | $4,020,960 | $907,972 | $907,972 |

## Priority Projects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Eligible Grant Request</th>
<th>Local Match</th>
<th>Local Match %</th>
<th>TFCA Cost per Ton</th>
<th>Grant Recommended</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Light Rail Shuttle Program</td>
<td>$2,468,180</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>$1,858,180</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$89,878</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>$610,000</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Monroe Street Class 2 Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$37,724</td>
<td>$31,500</td>
<td>$641,500</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail Reach 4</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>$57,660</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$683,500</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Borregas Avenue Bicycle Lanes</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$735,500</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Cochrane Eastbound Bike Lanes</td>
<td>$506,000</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>$344,000</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>$89,397</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>$897,500</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Stevens Creek Trail</td>
<td>$4,971,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$4,571,000</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>$75,989</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$1,297,500</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Priority:** | $8,102,180 | $1,297,500 | $6,804,680 | | $1,297,500 | $1,297,500 |

**Total:** | $13,714,552 | $2,888,912 | $10,825,640 | $2,205,472 | $2,205,472 |

* As explained in the memorandum.
** Project sponsor certified that project will not degrade transit operations or bicycle & pedestrian traffic.
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: April 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 April 6, 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 120** - The 7:45 a.m. southbound trip leaving Fremont BART will be moved 15 minutes later. Minor running time adjustments will be made to other trips as well. This change was supported by a passenger survey.

**Line 168** - Several changes will be made to morning northbound trips. The 5:30 a.m. and 5:50 a.m. trips leaving Gilroy Transit Center will be combined into one trip leaving at 5:40 a.m. due to low ridership. A new trip will be added leaving Gilroy Transit Center at 8:27 a.m. based on passenger requests.

**STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee heard a presentation from staff on this information item. The Committee unanimously recommended moving this item to the consent agenda for the April 3rd Board Meeting.

Prepared By: James Unites, Deputy Director, Service Planning
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:   Bus Wash Replacement (Chaboya)

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

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

BACKGROUND:

This work completes the replacement and upgrade of aging, difficult to maintain equipment now beyond its original life span. The wash was originally installed in 1980-1981 and was designed to last 20-25 years depending on wash cycles. It cannot accommodate Community Buses which are currently hand washed to maintain operational cleanliness.

New equipment will accommodate standard Gillig 40 foot, articulated 60 foot, and the new Community Bus fleet. The replacement equipment will bring the wash up to current standards for control and monitoring of the wash process with the ability to track individual wash cycles. New pumps and motors meet current efficiency standards and will be integrated into the existing water reclamation system. Each tunnel exit has a set of blower tunnels to dry the vehicles, reduce water spots on windows, and increase the amount of water run-off collected and recycled by the water reclamation system. The new wash system has a vehicle speed monitoring system with an alarm to detect vehicles moving too fast to be properly washed. When the alarm is engaged the bus wash shuts down.

DISCUSSION:
VTA issued an invitation to bid for the replacement of two Revenue Vehicle Fleet Wash System Tunnels at Chaboya Operating Division on December 22, 2008; 4 bids were received with the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Bid Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air and Lube Systems Incorporated</td>
<td>$ 610,034.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodan Builders</td>
<td>$ 672,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztec Consultants</td>
<td>$ 726,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angottii &amp; Reilly Incorporated</td>
<td>$ 992,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers Estimate</td>
<td>$ 850,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bid is 28% under the Engineer's Estimate. The bid is fair and reasonable and staff recommends award to the low bidder.

Reference checks and site visits confirmed Air and Lube Systems Incorporated is a responsible bidder. The replacement of the two Revenue Vehicle Fleet Wash System Tunnels at Chaboya Operating Division contract is based on a lump sum for materials and labor. This contract will not exceed the winning bid of $610,034.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board of Directors can request that staff issue another IFP. Since the proposals were submitted by leading contractors who specialize in wash equipment manufacture and installation, it is likely a new IFP will generate the same proposals. Delay will jeopardize federal grant funding for the replacement of this equipment.

FISCAL IMPACT:

This action will authorize $610,034 for bus wash replacement at Chaboya Division. Budget appropriation for this expenditure is included in the FY08 and FY09 Adopted VTA Transit Enterprise Fund Capital Budget.

SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE (SBE) PARTICIPATION:

SBE Participation

No specific goal has been established for this contract due to the lack of SBE firms available to perform the scope of work. The 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.

STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee received a presentation from staff on this item. The Committee unanimously voted without discussion to move this item to the consent agenda for the Board of Directors’ April 3rd meeting.

Prepared by: Mark Mahaffey
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Grant Program

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

Resolution

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt a resolution authorizing the filing and execution of grants with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for funding under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program.

BACKGROUND:

Since 2004, VTA has applied for and received funds from the FTA Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area Formula Grant Program. Caltrans manages the program and apportions funds to each region based on the population of the non-urbanized area. The purpose of the program is to provide funds for transit projects in non-urbanized areas with a population of 50,000 or less. VTA provides transit service on Route 68, which operates in the non-urbanized area along portions of Monterey Highway between the San Jose urbanized area and the Gilroy-Morgan Hill urbanized area.

The American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) signed into law by President Obama on February 18, 2009 includes Section 5311 funds for qualifying rural transit operators throughout the nation. The programming process in the San Francisco Bay Area is managed by Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

Caltrans requires all applicants to submit a resolution approved by their governing body authorizing the submittal of the grant application.
DISCUSSION:

On February 25, 2009, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) approved the ARRA Bay Area FTA Section 5311 Regional Program of Projects, which supports VTA’s request for preventive maintenance funding. These funds will be used to help defray the costs of preventive maintenance incurred as a result of providing transit service in the non-urbanized area of Route 68.

ALTERNATIVES:

The Board of Directors could elect not to accept the ARRA FTA Section 5311 Non-Urbanized Area grant and fund the Route 68 bus service entirely with local funds.

FISCAL IMPACT:

ARRA FTA Section 5311 funds will be made available to VTA to help defray preventive maintenance costs of providing bus service on Route 68.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Transportation Planning and Operations Committee considered this item on March 19, 2009 and unanimously recommended approval. There were no questions raised by the Committee.

Prepared by: Mike Tasosa
RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE SANTA VALLEY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (VTA)
AUTHORIZING THE FILING AND EXECUTION OF GRANTS WITH THE
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR FUNDING UNDER
THE FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION
SECTION 5311 PROGRAM (49 USC SECTION 5311)

WHEREAS, the United States Department of Transportation is authorized to make grants to
states through the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to support capital and operating
assistance projects under Section 5311 of the Federal Transit Act; and

WHEREAS, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has been designated by
the Governor of the State of California to administer Section 5311 grants for public
transportation projects; and

WHEREAS, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) desires to apply for
American Recovery & Reinvestment Act (ARRA) FTA Section 5311 financial assistance to
permit operation of rural transit service in Santa Clara County; and

WHEREAS, the VTA has, to the maximum extent feasible, coordinated with other
transportation providers and users in the region;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the VTA Board of Directors does hereby
authorize the General Manager to file and execute grant applications and agreements with
Caltrans on behalf of VTA to aid in the financing of operating or capital projects pursuant to
Section 5311 of the Federal Transit Act of 1964, as amended.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the General Manager is authorized to:

1. Execute and file all assurances or any other document required by Caltrans; and

2. Provide additional information as Caltrans may require in connection with the
   application for the Section 5311 projects; and

3. Submit and approve the request for reimbursement of funds from Caltrans for the
   Section 5311 projects.
PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board of Directors on ______________.

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

__________________________
Dolly Sandoval, Chairperson
Board of Directors

Attest:

__________________________
Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

__________________________
Kevin D. Allmand, 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 Joint Development Policy

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve the proposed Joint Development Program policy framework.

BACKGROUND:

Over the past six months, VTA staff has been engaged in discussions with Committee members regarding conceptual improvements to the existing Joint Development Policy. These discussions resulted in the creation of a new policy framework which was presented as an information item to VTA's Policy Advisory Committee and all three VTA Board Standing Committees the last two months. VTA staff also solicited feedback on the proposed framework from other VTA divisions. Overall, response to the proposed framework has been very favorable. Incorporating the comments received on the original draft, staff has created a final proposed new Joint Development Policy framework in the forms attached to this agenda item for your consideration and approval.

For reference, the prior discussion on this agenda item is reprinted below.

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) has an extensive portfolio of real estate assets, many of which are underutilized at present. The Joint Development Program, operating under the Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Division of VTA, is responsible for managing the process by which development on these underutilized sites occurs. To govern the activities of the Joint Development Program, the VTA Board of Directors approved a Joint Development Policy at its January 2005 meeting and approved and amended this policy at its May 2007 meeting.
Subsequently, in January 2009, the Board adopted the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Plan 2035 (VTP 2035). This is a strategic plan intended to position VTA, as the CMA of Santa Clara County, so that it can effectively respond to projected population growth, changes in land use patterns, transportation costs, environmental degradation and energy use over the next 25 years. Six major categories of programs are put forward in VTP 2035, and 14 funding sources are identified to carry out these programs. Of these funding sources, the Joint Development Program is projected to provide $554 Million in revenue toward VTA transit and transportation projects over the 25-year duration of VTP 2035.

DISCUSSION:

To meet the substantial financial expectations of the VTP 2035, the Joint Development Program must be guided by a stronger foundation of policies and procedures. As such, VTA staff proposes to replace the existing Joint Development Policy with a set of guidance documents that delineates more focused objectives for the Joint Development Program, is more comprehensive in topic, and offers greater consistency to industry standards in the arena of public private real estate development than does the existing Joint Development Policy. The sole intention of these revisions is to improve the functioning of the Joint Development Program so that VTA can effectively fulfill the program’s important mission.

A. Proposed Revisions

VTA staff proposes to replace the existing Joint Development Policy in its entirety with a new set of guidance documents for the Joint Development Program consisting of the following:

1) Preamble: This document provides an overview of the Joint Development Program and the structure of the policy framework governing the program.

2) Joint Development Policy (Part I): This document sets forth the fundamental principles that will guide the Joint Development Program.

3) Joint Development Implementation Plan (Part II): Expanding upon the core principles articulated in the Joint Development Policy, this document outlines the sequence of steps that will be taken by the Joint Development Program so as to effectuate joint development on VTA’s real estate assets in an effective and efficient manner.

These documents are collectively referred to as the Joint Development Guidance Documents. Drafts of the proposed Guidance Documents are attached to this memo.

B. Key Elements of Proposed Guidance Documents

The proposed Joint Development Policy encapsulates the core principles of the Joint Development Program in a concise but comprehensive new Mission Statement:

“The mission of VTA’s Joint Development Program is to provide appropriate stewardship of VTA’s publicly-owned real estate assets by maximizing their respective economic values through consensus-driven, site-appropriate development that also
increases transit ridership, creates vibrant community assets and enhances the long-term life of VTA’s facilities.”

The Mission Statement is buttressed by three clear Goals of the Joint Development, all of which are defined in greater detail through an associated series of Objectives:

1) Revenue: To provide a long-term, stable source of revenue for VTA;

2) Transit-Oriented Development: To carry out transit-oriented development, where appropriate; and

3) Transit Operations: To create development that results in ridership growth and/or infrastructure improvements.

While each of the above stated goals may be found in prior Board actions related to the Joint Development Program, the emphasis in the proposed Joint Development Policy is to create a competitive financial return for the Agency through the astute development of its valuable real estate assets. In fact, the new Policy prioritizes the three articulated Goals, in the order presented above.

The prioritization of the three Goals in this manner is necessary to appropriately position the Joint Development Program in a direction envisioned by the VTA Board when it adopted the VTP 2035. This repositioning of emphasis for the program will more effectively enable VTA to generate long term revenue from its underutilized real estate assets that can be reinvested in the core functions of VTA, as later determined by the VTA Board and management. Moreover, fair market revenue generation from VTA's real estate assets is consistent with the Federal Transit Authority's policies on joint development as well as VTA's fiduciary role as a steward of public assets.

Importantly, the Guidance Documents also enunciate comprehensive standards and protocols related to the other goals of the Joint Development Program noted above. For instance, along with the Implementation Plan, the new Policy specifies various standards which must be met to ensure that transit-oriented development consistent with local land use regulations and VTA's operational needs is pursued. Further, the documents outline a thorough process which must be undertaken for any joint development project pursuant to which staff must solicit input from local jurisdictions and other stakeholders on proposed development concepts prior to engaging developers so that consensus is built early on proposed projects. The new Guidance Documents also include several important tools for appropriately assessing and managing VTA's joint development assets and strengthening its organizational commitment to the Joint Development Program through the creation of internal management advisory groups and inter-departmental project teams as well as an appropriate allocation of funding and staff resources.

C. Summary

The intent of staff's proposal is to create an improved, more focused policy foundation for the Joint Development Program. VTA's expectations for the Joint Development Program, as
articulated in the VTP 2035, are ambitious. To meet these expectations, VTA at all levels must take actions that are clear and consistent. The proposed *Guidance Documents*, if adhered to, will enable VTA to implement the Joint Development Program out with the highest standards of professionalism while meeting the financial expectations of the VTP 2035 and creating vibrant community assets for local jurisdictions and the general public.

Staff recommends the Committee members approve the proposed Joint Development Guidance Documents in substantially the form attached.

**COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION**

The VTA Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) considered this item at its March 12, 2009 meeting. Staff summarized the key elements of the proposed new policy framework and responded to general questions regarding the text as well as specific questions regarding the priority order of the goals set forth in the policy. Staff also highlighted the upcoming efforts the Joint Development Program will be undertaking, which includes compilation of the Real Estate Inventory, Joint Development Portfolio and Priority Schedule. The PAC requested that VTA staff present these efforts to the PAC as informational items in the upcoming months and unanimously approved the agenda item.

The VTA Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee (CMPP) considered this item at its March 19, 2009 meeting. Staff made a presentation to the CMPP similar to that made to the PAC, as described above. Committee members commended the new policy framework for its clarity and thoroughness. They also engaged in general discussion with staff regarding practical applications of the policy in potential scenarios that could be faced by VTA in future development projects. VTA Board Member Yoriko Kishimoto requested a few minor changes in the text and the committee unanimously approved the item subject to those minor changes.

The attached documents reflect the minor changes requested by the CMPP.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There are no negative fiscal impacts related to revising the existing Joint Development Policy. In fact, as proposed by staff, the new policy framework will better enable the Joint Development Program to generate the significant revenue envisioned in the VTP 2035.

Prepared by: Bijal Patel
The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) has an extensive portfolio of real estate assets, many of which are underutilized and/or have potential for transit-oriented development. VTA recognizes the importance of developing these real estate assets, as reflected in the agency’s creation and ongoing support of the Joint Development Program (JDP). Operating under the CMA division of VTA, the JDP has primary organizational responsibility for managing the process by which development of VTA’s real estate assets occurs.

To ensure the success of the JDP, the VTA Board of Directors has mandated this major organizational effort be guided in principle and procedure by the Joint Development Policy (Part I of the JDP Guidance Documents) and the Joint Development Implementation Plan (Part II of the JDP Guidance Documents), both as adopted on ____________, 2009. These two documents, along with this Preamble, together replace in its entirety the previously adopted Joint Development Policy, as last amended by the VTA Board of Directors on May 3, 2007.

The Joint Development Policy sets forth the fundamental principles that guide the JDP. This document articulates the primary goal of VTA’s JDP as that of providing appropriate stewardship of VTA’s real estate assets through maximization of their respective economic values. Secondary goals of the JDP are to create vibrant community assets in the form of transit-oriented development and enhance VTA’s transit operations through improvements in ridership and infrastructure. All of these goals shall be accomplished through a consensus-driven, site-appropriate development process which includes both comprehensive intra-agency coordination and extensive collaboration with external stakeholders both interested in and affected by VTA’s JDP.

The Joint Development Implementation Plan, which comprises Part II of this document, lays out procedures which expand upon the core principles articulated in Part I. Together, these principles and procedures outline an intentioned path for VTA staff to follow to achieve success for the JDP. Starting with priority-setting of VTA’s joint development assets, this path includes procedures for collaborative identification of site-appropriate development concepts, competitive developer selection processes, and industry standard legal instruments for effective public-private partnerships with selected developers. The Joint Development Implementation Plan also specifies VTA processes to ensure intra-agency consultation and guidance, collaboration with affected localities, and an open public participation process.
PART I: JOINT DEVELOPMENT POLICY

I. MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of VTA’s Joint Development Program is to provide appropriate stewardship of VTA’s real estate assets by maximizing their respective economic values through consensus-driven, site-appropriate development that also increases transit ridership, creates vibrant community assets and enhances the long-term life of VTA’s facilities.

II. GOALS

The goals of the Joint Development Program are set forth below, in priority order. These goals and their respective priorities shall inform the entire arc of development pursued under the Joint Development Program. In instances where a conflict appears either among these goals or between these goals and the interests of stakeholders, these goals and their respective priorities shall govern VTA’s actions.

A. Revenue. To provide a long-term, stable source of revenue for VTA by obtaining fair market value on the sale or lease of its real property assets through an open and competitive development process.

B. Transit-Oriented Development. To carry out transit-oriented development, where appropriate, that provides the highest and best use of each site, conforms to the regulations of the affected jurisdiction in which the site is located and achieves the goals set forth in VTA’s Community Design and Transportation Manual for high quality design and community benefits.

C. Transit Operations. To create development that results in ridership growth on VTA’s multi-modal transit system and/or enhances VTA’s operational infrastructure.

III. OBJECTIVES

The aforementioned Goals shall be met through implementation of the following Objectives, as each may be further articulated in Part II, the Joint Development Implementation Plan.

A. REVENUE

1. Return on Investment. For each Joint Development asset, VTA shall achieve a rate of return over the life of the asset that is competitive in the market and reflects fair market value.

2. Participation in Asset Value Increase. For each Joint Development asset involving a long-term leasehold, VTA shall seek financial participation in the
increase in the asset’s value over time in the form of market competitive contractual mechanisms.

3. **Use of Proceeds.** Proceeds from the Joint Development Program shall be set aside in a special fund within the agency’s fiscal organization and shall be appropriated for use from this fund for the continued operation and development of the agency, as determined by the VTA Board of Directors from time to time through formal actions.

**B. TRANSIT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT**

1. **High Density Development.** Residential development projects pursued under the Joint Development Program shall strive to provide higher density at VTA’s major transit nodes and the downtown or core areas of the local jurisdictions in which the projects are situated.

2. **Land Use Policies.** Development projects pursued under the Joint Development Program shall comply with all the review and approval policies and procedures of the local jurisdictions in which the respective projects are sited.

3. **Stakeholder Interests.** Development projects pursued under the Joint Development Program shall address stakeholder interests to the extent consistent with the **Joint Development Policy**.

4. **Urban Design Standards.** Development projects pursued under the Joint Development Program shall strive to incorporate the urban design concepts, principles and guidance set forth in VTA’s *Community Design and Transportation Program*, the urban design standards of the localities with jurisdiction over them, and the “best practices” identified by industry leaders in transit-oriented development.

5. **Site Circulation.** Development projects pursued under the Joint Development Program shall incorporate efficient and safe vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian circulation and promote convenient, accessible and safe connections to transit service.

6. **Project Parking.** Each development project shall provide parking commensurate with demand forecasts and smart growth principles resulting from site evaluation documents. These documents may include environmental impact reports, on-site and off-site parking analyses, shuttle and bus linkages, and non-physical solutions to parking that are consistent with local jurisdiction requirements.

**C. TRANSIT OPERATIONS**

1. **Transit and Ridership Improvements.** Development projects pursued under the Joint Development Program shall strive to include physical improvements and/or
transit programs that encourage utilization of multi-modal transit services and increase long-term ridership.

2. **VTA Operational Requirements.** The Joint Development Program shall be implemented in a manner that is mindful of VTA’s necessity to manage costs, maximize revenues and balance system expansion with the maintenance of existing service.

3. **Replacement Parking.** For any development project pursued at a VTA park-and-ride, a site-by-site analysis shall be undertaken to determine the appropriate level at which existing parking should be replaced.

**IV. JOINT DEVELOPMENT REAL ESTATE ASSETS**

The identification of appropriate real estate assets for Joint Development is a prerequisite to the successful fulfillment of the Joint Development Program. As such, the Joint Development Program shall generate and maintain management information tools that catalog the agency’s extensive portfolio of real estate assets and identify those best suited for Joint Development within specified timeframes.

**A. REAL ESTATE ASSET INVENTORY**

VTA staff shall compile and maintain a comprehensive *Real Estate Inventory* (RE Inventory) which identifies all real estate assets that are owned, leased or otherwise controlled by VTA and available for revenue generation through leasing, development or other asset disposition. This *RE Inventory* shall include, for each asset, all reasonably ascertainable data on its respective location, size, physical features, current uses, planning constraints, and environmental characteristics. The *RE Inventory* shall be reviewed regularly by VTA staff and updated as significant information is made available with respect to any identified assets or as new assets are acquired by VTA.

**B. JOINT DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO**

From the *RE Inventory*, VTA staff shall identify a subset of assets which have reasonable potential for Joint Development over time and shall categorize them into a *Joint Development Portfolio*. The assets in the *Joint Development Portfolio* will be reviewed and re-categorized as the *RE Inventory* is updated. Further guidance on the *Joint Development Portfolio* shall be set forth in the *Joint Development Implementation Plan*.

**C. JOINT DEVELOPMENT PRIORITY SCHEDULE**

From time to time but not less than every five years, VTA staff shall propose to the VTA Board of Directors a specific set of assets from the *Joint Development Portfolio* that have been evaluated through economic and other analyses and determined to hold the greatest potential to become an active development project for the VTA’s Joint Development Program in the foreseeable future. The intention of the Priority Schedule is to target VTA’s limited resources toward those assets which have greater certainty and capacity to
generate revenue and meet the other goals set forth in this *Joint Development Policy*. The *Joint Development Priority Schedule* shall be developed through a participatory process with the local jurisdictions having land use control and subsequently proposed to the VTA Board of Directors for formal adoption and fiscal appropriation authority. VTA staff may initiate formal contractual negotiations for Joint Development assets not on the Priority Schedule only upon approval of an amendment to the Priority Schedule by the Board of Directors. Further guidance on the *Joint Development Portfolio* shall be set forth in the *Joint Development Implementation Plan*.

V. PARTICIPATORY PROCESS

The Joint Development Program shall carry out its activities so as to advance relationship-building with the wider communities affected by VTA’s operations. The *Joint Development Implementation Plan* provides further information on the various means through which the Joint Development Program shall solicit input from local jurisdictions and other stakeholders.

A. OUTREACH TO LOCAL JURISDICTIONS

VTA shall engage fully and collaboratively with the local jurisdictions in which VTA’s Joint Development assets are located and will solicit input from the appropriate staff and decision makers of these jurisdictions with respect to land uses, development parameters, and other regulatory issues while balancing the necessity to meet the core goals associated with the Joint Development Program as outlined in this *Joint Development Policy*.

B. COLLABORATION

The Joint Development Program shall employ all effective means to facilitate information-sharing, tap expertise and plan collaboratively with local jurisdictions and other agencies working to meet regional transit goals.

C. STAKEHOLDER INPUT

VTA shall endeavor to implement a participatory process for every Joint Development project so as to obtain maximum stakeholder input. To this end, VTA shall not, in most instances, propose to develop a Joint Development asset listed in the *Joint Development Priority Schedule* until the agency has gone thru a specific development strategy for that asset which includes adequate consultation with the community and other stakeholders. Further guidance on the participatory process shall be set forth in the *Joint Development Implementation Plan*.

VI. ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT

Cooperation and teamwork throughout the VTA organizational structure are essential to the success of the Joint Development Program. VTA is committed to providing the
requisite technical, legal and financial support necessary for performing the complex task of developing urban real estate assets under the Joint Development Program.

A. MANAGEMENT ADVISORY GROUP

Management of the various divisions within VTA shall provide regular input to the Joint Development Program on general activities as well as specific projects through a newly created Joint Development Management Advisory Group, led by the Joint Development Program.

B. INTRA-AGENCY SUPPORT

VTA’s organizational functions shall provide technical information and administrative support to the Joint Development Program as needed, particularly with respect to the compilation and ongoing maintenance of the asset management tools outlined in Section IV of this Joint Development Policy.

C. PROJECT TEAM

Each significant Joint Development asset requiring VTA oversight and coordination will be assigned a Project Team assembled from the various technical and support units of the agency as required, under the coordination of a Joint Development Project Manager. The intent of the Project Team is to avoid unintended consequences to VTA’s various functional divisions, conserve scarce agency funds and staff resources, and tap into the experience and expertise of the agency’s staff so as to generate the best real estate solutions for each such asset.

D. STAFF AND FUNDING RESOURCES

VTA recognizes that the development of complex real estate assets as contemplated in the Joint Development Program requires an initial investment of staff and financial resources and is committed to allocating such resources.
I. INTRODUCTION

The Joint Development Implementation Plan comprises Part II of the Joint Development Guidance Documents. Expanding upon the core principles outlined in Part I, the Joint Development Policy, this document summarizes the sequence of steps that will take place to successfully carry out the Joint Development Program.

As used in the Joint Development Guidance Documents, the term “Joint Development” shall mean the development of a transit agency’s real estate assets through a public private partnership. While real estate development is not a core function of a transit agency such as VTA, it is an activity that is commonly practiced among public transit providers across the nation empowered with such authority. VTA’s statutory authority for the Joint Development Program exists in various legislative actions.1 In fact, VTA is one of only three transit operators in California that has the statutory authority to acquire land entirely for the purpose of transit-oriented development.2 This state support for VTA’s Joint Development is consistent with federal guidance, in that the Federal Transit Administration encourages public transit agencies to pursue incidental uses of their real property that raise additional revenues for the transit system or, at a reasonable cost, enhance system ridership.3

As noted in the Joint Development Policy, the approach outlined in this Implementation Plan is intended to be consistent with the other policies and goals set herein; to be clear and uniform for all projects; to involve close communication and collaboration with affected jurisdictions; to follow a competitive developer selection process; to include “best practices” in the public-private contracting arena; and to be fair and transparent to developers, jurisdictions, real estate markets and the public.

The Implementation Plan covers the following topics:

A. REAL ESTATE INVENTORY (RE Inventory). A comprehensive summary of basic data on all VTA-owned or -leased sites, or those otherwise controlled by VTA, and which are available for revenue generation through leasing, development or other asset disposition.

1 Assembly Bill (AB) No. 1937, Dutra (enacted February 2002) allows a transit operator to enter into agreements with a public agency, public utility or person or entity for the purpose of joint development. See also Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Act (California Public Utilities Code 100000 et. seq)
2 AB No. 670, Papan (enacted February 1999) allows VTA, the San Mateo County Transit District and the Bay Area Rapid Transit District to acquire land entirely for a project that is a commercial, residential or mixed use development that is undertaken in connection with existing, planned or proposed transit facilities and is located ¼ mile or less from the external boundaries of that facility.”
3 Federal Transit Law (FR/Vol. 72, No.25/Wednesday, February 7, 2007/Notices)
JOIN DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO (Portfolio). A subset of the RE Inventory and the established list of those VTA’s assets which have joint development potential.

JOIN DEVELOPMENT PRIORITY SCHEDULE (Priority Schedule). The official VTA document which sets forth a limited number of high-priority sites for development and which the Board formally adopts.

DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY AND SITE DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT. To be generated for each site as it moves forward in the development process in a collaborative process with the affected jurisdiction, the public and others as appropriate.

DEVELOPER SELECTION PROCESS. The process by which the VTA will solicit interest in developing specific sites, whether via Request for Qualifications, or Request for Proposal.

JOINT DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS. The legal agreements between VTA and the selected developer for any given project.

POST-CONSTRUCTION REVIEW. A staff review of the effectiveness of the process and procedures established for VTA Joint Development Projects.

These are discussed in turn, as they represent a sequence of activities by VTA staff and the Board.

II. REAL ESTATE INVENTORY

VTA is the fee title holder of an extensive portfolio of real estate assets along key transit corridors in Santa Clara County. To enable their proper management and utilization, these assets will be catalogued in a comprehensive inventory referred to as the Real Estate Inventory (RE Inventory) in accordance with the procedures outlined below.

A. COMPILATION OF RE INVENTORY

The RE Inventory will consist of all real property assets meeting the following criteria:

1) is owned, leased or otherwise controlled by VTA; and
2) offers potential for revenue generation through leasing, joint development, sale, licensing or other asset disposition.

In addition to cataloguing each asset by the appropriate markers (e.g., location, type of property, parcel numbers, etc.), the RE Inventory will include a comprehensive summary of basic data pertinent to each asset. This data generally will consist of information that can be easily collected from existing external and internal sources (e.g., VTA files, title records, local land use regulations, internet tools, etc.). Examples of pertinent data for each asset include, without limitation, the following:
iii) each location and ownership;
iv) demographic profile,
v) distance to public transit stations and/or stops,
vi) summary statement of land use setting,
vii) land use regulations that apply,
viii) alternative transportation modes located within ½ mile of the sites,
ix) the status of the site’s availability for development and
x) any known environmental constraints.

For ease of use and maximum access across the organization, VTA staff will make every effort possible to compile the RE Inventory using the most appropriate technological tools then available (e.g. GIS, SAP, PATH, and Excel).

The most current RE Inventory shall be incorporated by reference into this Implementation Plan and included as Attachment 1.

B. CATEGORIZATION OF ASSETS

In addition to the above-mentioned compilation, the RE Inventory will segregate the assets into strategic categories based upon preliminary assessments of their respective real estate potentials and/or anticipated uses by VTA staff. The goal of this categorization is to enable VTA staff to formulate site-appropriate real estate management plans for each of the catalogued assets, including without limitation, joint development in accordance with the Joint Development Guidance Documents, interim leasing and licensing pursuant to VTA’s leasing policies and procedures, and sale, transfer or other disposition as determined by VTA from time to time.

VTA Real Estate management will determine these categories and may rename, expand or altogether delete them as necessary from time to time. The initial categories determined appropriate for the RE Inventory include the following:

1. **Joint Development.** This category consists of those assets with potential for Joint Development, either in the near or long term. Special import will be given to those assets with strong transit-oriented development viability and/or long-term revenue potential through ground leasing or a joint venture development structure. Assets in this category may also include those which require value-added investment to be made to them prior to development. Value-added investment includes any pre-development or disposition work performed for an asset, such as site remediation or improvements, site assembly, facilities relocation, entitlement work and pre-design. A cost benefit analysis should be done prior to investment is made in any value added work for an asset. The assets in this category will comprise the Joint Development Portfolio and are further discussed in Section III below.

2. **Interim Leasing.** This category consists of those assets that have limited near term Joint Development potential, are currently available and/or significantly underutilized, do not
warrant permanent disposition due to anticipated favorable, long-term market shifts, yet offer interim revenue potential through leasing, licensing or other asset management. These assets should be managed through VTA’s leasing policies and procedures in a manner that is industry competitive yet compatible with the organization’s core purposes.

3. **Permanent Disposition.** This category is reserved for those assets that offer limited Joint Development potential, either because of their small sizes (which limit the economic viability of a public private partnership), the complexity of their local land use regulatory environments, difficult site attributes/constraints, or other factors affecting their development feasibility. These properties may be either disposed of for fair market value pursuant to VTA’s disposition policies and procedures or used for exchange of fair market value property with private or public entities as determined by the VTA through formal actions. Properties in this category should not be considered for joint development once active disposition strategies have been implemented without a thorough analysis at the staff level of such reconsideration.

4. **Land Banking.** Assets in this category include those which do not readily fall into one of the above-mentioned categories due to any number of factors, including the insufficiency of information necessary to ascertain the asset’s potential, contingency upon the occurrence of future events, planning efforts and/or capital projects, and anticipated favorable changes in the long term market dynamics relevant to the asset. Any asset in the Land Banking category should be regularly assessed for its suitability for interim leasing and deployed on such a strategic plan as appropriate.

The attached Exhibit A illustrates the categorization of assets as described above.

The above categorization of assets is only a preliminary assessment of the respective assets’ potential and not intended to be a final determination of their disposition. As such, the RE Inventory may place the same asset into multiple categories if several disposition strategies appear viable, key data to narrow the categorization is not readily available, or further refinement is contingent upon the occurrence of future events, planning efforts or capital projects.

C. **UPDATES TO RE INVENTORY**

The RE Inventory will be periodically reviewed and updated as necessary to reflect new acquisitions, sales, and other asset dispositions so as to ensure its accuracy and completeness to the maximum extent possible. The categorization of assets, in a manner consistent with the procedures outlined above, may be modified at staff level from time to time, as new information is learned about particular assets and/or to address VTA’s changing real estate needs. However, the creation or deletion of any category of asset altogether (from those categories noted in Section II.B. above) must be done through a VTA Board-approved amendment of this Implementation Plan.
Of critical import will be synchronization of the RE Inventory with VTA’s planned system extensions and upgrades as well as key regulations governing any given site. New land use regulations and plans -- especially those affecting housing density and location and those affecting transit funding – should be incorporated in the RE Inventory, including updated Regional Plans from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission and the Association of Bay Area Governments (which provides population projections that govern the “Housing Elements” of each jurisdiction’s General Plan or Special Area Plan).

III. JOINT DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

Undertaking a robust joint development program is a highly complex undertaking and requires a systematic plan of action. The starting point for such a plan of action is the category of Joint Development assets catalogued in the RE Inventory. To truly understand their Joint Development potential, these assets must be analyzed further through an economic gauge. One industry standard gauge is a residual land value analysis to determine the market-based value of these assets for near-term development. Other economic methodologies may be used appropriate.

A. INITIAL ECONOMIC ANALYSES

First-level financial evaluations for the assets in the Joint Development Category will be carried out to estimate what each given site would yield to VTA, financially, as expressed in relative terms. This task requires each site to be evaluated broadly for its general characteristics of development (such as height, density, parking requirements, etc.) and then by alternative development uses (residential housing, office, retail, and/or mixed-use). Parking requirements per type of development are also estimated.

From these typical prototypes, an estimate is generated on the potential cost at which the site could be developed for a given use at a given density. Overall land value is thus estimated. In addition, using recently published secondary data sources of the prices at which similar projects have sold, or rented, revenues are projected for each type of use at a given site. Comparing the costs with the revenues, a very broad-scale analysis of the residential land value is obtained. The result is not an actual figure, but a relative range of costs and a relative range of potential financial return to VTA for each development alternative.

For example, Site A may be evaluated for its potential to support (a) 20 units of housing at low-density with surface parking; compared to (b) 40 units of medium-density housing with a garage; or (c) 100 units of housing with underground parking. Construction costs will vary depending on the scenario. Prices will also vary on what a developer could sell housing units for, or in the case or rental housing, what rental rates could be charged. Through calculations that determine the resulting residual land value of various options, the VTA can estimate relative returns to the agency of different options. (NOTE: These estimates may differ from those that would result strictly from a land appraisal, as the theoretical scenarios that are evaluated consider such factors as the potential to alter zoning, change in housing density permitted, and other factors.)
As the evaluation process proceeds, VTA seeks early and continuous consultation and input from local regulatory agencies, the community and other stakeholders as identified. The iterations of these communications inform the final consideration of a site’s potential.

Any newly acquired assets included in the RE Inventory Joint Development category are to be evaluated through similar economic methodology. Their respective residual land values shall be compared to the values obtained in the last analysis conducted for the previously categorized assets so as to inform the path on which the newly acquired assets should proceed in accordance with the steps outlined below.

B. CATALOGUING BY DEVELOPMENT PROTOTYPE

The residual land values and other economic analysis, if any, calculated above shall be used to refine the assets into a Joint Development Portfolio. This portfolio shall consist of only those assets that have identified to have true economic potential for joint development, either near or long term. In addition to the site specific data included in the RE Inventory, the Joint Development Portfolio shall include the development prototypes likely to be suitable for the respective assets and shall catalog the assets according to these prototypes.

Similar to the RE Inventory, VTA staff will make every effort possible to compile and maintain the Joint Development Portfolio using the most appropriate technological tools then available (e.g., GIS, SAP, PATH, Excel).

The most current Joint Development Portfolio shall be incorporated by reference into this Implementation Plan and included as Attachment 2.

C. UPDATES TO JOINT DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

The Joint Development Portfolio will be periodically reviewed and updated as necessary, particularly when the RE Inventory is updated so as to ensure its accuracy and completeness to the maximum extent possible. The Joint Development Portfolio may be modified at VTA staff level from time to time, as new information is learned about particular assets and/or to address VTA’s changing real estate needs.

IV. THE JOINT DEVELOPMENT PRIORITY SCHEDULE

From the Joint Development Portfolio, VTA staff will, from time to time, but not less than every five years, propose to the VTA Board a specific set of VTA real estate assets that will become the priority joint development sites for the organization, either because these sites warrant certain value-added investment to be made by VTA in the near term and/or these sites have been determined to hold the greatest potential for joint development project in the foreseeable future. The priority assets, as approved by the VTA Board, will comprise the Joint Development Priority Schedule (Priority Schedule).

A. GOALS OF PRIORITY SCHEDULE
The primary intention of the *Priority Schedule* is to target VTA’s limited resources toward those assets which have greater certainty and capacity to generate revenue as well as meet the other goals of the *Joint Development Policy*. VTA’s real estate holdings are extensive and a focused plan of action for the implementation of VTA’s Joint Development Program is necessary to reach success. Moreover, many of VTA’s real estate assets have complex operational and site constraints and involve multiple stakeholders and cannot all be developed at the same time or without concerted efforts at the organizational level.

In addition to identifying those assets with the most near term development potential, the *Priority Schedule* may also be used to ascertain those select sites which necessitate near term value add investment to be made to them by VTA. Not all sites within the *Joint Development Portfolio* will be deemed ripe for development immediately. Specific site issues, pre-development requirements, entitlement reviews and local planning agency plans will affect the timing of VTA’s Joint Development efforts. The need for infrastructure replacement, ascertaining the extent of environmental contamination, moving or replacing VTA transit-related functions, terminating or buying-out existing leaseholds, clarifying title disputes to land parcels, completing a community’s General Plan update are all examples of pre-development constraints that would delay a site’s development.

While these constraints would prevent the immediate development of certain sites, they may nonetheless warrant VTA to focus the organization’s near term efforts on the constrained sites. This is due to any number of factors, such as that the constraints are related to VTA’s other time-sensitive efforts or needs; the sites themselves offer tremendous Joint Development potential once the constraints are properly addressed; and there exists strong external interest for a particular site either because of market-driven forces or local jurisdictional objectives. These constraints, if sufficiently weighty in comparison to other factors, may justify the relevant sites to be identified as near term priorities on the *Priority Schedule*.

Given the above, the expectation is that the *Priority Schedule* will be a formal compilation of the known technical and planning issues for each site identified in the *Joint Development Portfolio*. The document will identify as near-term “priority sites” those assets that either offer near term high-economic value or are in need of focused value-add investment efforts. In addition to these “priority sites,” the Priority Schedule will indicate the relative timeliness for Joint Development (or value-add investment) of the remainder of the assets itemized in the *Joint Development Portfolio*.

**B. PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA**

To create the *Priority Schedule*, the VTA Joint Development Program staff and consultants will employ professional evaluation of the *Joint Development Portfolio* assets using criteria that include the sites’ physical attributes and constraints; the potential economic values resulting from anticipated joint development; the potential impacts on other VTA projects or activities Joint Development of the respective assets will have; any environmental and other significant constraints pertaining to each site; and the local land use regulatory environment.
relevant to each asset. The weighting given to the respective prioritization criteria will be consistent with the Joint Development Policy.

Each asset will be assessed by the following prioritization criteria to address site-specific issues:

1. **Parcel and/or Asset Size and Improvements.** Is the site of a suitable size for a public-private partnership structure? Does it contain improvements to be reused, sold or replaced? Are there other improvements on site?

2. **Transit Access/Impacts.** Does the site have access to existing light-rail, Caltrain, BART, VTA, high speed rail, or other transit services or is it scheduled to have access in a planned extension? Will Joint Development of the site impact VTA’s transit operations or facilities, either favorably or negatively?

3. **Site Availability.** Is the site compatible with VTA plans and operations and available for redevelopment or does VTA have commitments for the site that constrain its use?

4. **Location Efficiency.** Is the site located in close proximity to job-generating centers and to commercial services that serve commuters and residents? Will joint development of the site encourage/increase transit use?

5. **Developer/Market Interest.** Has developer interest been expressed in the site or similar development proximate to the site? Is there a market for the type of product anticipated on the site through Joint Development?

6. **Land Use Policy.** Is the site located in a jurisdiction with land use designations conducive to the anticipated development or would a zoning and/or General Plan Amendment be required?

7. **Municipal Responsiveness.** What is the initial response by the local jurisdiction’s staff to VTA outreach regarding Joint Development on the site? What is the existing or anticipated response by local residents and other stakeholders to joint development on the site?

8. **Environmental Constraints.** Is the site located in an area with known soils contamination, in a floodplain, or along a riparian corridor? What level of review and impact mitigation would be required for the anticipated development prototypes under the California Environmental Quality Act or the National Environmental Protection Act?

9. **Revenue.** Is Joint Development likely to generate positive cash flow, preferably in the form of a long-term revenue stream, to VTA? Is a significant upfront investment required by VTA to generate the anticipated revenue?
10. **Other Criteria.** As discussed above, constrained sites may also become near term priorities for VTA due to any number of factors, including other VTA time-sensitive efforts or needs, market forces and local jurisdictional preferences. These factors will be considered in the prioritization of the assets as appropriate.

C. **STAKEHOLDER REVIEWS**

To enable an informed application of the prioritization criteria for the various assets being considered, VTA Joint Development staff will solicit stakeholder input through an iterative process of site evaluation and response by the following groups and agencies:

1. **Intra-Agency.** Joint Development staff will review sites with appropriate VTA departments with the purpose of identifying physical planning issues, timing, costs associated with redevelopment of a site currently in use for a VTA purpose and related organizational concerns.

2. **Local Jurisdictions.** Joint Development staff will review the sites with officials of the relevant jurisdictions in order to identify local planning agency goals and objectives regarding the specific sites and to identify other key constraints and opportunities regarding the implementation of a Joint Development effort in that jurisdiction.

3. **Regional Bodies.** As appropriate, the Joint Development staff will inform, seek input from and collaborate with regional organizations such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group regarding VTA’s Joint Development program generally and Joint Development priorities specifically.

4. **General Public.** The Joint Development staff will acquaint the general public with VTA’s Joint Development program and solicit input from the public on VTA’s Joint Development priorities, as deemed appropriate by staff.

5. **VTA Management.** The VTA Joint Development staff will seek early and regular input from relevant management levels, including the General Manager, across the organization on the *Priority Schedule* as it is being formulated and finalized for Board approval.

6. **VTA Board Committees.** The final draft *Priority Schedule* will be presented to the appropriate advisory and standing committees of VTA’s Board for consideration and approval pursuant to VTA’s established Board adoption policies and procedures.

D. **FORMAL VTA BOARD ADOPTION**

The VTA Joint Development Program will seek VTA Board approval for the final *Priority Schedule*. The staff report for the proposed Board agenda item will provide all requisite information necessary to make an informed decision regarding the various assets under
consideration. Such information will include, at a minimum, an overview of the physical attributes of the respective assets; a summary of the findings of the various technical, planning and economic analyses conducted; intra-agency feedback on the proposed Priority Schedule; input received from the various localities and the general public during the stakeholder review process; and the deciding factors for the staff’s recommendations.

Once approved by the VTA Board, the Priority Schedule will serve as the framework for the Joint Development Program’s ongoing efforts until it is amended consistent with the procedures outlined below. Specifically, the priority sites identified on the approved Priority Schedule will be the primary focus of VTA efforts, including all significant expenditures made for Joint Development activities. Nonetheless, because of the dynamic nature of real estate development and to ensure that all opportunities are considered as presented, the procedures outlined in this Implementation Plan should not be deemed a prohibition for the VTA Joint Development Program to engage in routine development activities regarding the overall Joint Development Portfolio, such as conducting preliminary analysis, responding to questions from or engaging in general discussions with external parties, or conducting basic due diligence regarding Joint Development opportunities for assets other than the approved priority sites. If after such routine development activities, the VTA Joint Development Program determines that any given asset should become a “priority site” on the Priority Schedule, it should seek a formal amendment to the Priority Schedule pursuant to the procedures outlined below.

The most current Priority Schedule shall be incorporated by reference into this Implementation Plan and included as Attachment 3.

E. AMENDMENT PROCESS

The Priority Schedule is intended to be a relatively stable document that will be renewed from time to time, but not less often than every five years. However, land development is subject to a great many unforeseen circumstances that can affect a given site’s priority in the Priority Schedule. Thus, the Joint Development staff may propose a formal amendment of the Priority Schedule at any time for any reason, including: at the conclusion of site build-out, if significant new information about a site is uncovered; if an opportunity for development of a site not on the Priority Schedule appears; dramatic market changes affecting the site’s near term viability; or potential impacts or interests from other VTA projects or external parties. The amendment of the Priority Schedule would only occur if the Joint Development Program has gone through the process noted above to examine a site, analyzed it against the listed prioritization criteria, and solicited the input of key stakeholders through the outreach process noted above.

V. SITE-SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES

The next step for each of the priority sites identified in the approved Priority Schedule is either to implement the recommended value-add strategies or to enter into a development path, as appropriate. In the case of the former sites, the value-add strategies will be implemented as envisioned in the Priority Schedule in a manner deemed appropriate by the
Joint Development Program and General Manager and consistent with the Joint Development Guidance Documents.

In the case of the priority sites embarking upon a development path, VTA’s Joint Development Program will follow the procedures outlined below to ensure that a consensus-driven, participatory process is employed.

A. FORMULATION OF DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT

For each relevant priority site, VTA’s Joint Development Program will define, at a conceptual level, a viable development prototype consistent with the procedures outlined below. The viability of a development prototype will be ascertained from both a market perspective through early developer outreach as well as from an entitlement perspective through a collaborative process involving the affected land use jurisdictions and other key stakeholders. The intention is to arrive at a development prototype that has a mix of uses, desired density, height and bulk requirements, general aesthetic and design elements, and site-specific improvements most likely to be supported by both the affected community and the market. The collection of proposed features for the site that results from this early consensus-building process is referred to as the “Development Concept.”

This early consensus-building process will include the following activities for most sites (see Exhibit B for a schematic representation of the sequence discussed):

1. **Developer Response.** The Joint Development Program will hold developer conferences or similar efforts in order to obtain responses as to the market-readiness of various kinds of uses proposed for the site and to identify potential constraints and opportunities reflected by this market-oriented group.

2. **Local Jurisdiction/Stakeholder Reviews.** The Joint Development Program will carry out extensive consultations with the officials of the affected local jurisdictions as well as with key stakeholders identified by the local officials to help define the parameters of the Development Concept and the likely land use regulatory process for such a project.

3. **Public Outreach.** The Joint Development Program will hold workshops and other kinds of community outreach consistent with the plans and procedures of the jurisdiction(s) involved to obtain early community response to the site uses and concepts being considered.

4. **Intra-Agency Consultations.** The Joint Development Program will create an internal, multi-departmental VTA “Project Team,” as appropriate; to examine the iterative development concept as it is being formulated.

5. **Regional Bodies.** As appropriate, the Joint Development staff will meet with regional organizations such as the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and the Silicon Valley Leadership Group as the
Development Concept is defined to identify grant funding or other economic incentives for such development.

6. **VTA Board Committee Reviews.** The Joint Development Program will present any final draft Development Concept to the appropriate advisory and standing committees of VTA’s Board for consideration and approval pursuant to VTA’s established policies and procedures for Board adoption.

**B. VTA BOARD APPROVAL**

The VTA Joint Development Program will seek VTA Board approval for the final Development Concept formulated for a given site prior to soliciting developer proposals for the development opportunity. The staff report for the proposed Board agenda item will describe the key elements of the Development Concept, the various steps taken to solicit input and build early consensus on the proposed concept, and the next steps. These next steps, in most cases, will include competitive solicitation of developer proposals and entering into contractual agreements with the selected developer(s), consistent with VTA’s policies and the procedures outlined below. If staff recommends VTA engage in a competitive solicitation process through the issuance of a Request for Proposals (RFP), the Board would approve the substantive terms of such a competitive solicitation at the same time it approves the Development Concept.

However, where the consultative process does not result in a clearly defined Development Concept for a given site, staff’s recommendation may be that VTA initiate a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process to generate new ideas for the site pursuant to the RFQ procedures outlined below. In this case, staff will recommend the substantive terms of such an RFQ for the Board to approve.

If the participatory process identifies significant constraints on moving forward with any Development Concept for a priority site, the Joint Development Program should present such information to the Board and recommend either amending the *Priority Schedule* to recharacterize the priority of the site or a strategy for resolving the identified constraints prior to pursuing any further development activities on the site.

Once approved by the VTA Board, the Development Concept will form the basis for the subsequent joint development actions on the site, as described in more detail below.

**VI. DEVELOPER SELECTION PROCESS**

After engaging in the participatory process outlined in Section IV above, VTA must next determine which of two possible routes the agency wishes to take to select developers with direct experience in the type of site use and design concept contemplated for a given site, either through an RFP or an RFQ leading to an RFP. By orchestrating a process that is specific to each site—and is based on the Development Concept for a particular mix of uses
contemplated for that site—VTA expects to be able to target projects to those developers with direct experience in the particular mix of uses proposed for a given jurisdiction.

As noted above, where the consultative process did not result in a clearly defined Development Concept for a given site, staff’s recommendation may be to embark upon an RFQ process to generate new ideas for the site. Where a clear Development Concept does result from the consultations with stakeholders, VTA will, in most cases, issue an RFP.

A. REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

For sites where the VTA Board determines an RFP is the appropriate vehicle, the Board would approve the substantive terms of such an issuance at the same time it approves the Development Concept. Generally, the RFP would require respondents to provide a site development proposal that satisfies the approved Development Concept, a financial pro forma laying out proposed financial terms, and a schedule of development. Market-standard requirements for the given Development Concept also would be called out in the specific RFP document and/or in separate VTA procurement policies and procedures. At a minimum, the RFP would include the:

1. **Developer Qualifications.** Extensive firm and project team experience in transit-oriented development projects, in projects that have generated strong revenue generation for public agencies as joint partners, in achieving required high-quality urban design, and in managing highly complex construction projects on time and budget.

2. **Commitment to Environmental Building Practices.** Experience in construction projects that include environmentally-sustainable practices and products, in conformance with local jurisdiction requirements, and that have achieved LEED certification or similar building measures.

3. **Strong Familiarity with Complex Land Use Environments.** Strong familiarity with and, preferably, proven success with navigating development projects through complex land use regulatory environments.

4. **Ground Lease Management.** For projects that involve ground leases with VTA, experience with public agencies, with successful property management and profit-and-loss management of real estate developments over time, and/or in the sales and leasing of residential and commercial development products, as appropriate.

B. REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS, QUALIFIED DEVELOPER LIST, AND RFP

As noted above, in some cases where a clear Development Concept has not emerged or there is a desire to test market feasibility of a potential design concept or concepts, VTA may first issue an RFQ to identify a set of qualified developers with experience in the type of uses contemplated for a given site and the capacity to enter into a public-private project of the type envisioned. Those developers selected to be on the “Qualified Developer List” will then
receive an RFP soliciting their interest in constructing the project and fulfilling the financial goals of the VTA with the project. The VTA Board must approve the terms and conditions set forth in the RFQ, as well as the subsequent Qualified Developer List and RFP.

C. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

To review and score the RFPs, VTA will establish a proposal evaluation process that involves agency staff from the VTA Project Team and the Joint Development Program and the appropriate staff from the local jurisdictions, consistent with VTA’s competitive bidding process. The process will employ evaluation criteria selected for each project based on the circumstances at hand, and those criteria will be included in a subsequent action item to the Board concerning any proposed developer.

For projects involving an RFQ, the initial review will be by VTA staff only, but any subsequent RFP resulting from the RFQ would involve the larger team as noted above.

The assembled group reserves the right not to select a developer from the RFP process and to re-structure the RFP or RFQ if the response is unsatisfactory.

From time to time, the Joint Development Program will solicit external comments on the efficiency of the process and solicit comments on how it may be improved.

D. VTA BOARD APPROVAL OF DEVELOPER’S PROPOSED RESPONSE

The VTA Board must approve the proposed selection by VTA of a Developer’s Response to the RFP. Following established procedure, the approval will generally be limited to acceptance of the Design Concept and will include approval to enter into negotiations with a Developer toward an Exclusive Negotiation Agreement. The approval is conducted formally in an open session properly noticed and includes consideration of the Developer’s response to the RFP, including the response to all terms and conditions as set forth in the approved RFP. The Board reserves the right to request negotiation with the selected developer to improve the proposal as necessary. The Board also reserves the right to reject the staff proposal and to select an alternative or to order the staff to conduct an additional review process.

The staff report prepared for the Board’s consideration of the item will fully explain key issues in the RFP or RFQ, summarize the responses received to the RFP or RFQ, the process by which the Developer’s proposal was reviewed, the ranking of the selected proposal, and any significant matters the staff and believe important for the Board’s informed review. If the proposal is not unanimously supported by the VTA staff, the reasons for differences in scoring, or position, will be summarized for the Board in the staff report.

E. UNSOLICITED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

From time to time, VTA may receive unsolicited offers to acquire or develop sites. Notwithstanding the competitive solicitation process outlined above, the Joint Development
Program will examine any such offers based on the criteria described below. The primary intention is to ascertain if the unsolicited offers have the likelihood to achieve the Joint Development Policy objectives better than the standard procedures outlined in this Implementation Plan.

Specifically, the unsolicited offers would be considered only if:

- The unsolicited property is not located at or near a light rail, Caltrain or BART station;
- The unsolicited property does not offer significant potential for Joint Development through a public private partnership;
- The unsolicited property size is very limited; and
- A financial analysis of the proposal concludes that accepting the offer is more cost-effective to VTA than the costs associated with the competitive solicitation process required in the Guidance Documents.

Upon determining that an unsolicited offer should be considered, the Joint Development Program should initiate the participatory process outlined above to determine the level of internal and external consensus for the unsolicited offer and make a recommendation to the VTA Board for formal action.

VII. DEVELOPMENT PATH – EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATION AGREEMENT AND JOINT DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

For all projects, following selection of a Developer, the VTA Board will authorize the General Manager to negotiate and execute an Exclusive Negotiating Agreement (ENA) between the Developer and VTA. The ENA grants the Developer sole opportunity to propose a development project for the land subject to the ENA during the term of the ENA. If all the terms of the ENA are subsequently satisfied, including the approval by the local jurisdiction of the project, the VTA Board may approve a proposed Joint Development Agreement (JDA) which sets forth the respective obligations of the Developer and VTA regarding development of the site and compensation to VTA and defines the legal structure between the Developer and VTA that is most appropriate for the particular project (e.g., a long term ground lease, a purchase and sale, or a combination of both).

A. EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATING AGREEMENT

The ENA establishes a project schedule under which the developer is permitted to carry out certain tasks to develop a project and the VTA is obligated to provide appropriate assistance and review. A non-refundable fee is charged by VTA for all ENAs, to include fees for VTA staffing to the necessary coordination, technical reviews and agency support during the term of the ENA. Developer task include the following, among others:

1. **Due Diligence.** To conduct due diligence investigations of the subject property, including title searches, property inspections, environmental test, and similar work.
2. **Stakeholder Involvement.** To meet with stakeholders on alternative proposals for the site, including the jurisdiction, the general public, VTA advisory groups and others.

3. **Final Project Design and Uses.** To propose a final project design and mix of uses to the VTA Board for their approval in a format set forth by VTA as part of the approval.

4. **Financial Pro Forma.** To produce a financial pro forma for the final project in sufficient detail to permit financial analysis by VTA.

5. **Submittal to Local Planning Authority for Approval.** If the final project is approved, to submit a formal application including the project information to the local governmental jurisdiction for planning approvals.

6. **Joint Development Agreement Negotiation.** To negotiate a Joint Development Agreement for subsequent approval.

### B. JOINT DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Subsequent to approval of a project by the VTA Board and the local land use having jurisdiction, VTA will negotiate a JDA that is project-appropriate and reflective of industry standards for public-private property development. The JDA covers the following topics in most cases:

1. **Ownership.** Assignment, transfers and management control is established.

2. **Site Description and Development Site Plan.** Maps, legal description of the property, including air space development rights, and other requirements that may be specific to the VTA (track alignment paths, for example); site plan; specific technical plans for construction, grading and landscaping; subdivision maps and similar maps.

3. **Permit Requirements.** An enumeration of the permits and planning approvals and covenants that VTA will cooperate with the Developer to obtain, to include permitted and prohibited uses.

4. **Funding and Financing.** Evidence of financial capability to carry out the project; compensation and other payments required to be conveyed to VTA, payments of taxes and insurance; hold harmless and indemnity clauses; allocation of liability and responsibility for remediation of environmental contamination.

5. **Environmental and Other Entitlements.** Certifications of compliance with environmental regulations and restrictions required by the state, regional agencies, the federal government or other entities.

6. **Specification of VTA Approval Rights of Approval.** Depending on the site, there may be an extensive list of matters the VTA will retain the rights to approve, such as
vehicular entrances and exits, relocation of property, ownership rights of leaseholds and similar matters.

VIII. POST-CONSTRUCTION REVIEW

The Post-Construction Review will be led by the Project Team and VTA Project Manager, who will prepare a report on the effectiveness of the process and procedures and provide an opportunity for VTA staff and management and to amend these. Typically occurring at the 11th month after a Certificate of Occupancy is issued by the local jurisdiction, such a review would include:

- Examining the developer selection process at close of construction to determine if adequate criteria were used and if the developer’s communications, documentation and responsiveness were in accord with the ENA;
- Determining if the quality of construction as determined by the punch list of remaining issues;
- Noting any desired changes to VTA specifications for future similar projects, noting quality of materials, aesthetic requirements or engineering requirements;
- Noting the effects on transit operations and whether they were properly accounted for in the project scope;
- Concluding if the budget and change orders fell within expected parameters
- Examining the revenue projections included in the JDA and noting any unusual market conditions, use changes or other factors that may affect the revenue projection
- Project Team effectiveness in identifying critical issues, responding to requests for information by developer and identifying issues for the developer to respond to, this portion of the report to include suggestions for improvements in the project management process
- Other matters that may arise in the course of the project

This report would be made available to the VTA General Manager and a summary may be provided to the Board or a subcommittee as it deems appropriate.
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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

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

ACTION ITEM

RECOMMENDATION:

Adopt the 2009 Annual Transit Service Plan and the recommended service changes.

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.

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 under performing 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 has been completed for the major bus service changes and is included in the submitted Annual Transit Service Plan.

Implementation of proposed service 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):** Currently Line 17 operates as a large one-way loop serving Kaiser and Valley Health Center on the south end of the route and St. Louise Hospital and a Social Services facility on the north end. Line 14 runs a west/east route serving the Gilroy Crossings Shopping Center. In order to make the Line 17 route more convenient it would be changed to two-way service from the Social Services facility on Tomkins Court to the Gilroy Transit Center. The weekday frequency for Line 17 would be improved to operate every 30 minutes from its current frequency of every 60 minutes. The line would operate on weekdays only, from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Line 14 would fill the service gap left by the 17 via the newly opened bridge along Camino Arroyo. It would be extended to two-way service between the Gilroy Transit Center, the outlet stores, the Kaiser Clinic, Valley Health Center and St. Louise Hospital. It would operate from 7:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, 9:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on Saturdays and 9:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on Sundays. Currently, the line runs every 60 minutes during the weekdays, which would be improved to every 30 minutes.
A three-year Lifeline Grant has been approved by the VTA Board, which covers 80% of these service improvements. The grant also provides for bus stop improvements and promoting the new service. MTC approval of this grant is still pending.

**Line 15 (Morgan Hill Community Bus):** Community Bus services in Morgan Hill and Gilroy, including Line 15 was studied and implemented in July of 2007. VTA staff, the City of Morgan Hill and other stakeholders met to develop service changes to improve ridership levels. Line 15 has been a long-time low performing VTA route and was converted, along with Line 16 to Community Bus service. Other changes included extending the route to the new Centennial Recreation Center and the housing developments along LeCrosse and Watsonville Road during the midday. Service to Holiday Lakes Estates was retained for school trips.

An extensive marketing campaign was implemented in South County to attract more passengers to these routes. Despite service changes and marketing efforts Line 15 continues to perform well below minimum standards. This line is proposed to be discontinued due to poor ridership performance.

**Line 37 (Capitol Light Rail Station to West Valley College - Community Bus):** Currently Line 37 does not operate on Saturdays. To improve VTA west/east coverage in this area, service would be implemented between the Capitol Light Rail Station and the Winchester Light Rail Station along Hillsdale Avenue. VTA has received many requests to add this service. This new Saturday service would operate every 60 minutes between the stations.

**Line 45 (Alum Rock Light Rail Station to Penitencia Creek Light Rail Station - Community Bus):** Prior to New Bus Service implementation in January 2008, the routing of Line 45 was an extension of Line 64. Due to lower ridership the new Line 45 was created as a community bus route. To date it is still performing well below the ridership standards. In an effort to use these resources where they are needed most, service frequency would be reduced on weekdays and Saturdays to operate every 60 minutes instead of 30 minutes as it currently does. On weekdays, this route would operate until 7:30 p.m. On Saturdays, service would operate from 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. and Sunday service would operate from 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

**Line 63 (Almaden Valley to San Jose State University):** Currently this line runs every 30 minutes on Saturdays. The Saturday ridership levels are on average below the performance standard for routes in the local network. Service will be changed to operate every 60 minutes to address this low ridership.

**Line 64 (Almaden Light Rail Station to McKee & White):** On Saturdays, Line 64 operates every 30 minutes with additional trips to provide 15 minute service between San Jose Diridon and McKee & White. The average peak load on these trips is 6 riders. It is proposed that Saturday service operate every 30 minutes over the entire line with the elimination of the extra trips between McKee & White and the San Jose Diridon.

**Line 66: Kaiser San Jose to Milpitas/Dixon Road**
**Line 68: Gilroy Transit Center to San Jose Diridon Transit Center**
Ridership on Lines 66 and 68 increased by 15-20% in 2008. The higher ridership levels have led
to more demand for frequent service. Currently, not all of the trips serve all stops and the routes run at different frequencies (15 and 30 minutes) throughout the day. These lines are important arterial routes in our Core network. In order to make both routes more convenient and address current overload situations, both lines would be modified to operate every 15 minutes all day over the entire route on weekdays.

**Line 88 (Palo Alto Community Bus):** As an outcome of the COA process, VTA engaged in a community based planning study to determine how to best integrate VTA’s bus service with shuttles provided by Stanford University (Marguerite Shuttle) and the City of Palo Alto. Line 88 has historically exhibited low ridership that needed to be addressed. As a result of the study, the Line 88 service was implemented as a Community Bus in July 2008. Service was improved to operate every 30 minutes (from every 60 minutes) in the peak hours and the routing was modified. Service to Gunn High School, the major generator on the route was also improved and has done well. However the other Line 88 trips continue to perform poorly, carrying an average of 4 passengers per trip. These light loads do not justify continuing the 30 minute peak frequencies. It is proposed that service return to operating every 60 minutes on weekdays. Special routing on selected trips to Jordan Middle School would be discontinued but no changes are proposed to the main trips serving Gunn High School.

**Line 89 (California Ave. Caltrain Station to Stanford Research Park):** Line 89 has been operating as a Community Bus. However, due to high ridership a larger, 40 foot bus has been substituted on many of the trips to increase the load capacity. Instead of operating both community buses and large buses, this line would be converted from a Community Bus line to a regular bus line with standard VTA fares.

**Express 180: Fremont BART Station to Great Mall Transit Center & San Jose Diridon**

Express 180 would continue to operate on the existing routing on Mission Boulevard between Fremont BART and the Great Mall. It would operate every 30 minutes all day on weekdays and hourly in the evenings until approx. 10:30 p.m. There would be no change to the weekend service, which would go to both Great Mall and downtown San Jose every 30 minutes. On weekends, a new 7:42 p.m. southbound trip would be added.

Express 181, which currently operate during peak hours only, would be modified to operate every 15 minutes all day in both directions until 7:00 p.m., between the Fremont BART Station and the San Jose Diridon Transit Center. Line 181 would be modified to operate via Stevenson and I-880 instead of Mission Boulevard and I-680. A new Park & Ride location will be available at Stevenson & Civic Center Drive.

**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)
As a result of the COA, Community Bus Line 11 was created to replace Lines 82 and 85 that served the area just north of downtown. The line also serves the Northside Community Center and the San Jose Market Center. VTA worked with the neighborhood and the City Council Office to plan and implement this route. Due to lower than expected ridership performance on some sections of the route, a study that re-engages the community to explore potential service changes is proposed.

Community Bus Line 13 (Almaden Valley - Oakridge - Ohlone/Chynoweth Light Rail)
Community Bus Line 13 connects the Almaden Valley to the VTA’s core transit service, light rail and the Oakridge Mall. However, it has been performing below minimum standards. A study to consider re-routing and other service changes is proposed in order to increase ridership and productivity. Initial discussions with the local Council Office have been held to identify community stakeholders to participate in the planning process.

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 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. Lines 32, 35, 40, 51 and 52 also serve the surrounding area. 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 Line 81 currently serves the Santa Clara Kaiser facility only from east/west directions. VTA and community input have identified a need for north/south service from the El Camino to the medical facility campus. The new community bus route would provide a convenient, direct connection from the core service VTA operates on the El Camino, such as Line 22 and Rapid 522. A study will be conducted to determine how to route the new line and where bus stops will be located. Early discussions with Kaiser administration staff have indicated their support of the route. Ideas to support the route such as employee/patient surveys, promotions, Eco Pass participation and direct funding have been discussed.

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
Changes are 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 proposals are indicative of the service changes that VTA makes every quarter to improve our transit system. Service adjustments of this nature are reported quarterly to the VTA’s Transit Planning and Operations Committee. These proposals have been included in the public outreach process, so input and comments could be solicited. They will be implemented in July 2009.

Public Outreach and Comments
A comprehensive community outreach and marketing plan was implemented to afford the public numerous opportunities to learn of the proposed service changes and provide input and comment.

- Briefed and received input from four VTA Advisory Committees in January: the Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC); the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA); Policy Advisory Committee (PAC); and, the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC).
- Held 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>2pm</td>
<td>31, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>2pm</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>

The meetings and proposed service changes were promoted in the following manner:

- Advertised in community newspapers throughout Santa Clara County prior to meetings.
- Media releases sent to newspapers, broadcast media, multilingual media and daily publications.
- Information and proposals were posted on VTA.org with opportunities to comment by email.
- Meeting announcements were provided to city websites and access cable channel outlets.
- Fliers were mailed to cities in Santa Clara County, Eco Pass employers, community organizations including those on the Title VI list and other stakeholders.
- Proposals were e-mailed to several outreach mailing lists including Eco Pass participants.
- Interior car cards were displayed on all bus and light rail vehicles.
- Information published in December rider newsletter, Take One, giving passengers a “heads up” and directing them to look for more details in a “Special Take One.”
- “Special Take One” distributed on all VTA vehicles in the first or second week of January with information on service changes and meeting schedule.
- Meeting announcement fliers included in mailing to monthly pass holders and Eco Pass participants/employers.
- Information made available at the Downtown Customer Service Center and River Oaks.
- All customer service representatives were briefed.
The outreach process resulted in hundreds of comments from community members at the public meetings. 103 persons attended these eight public sessions. Additionally almost 70 comments were received by VTA’s Customer Service department. Summary reports of each public meeting were produced by VTA staff. Comments received through the Customer Service department via email, letter or telephone call are individually documented.

VTA staff evaluated the public input to determine how to address them in the final plan. Many comments were regarding specific trips times and schedules on certain lines. These types of comments were received regarding almost all VTA routes. As much as possible, proposals were reevaluated and revised to reflect this input.

Overall there seems to be a good public understanding of VTA’s approach to re-allocate services from under performing routes to other routes and markets that demand improved transit service. A few major themes did arise from the public outreach and comment process. Certain service change proposals elicited the most comments and public concern.

Line 26 (Eastridge Transit Center - Sunnyvale/Lockheed Martin): Many current passengers requested more frequent service on Line 26, particularly on the section of route connecting El Camino to the Moffett Park area. Commentors were mainly high tech and other employees traveling to Moffett Park. VTA’s original proposal does include adding more trips into peak period service.

Community Bus Line 45 (Alum Rock Transit Center - Penitencia Creek Transit Center): Passengers are displeased with the proposed reduction in weekday and Saturday service from buses running every 30 minutes to every 60 minutes due to low ridership. A Community Based Transportation Plan for East San Jose is being completed by VTA that identifies an action plan and potential funding sources to address transportation needs in this area. This plan could be the catalyst to attract Lifeline grant funding through MTC to provide additional public transit service in this area, particularly east of White Road.

Lines 61 and 62 (Good Samaritan Hospital to Sierra & Piedmont): Only schedule and trip revisions were originally proposed by VTA for these routes. However San Jose Councilmember Chu and the Berryessa Union School District requested that we review how these two lines are routed in Berryessa to better serve students at Piedmont Middle School. Currently Line 62 operates on Sierra Road east of Capitol Avenue while Line 61 uses Berryessa. Essentially the routing of these two line was to be swapped so Line 62 would use Berryessa and Line 61 would use Sierra. This would eliminate the need for some students traveling to Piedmont Middle School to have to transfer at Capitol Avenue.

Community Bus Line 88 (Palo Alto Veteran’s Hospital to California Avenue Caltrain): Line 88 has historically exhibited low ridership. Saturday service has not been provided on this line since January 2008 when it was discontinued due to low ridership (1-2 passengers per trip). In July 2008, based on VTA planning study with the City of Palo Alto and Stanford, Line 88
Service was improved to operate every 30 minutes from every 60 minutes in the peak hours. Service to Gunn High School, the major generator on the route was also improved and has done well. However the other Line 88 trips continue to perform poorly, carrying an average of 4 passengers per trip and do not justify continuing the 30 minute peak frequencies, so we are proposing that service return to operating every 60 minutes on weekdays. Veterans from the Palo Alto VA Hospital and the Western Blind Rehabilitation Center located there attended one of our public meetings to request that the service not be reduced and Saturday service be restored. However given the low ridership here we cannot justify any higher levels of service. A letter from Congress member Eshoo was received supporting the veterans.

Express 180 & Express 181 (Fremont BART to San Jose Diridon Station): Proposed service changes on the rerouting of these two lines garnered the most public commentary. Initially staff proposed to reroute both lines to use I-880, instead of I-680, to take advantage of the recently opened HOV lane and completion of the Mission Boulevard interchange. Many riders objected to changing both lines as it would inconvenience those going to the Great Mall as well as those who were using Park & Ride locations along Mission Boulevard. To accommodate these riders, the proposal has been changed to include a rerouting of only the Express 181 to use I-880.

Deferred Service Improvements
Unfortunately, with the current economic climate, the reduction of state funding for transit and the flat growth in sales tax, VTA must be cautious with service plan improvements given the need to address our operating deficit in the next couple fiscal years. As such, some of the originally proposed service improvements have been identified and will be deferred until VTA’s financial condition improves. These improvements, listed below, account for approximately 10,200 annual service hours.

Additionally, VTA has discontinued the operation of the Great America Shuttle for the 2009 season. This route exclusively served Great America employees traveling to the park. Small amount of funding was received by the air district ($15,000) and Great America ($36,000) however VTA’s subsidy was about $200,000 annually. This route accounts for 2,300 service hours annually.

The service change recommendations, including these deferred proposals were provided to the public in early March on VTA’s website and through mailings and email to interested citizens and organizations.

Line 23 - Additional weekday and Sunday evening trip
Line 25 - Additional morning trip on Saturday and Sunday
Line 26 - Eight additional peak trips between El Camino and Lockheed Martin
Community Bus Line 37 - New Saturday service
Community Bus Line 41 - New weekday route serving Kaiser Santa Clara Medical Center
Line 60 - Extend morning trip to Great America
Line 66 - Two additional Sunday evening trips
Line 68 - Two additional Sunday evening trips
Express Line 181 - Operate weekday midday frequency every 30 minutes instead of 15 minutes
Limited Stop Line 330 - Extend trips to Great Mall
Line 202 - Great America Shuttle

**ALTERNATIVES:**

The VTA Board of Directors could decide to adopt the plan in whole, just adopt certain service change recommendations or delay the timing of implementing the recommendations. Since the plan is developed on a cost-neutral basis, changes to the proposed plan could have financial implications.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The proposed Annual Transit Service Plan has been developed on a cost neutral basis. Service hours have been reallocated from substandard performing routes to other routes which have shown demand for additional resources. Some service improvements have been identified for deferral pending improvements in VTA's financial condition. These deferrals save about $1.3M annually.

Given the uncertainty of the current economic environment and anticipated deficits for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011 it is likely that future Annual Transit Service Plans may need to identify potential service reductions to help offset declining revenues.

**STANDING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

The Transit Planning and Operations Committee heard a presentation from staff.

The Committee asked if any public meetings were better attended than others and if there were any trends in attendance. Staff explained that meetings with higher attendance were in locations with major service changes and noted those meetings scheduled for after school were generally better attended.

The Committee recommended that future outreach programs for service changes include a card customers can fill out and turn in on the bus, noting this would be a good opportunity to capture feedback.

Staff reported the elimination of Community Bus Line 15 serving Morgan Hill, due to low ridership. The Committee asked about current rider demographics and expressed concern about the elderly passengers who use Line 15. Staff was requested to include information about alternate transportation services such as Outreach when notifying customers about the elimination of this service.

The Committee noted the high use of the Monterey Corridor noting that some neighborhoods east of Monterey do not have bus service. It is important to make the Monterey Corridor more accessible to these neighborhoods and perhaps future Community Bus studies could consider these neighborhoods.
The Committee discussed the recommended deferred service improvements and asked staff to explain the rationale behind the decision. Staff responded that the uncertain current economic conditions warrant the preservation of existing service and the service recommended for deferral are service improvements originally proposed for this Plan. The Committee felt it important to stress the importance of preserving our core service.

The Committee unanimously voted to adopt the 2009 Annual Transit Service Plan and the recommended service changes; the Committee further recommended this item for placement on the Board’s Regular Agenda for April 3, 2009.
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INTRODUCTION

Annually, VTA has prepared a Service Management Plan to evaluate performance of the transit system and to provide proposed service change recommendations. In 2007 and 2008, this process was deferred, while VTA engaged in the development of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA). The Annual Transit Service Plan continues the yearly process of service review and recommendations.

The Annual Transit Service Plan is the process and document that implements the policies set forward in the Transit Sustainability Policy. The mandated annual review of transit services includes an evaluation of existing services compared to the Board adopted performance standards contained in the Service Design Guidelines. It also includes a 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 Quarterly Transit Operations Performance Report provides the VTA Board a report card on the performance of every line in the VTA transit system. Based on these quarterly ridership updates, passenger input and detailed ridership data, the Annual Transit Service Plan proposes modifications to VTA’s bus and rail service. These include measures to increase or decrease service hours or frequency, change routing or service span, add new service and increase marketing. The Plan also considers studies for future service options. The ultimate alternative for underperforming lines is deletion and reinvestment of those resources into stronger transit markets.

Comprehensive Operations Analysis

The Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) was an 18 month in-depth process to analyze VTA’s existing transit services, identify underserved markets and ultimately produce a new structure for bus services. The COA incorporated market research including a survey of VTA bus and light rail passengers as well as a telephone survey of Santa Clara County households. A detailed examination of VTA’s existing transit operations and ridership performance was also performed. The VTA Board adopted a new Bus Service Operating Plan at its August 30, 2007 meeting. Implementation occurred on January 14, 2008.

The plan was developed with the goal of a cost neutral revised bus transit network. While reductions occurred in some areas, overall system service levels remained the same. The goal was to increase ridership and improve farebox recovery through more efficient use and distribution of our transit resources. By eliminating or consolidating unproductive route segments, the plan generated resource savings. These resources were then reinvested into areas of the system that were most productive and offered the best opportunities for ridership growth.
**Transit Sustainability Policy**

The annual service review process was further refined and strengthened when the VTA Board of Directors adopted the Transit Sustainability Policy (TSP) and the accompanying the Service Design Guidelines (SDG). The TSP provides a policy framework for the efficient and effective expenditure of funds in order to achieve the highest return on transit investments. The policy guides the implementation of new transit services as well as the improvement of existing services. The TSP adopted goals and core principles are:

**Goals**
- Improve system ridership, productivity, and efficiency.
- Improve farebox recovery.
- Improve VTA's role as a viable alternative mode of transportation.
- Use transit investments and resources more effectively.

**Core Principles**
- Develop a financially sustainable transit system.
- Match capital investment with quantifiable service needs and local participation and commitments.
- Improve customer focus.
- Target markets where transit can compete.
- Improve system integration and efficiency.

In accordance with the Transit Sustainability Policy, all transit services are subject to an evaluation of ridership and operating efficiency, based on Board-adopted performance standards.

**Service Performance Standards**

The Service Performance Standards are the primary criteria for the TSP evaluation and recommendation process and are applied to service changes, new lines and capital projects. These standards apply to both existing and new services. In the case of existing services, the standards are used to identify low performance lines and make recommendations for improvement. In the case of new service, the standards are used in the development of recommendations for service refinements, modal alterations, or implementation. The following is a summary of the service performance standards:

**Primary Standard.** The **primary standard is average boardings per revenue hour**. This standard applies to Community Bus, Local Bus, BRT and Light Rail (LRT). For evaluation purposes the standard is calculated for all time-periods 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.

**Secondary Standards.** The secondary standards are average daily boardings per station for BRT,
LRT, Commuter Rail and Heavy Rail, and average boardings per mile applied to BRT and LRT modes.

Express Bus Standard. The express bus standard is 60% of the seated vehicle loading capacity. This singular standard is needed due to the special characteristics of express bus lines where seat turnover is low.

Minimum Standard. 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 shall be discontinued. There is no minimum standard for existing rail lines since the capital investments in these lines have already been made.

It is important to note that new transit services are also subject to the annual review. However these services are provided with a 24 month “growth” period to enable ridership to mature to expected levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time from Implementation</th>
<th>Expected Ridership as Percentage of Service Classification Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 months</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Service Change Approval Process

VTA implements service changes quarterly in January, April, July and October. Major changes are typically planned for January and July, while minor changes are implemented in April and October. Proposed service changes that meet any of the criteria listed below are submitted to the VTA Board of Directors for review and approval. 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 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 the staff level. These proposals are still subject to an appropriate level of public and community review and comment.
Introduction

Major service change proposals in the Annual Transit Service Plan were presented to the Transit Planning and Operations Committee at the December 2008 meeting as an information item. Public and community meetings and outreach were held during January and February, with the Final Plan submitted to the Committee at the March meeting and to the VTA Board of Directors in April. Implementation will start in July 2009.

**Title VI Evaluation**

Finally, in order to comply with 49 CFR Section 21.5(b)(2), 49 CFR Section 21.5(b)(7) and Appendix C to 49 CFR part 21, recipients of financial assistance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) shall 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.

In accordance with the May 13, 2007 Title VI Circular, a Title VI Evaluation was completed for the major bus service changes proposed in this Annual Transit Service Plan. No changes to VTA’s light rail service or fare structure were considered as part of this process.
**Public Outreach**

A comprehensive community outreach plan was implemented to provide the public with numerous opportunities to learn of the proposed service changes and respond with input. Public comments and suggestions helped to shape the recommendations presented in the Annual Transit Service Plan.

**Schedule and Process**

VTA staff held eight public meetings in late January in areas that would be most impacted by the proposed service plan. (See Table 2-1) The meetings and proposed service changes were marketed in the following manner:

- Advertised in community newspapers throughout Santa Clara County prior to meetings.
- Media releases sent to newspapers, broadcast media, multilingual media and daily publications.
- Information and proposals were posted on VTA.org with opportunities to comment by e-mail.
- Meeting announcements were provided to city websites and access cable channel outlets.
- Fliers were mailed to cities in Santa Clara County, Eco Pass employers, community organizations including those on the Title VI list and other stakeholders.
- Proposals were e-mailed to several mailing lists including Eco Pass participants.
- Interior car cards were displayed on all bus and light rail vehicles.
- Information published in December rider newsletter, Take One, giving passengers a “heads up” and directing them to look for more details in a “Special Take One.”
- “Special Take One” distributed on all VTA vehicles in the first and second week of January with information on service change proposals and meeting schedule.
- Meeting announcement fliers included in mailing to monthly pass holders and Eco Pass participants/employers.
- Information made available at the Downtown Customer Service Center and River Oaks.
- All customer service representatives were briefed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Main Routes of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 21</td>
<td>East San Jose</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>31, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 26</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>88, 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>2:00 pm</td>
<td>37, 48, 49, 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 27</td>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>180, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 28</td>
<td>Downtown San Jose</td>
<td>3:00 pm &amp; 7:00 pm</td>
<td>11, 63, 64, 66, 68, 180, 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29</td>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>4:00 pm</td>
<td>15, 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>7:00 pm</td>
<td>14, 17, 15, 68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Feedback

The outreach process resulted in hundreds of comments from community members at the public meetings. 103 persons attended these eight public sessions. Additionally almost 70 comments were received by VTA’s Customer Service department. Summary reports of each public meeting were produced by VTA staff. Comments received through the Customer Service department via e-mail, letter or telephone call are individually documented. Both these extensive sources of comment information are available on CD.

VTA staff evaluated the public input to determine how to address them in the final plan. Many comments were regarding specific trips times and schedules on certain lines. These types of comments were received regarding almost all VTA routes. As much as possible, proposals were reevaluated and revised to reflect this input.

Overall there seems to be a good public understanding of VTA’s approach to re-allocate services from under performing routes to other routes and markets that demand improved transit service. Extensive use of ridership data collected by our automatic passenger counters provided the quantitative justification for many of the service change proposals. This ridership data provided powerful rationalizations for the proposals and seemed to be understood by the public attending the meetings. While some people were not happy that service was being reduced on their particular route, there was a general understanding of our need to reduce service on certain lines when it wasn’t being used.

A few major themes did arise from the public outreach and comment process. Certain service change proposals elicited the most comments and public concern. A summary of these comments and VTA’s proposal or revision to the proposal is presented as follows. These comments are further addressed in the Recommendations chapter.

Line 26 (Eastridge Transit Center - Sunnyvale/Lockheed Martin): Many current passengers requested more frequent service on Line 26, particularly on the section of route connecting El Camino to the Moffett Park area. Commentators were mainly high tech and other employees traveling to Moffett Park. VTA’s original proposal does include adding more trips into peak period service.

Community Bus Line 45 (Alum Rock Transit Center – Penitencia Creek Transit Center): Passengers are displeased with the proposed reduction in weekday and Saturday service from buses running every 30 minutes to every 60 minutes due to low ridership. A Community Based Transportation Plan for East San Jose is being completed by VTA that identifies an action plan and potential funding sources to address transportation needs in this area. This plan could be the catalyst to attract Lifeline grant funding through MTC to provide additional public transit service in this area, particularly east of White Road.
Lines 61 and 62 (Good Samaritan Hospital to Sierra & Piedmont): Only schedule and trip revisions were originally proposed by VTA for these routes. However San Jose Council member Chu and the Berryessa Union School District requested that we review how these two lines are routed in Berryessa to better serve students at Piedmont Middle School. Currently Line 62 operates on Sierra Road east of Capitol Avenue while Line 61 uses Berryessa. Essentially the routing of these two line was be swapped so Line 62 would use Berryessa and Line 61 would use Sierra. This would eliminate the need for some students traveling to Piedmont Middle School to have to transfer at Capitol Avenue.

Community Bus Line 88 (Palo Alto Veteran’s Hospital to California Avenue Caltrain): Line 88 has historically exhibited low ridership. Saturday service has not been provided on this line since January 2008 when it was discontinued due to low ridership (1-2 passengers per trip). In July 2008, based on VTA planning study with the City of Palo Alto and Stanford, Line 88 service was improved to operate every 30 minutes from every 60 minutes in the peak hours. Service to Gunn High School, the major generator on the route was also improved and has done well. However the other Line 88 trips continue to perform poorly, carrying an average of 4 passengers per trip and do not justify continuing the 30 minute peak frequencies, so we are proposing that service return to operating every 60 minutes on weekdays. Veterans from the Palo Alto VA Hospital and the Western Blind Rehabilitation Center located there attended one of our public meetings to request that the service not be reduced and Saturday service be restored. However given the low ridership here we cannot justify any higher levels of service. A letter from Congress member Eshoo was received supporting the veterans and the reduction in Line 88 service.

Express 180 & Express 181 (Fremont BART to San Jose Diridon Station): Proposed service changes on the rerouting of these two lines garnered the most public commentary. Initially staff proposed to reroute both lines to use I-880, instead of I-680, to take advantage of the recently opened HOV lane and completion of the Mission Boulevard interchange. Many riders objected to changing both lines as it would inconvenience those going to the Great Mall as well as those who were using Park & Ride locations along Mission Boulevard. To accommodate these riders, the proposal has been changed to include a rerouting of only the Express 181 to use I-880. This proposal is pending the availability of a Park and Ride along or near Stevenson. Some persons also commented on discontinuing the operations of Express 180 south of the Great Mall as this would require a transfer to light rail to go downtown or use of the Express 181, which is being proposed to operate all day to downtown San Jose.
**BUS SYSTEM OVERVIEW**

**Network Description**

VTA operates an active fleet of 450 buses on 75 routes throughout the urbanized area of Santa Clara County. Bus routes directly operated by VTA are functionally separated into the following service categories: a core network, a local network, feeder/community buses and express/limited buses.

**Core Network**
The Core Network is defined as bus routes or shared corridors that feature weekday service frequencies of 15 minutes or less during the peak and midday periods and/or have service that spans 18 hours or more. Core routes typically operate 7 days per week and travel on long distance corridors. They connect major trip generators such as universities, regional shopping malls and high density housing and employment sites. Bus Rapid Transit, including VTA’s Rapid 522 are part of the core network.

**Local Network**
The Local Network is defined as bus routes or corridors that feature weekday service frequencies of 30 minutes or more during the peak and midday periods and/or have service that spans less than 18 hours. Local routes operate 7 days per week or less and typically travel on medium distance corridors. They serve minor trip generators such as schools, hospitals and medium density housing and employment sites.

**Community Bus/Feeder Bus**
This service is defined as routes that have weekday frequencies of 30 minutes or more in both the peak and midday periods. Service spans 14 hours or less, usually 12 hours for weekdays and operates 7 days per week or less. Community Bus Routes use 28 foot, 25 passenger capacity vehicles. These routes are neighborhood-based and travel within a limited area connecting small-scale trip generators and destination points with the core transit system.

**Express Routes**
These routes are separated by type of service; Limited Stop and Express. These services are differentiated by the length of the trip, time of day, and area served.

- Limited Stop: Long routes operating through major corridors, generally on arterials and expressways: they serve major transfer points and operate during weekday peak hours.
- Express: Long distance commute-oriented lines, usually over 20 miles. They serve a maximum of three park & ride lots with more than 50 percent of the line on freeways and/ or expressways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3-1: Number of Routes by Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3-2: Number of Vehicles by Type of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AM Peak</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>PM Peak</th>
<th>Off Peak</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3-3: Service Hours by Route Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Percentage of Annual Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>2,907</td>
<td>1,906</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>936,027</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>124,118</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>93,091</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>138,453</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>97,406</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,432</td>
<td>2,570</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>1,389,095</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.1: Bus System Map
Figure 3-2: Core Bus Map
Figure 3-3: Local Bus Map
Figure 3-4: Feeder Bus Map
Figure 3-5: Community Bus Map
Figure 3-6: Express and Limited Stop Bus Map
Bus Fleet

VTA’s current active fleet of 450 consists of 398 diesel fuel powered buses, 49 gas powered Community Buses and 3 hydrogen fuel powered Zero-Emission Buses (ZEB). At the present time, 234 of the buses are low floor. The average age of buses in VTA’s active fleet is about seven and a half years. Buses in the active fleet operate an average of 44,000 scheduled miles annually.

Passenger Facilities

Currently VTA utilizes 3,814 bus stops. Of those 793 or 20% have shelters and 1,935 or 50% have benches. 64% of the stops are fully ADA compliant. VTA utilizes 15 transit centers throughout Santa Clara County as shown in Figure 3-7. Transit centers provide safe, convenient facilities for bus-to-bus as well as inter-modal passenger transfers.

Interagency Services, Shuttles and Paratransit

In addition to operating regular bus service, VTA partners with other transit agencies and organizations to provide service to specific markets. These services include regional express buses and rail services and shuttles that provide connections to light rail, ACE and Caltrain. Paratransit service is provided to individuals with disabilities who are unable to use VTA’s bus and rail service. Ridership and performance review of these services is done through the unique partnership or agreement established for each service and is not addressed in this plan (except for Rail Shuttles).

Table 3-4: Ridership of Interagency Services and Other Services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Average Weekday Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paratransit</td>
<td>3,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail Shuttles</td>
<td>1,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Shuttles</td>
<td>1,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain Shuttles</td>
<td>4,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Express</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway 17 Express</td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose - Monterey Express</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>41,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Train</td>
<td>2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitol Corridor</td>
<td>5,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Ridership data for Fiscal Year 2009 through January.
Regional Rail Services

Altamont Commuter Express service is administered under a cooperative agreement among VTA, Alameda County Congestion Management Agency and the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (SJRRC). ACE rail service provides 3 peak and 1 midday roundtrips each weekday. The rail line includes stops located in Stockton, Lathrop, Tracy, Livermore (2), Pleasanton, Fremont, Great America, and San Jose Diridon Station. Pursuant to the ACE agreement, funding of operating costs is based on Fiscal Year 2003 contributions, escalated annually by CPI. SJRRC, CalTrans and the San Joaquin/Amtrak Intercity Rail Service provide funding for the midday service. VTA’s FY2009 expense for ACE rail services is $2.7 Million.

Caltrain rail service is provided by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board, which is composed of three member agencies - VTA, SamTrans and the City and County of San Francisco. Ninety-eight trains, including 22 Baby Bullet Express trains) operate between San Jose Diridon Station and San Francisco each weekday. Forty-eight of these trains extend to the Tamien Station in San Jose. Six peak-hour weekday trains extend south of Tamien station to Gilroy. Hourly weekend service (32 Saturday trains and 28 Sunday trains) is operated between the San Jose Diridon Station and San Francisco. Funding of operating costs is apportioned to each member agency and is based upon morning peak period boardings in each county, currently approximately 41% for VTA. In FY2009 VTA will contribute $15.9 Million for Caltrain operating expenses and an additional $2.8 Million to provide local match for Caltrain capital projects. VTA also has its own program of Caltrain capital improvements funded by Measure A.

Capitol Corridor Intercity Rail Service operates 32 weekday trains between Oakland and Sacramento, with 14 continuing to San Jose. Stops are located at stations in Auburn, Rocklin, Roseville, Sacramento, Davis, Suisun/Fairfield, Martinez, Richmond, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland (2), Hayward, Fremont, Santa Clara and San Jose. Weekend service is also provided. The Capitol Corridor JPA is comprised of 16 members, two are from VTA. Under contract with the Capitol Corridor JPA, BART manages the service and Amtrak operates the service on tracks owned by Union Pacific Railroad. The service is funded through State funds and fare revenues, not through member agency contributions.

Regional Express Bus Service

Highway 17 Express service operates between Santa Cruz and downtown San Jose as an inter-county bus service provided through an agreement amongst VTA, the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District (Santa Cruz Metro), the Capitol Corridor JPA and CalTrans. VTA and Santa Cruz Metro equally share the majority of weekday net operating costs. The Capitol Corridor JPA and CalTrans provide funding for weekend/holiday service and additional weekday trips. Santa Cruz Metro manages and operates the service. VTA’s share of expenses for FY2009 is projected to be about $350,000.

Dumbarton Express is a transbay route operating between the Union City BART Station and Stanford Research Park in Palo Alto. The weekday only service is funded by a consortium comprised of representatives from AC Transit, BART, Union City Transit, SamTrans and VTA.
Each member of the consortium pays a share of the net operating expense based on the origin and destination of the passengers, which is currently about 41% for VTA. AC Transit manages and operates the service. VTA’s share of expenses for FY2009 is $376,000.

**San Jose-Monterey Express** service is provided through an agreement amongst Monterey-Salinas Transit (MST), CCJPA and VTA. MST operates and maintains the service. The route runs a morning, midday and late afternoon round trip daily between Monterey and San Jose with stops also in Edgewater, Prunedale, Gilroy and Morgan Hill. VTA’s share of the expenses for this service is $35,000 in FY2009.

**Shuttles**

**Rail Shuttles** are provided through a partnership amongst VTA and interested parties, mainly employers. These free shuttle services provide connections to commuter rail and light rail stations. Operating costs are met with combined funding from the local partners served by the shuttles, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) Transportation Fund for Clean Air, and VTA. This service is operated by VTA except for the IBM Shuttle which is provided by a private contractor. Currently the DASH (Line 201), Great America (Line 202), River Oaks (Line 203) and IBM shuttles are included in this program. Also, VTA in partnership with the City of San Jose, provides the free Airport Flyer bus service (Line 10) connecting the Norman Y. Mineta San Jose International Airport terminals with the Metro/Airport Light Rail Station and the Santa Clara Caltrain Station. The City of San Jose contributes approximately 30% to the net operating costs for this service with VTA funding the remainder. All of these services are included in the evaluation process in this plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Name</th>
<th>Rail Stations Served</th>
<th>Primary Sites Served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great America</td>
<td>Old Ironsides LRT</td>
<td>Great America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oaks</td>
<td>River Oaks LRT</td>
<td>River Oaks Residential/Industrial Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Area</td>
<td>San Antonio, Santa Clara, San Fernando and Convention Center</td>
<td>Downtown San Jose Employers, San Jose City Hall and San Jose State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DASH)</td>
<td>LRT and San Jose Diridon Caltrain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM/Hitachi</td>
<td>Santa Teresa LRT and Blossom Hill Caltrain</td>
<td>IBM Silicon Valley Labs and Hitachi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Altamont Commuter Express Shuttles** were implemented in 1998 to provide convenient connections between ACE rail service and major employment sites. VTA manages the eight ACE shuttle routes that connect with trains during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods at the Great America Station. Shuttle operations are contracted out and are funded through the BAAQMD, the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (SJRRRC) and regional employers.

**Caltrain Shuttles** are provided by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB). Shuttles from train stations to local employers operate throughout all three counties, enabling access to
employment sites. 14 Caltrain shuttles are operated in Santa Clara County. Funding is provided by local employers, Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) regional grant funds and JPB local funds.

**Paratransit**

VTA implemented a paratransit brokerage system in 1993. Paratransit service is a specialized form of transportation operated for persons with disabilities who cannot use conventional public transit service. As an operator of bus and light rail service, VTA is required under the Americans with Disabilities Act to ensure that paratransit service is provided to eligible individuals with disabilities. The level of service provided must be comparable, in terms of hours of service and area served, to the service provided by the bus and light rail system. VTA does not directly provide paratransit service but contracts with Outreach and Escort, Inc. to provide the service. Outreach determines and certifies qualified individuals for paratransit eligibility, receives and schedules trip requests, builds vehicle manifests, and contracts for services with taxi, sedan and accessible van service providers. VTA does fund and procure a majority of the vehicles for the paratransit fleet and provides facilities and parking at two of our operating divisions for the daily paratransit operations. VTA’s budget for the direct paratransit operations is $29.4 Million in FY2009.

**BRT Strategic Plan and Express Bus Study**

VTA is developing two studies that will impact future bus services. The results of these studies will be incorporated into future Annual Transit Service Plans. VTA is developing an integrated Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) network linking activity centers throughout the county. The **BRT Strategic Plan** studied candidate BRT corridors identified in VTA’s long-range plan, Valley Transportation Plan 2030 and the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA). The goals of the BRT Strategic Plan are to 1) establish a brand identity for VTA’s future network of BRT services; 2) evaluate the feasibility and effectiveness of developing BRT facilities in the candidate corridors, and; 3) develop an action plan for implementation in each corridor. Recommendations from this study will include unique vehicle specifications for the new service. At this time, the BRT Strategic Plan proposes implementation of BRT improvements on El Camino (22/522) in 2012 and Steven’s Creek (23) in 2014. The BRT Strategic Plan will be presented to the Board in the Spring of 2009 for adoption.

Capitalizing on a number of other studies including the BRT Strategic Plan, 2007 Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA) and the upcoming Silicon Valley Congestion Pricing (HOT lane network) Plan, **VTA’s Express Bus Study** (also known as the Highway-Based BRT Alternatives Analysis) will evaluate the system of express buses together with the market potential to determine the business case for providing highway-based bus services in each corridor. The study is designed to engage all the players in providing commuter bus services in the Valley including employers and business associations. The result will be a product tailored specifically to this market possibly including unique vehicles. The Express Bus Study (or Highway-Based BRT Alternatives Analysis) started in February 2009. The Study may provide recommendation for changes to any aspect of VTA’s Express bus system.
Rail System Overview

Network Description

VTA operates nearly 42 miles of light rail service, and serves 62 stations. Service is provided along three routes (See Figure 4-3):

Alum Rock–Santa Teresa Line
The Alum Rock-Santa Teresa Line operates between the Santa Teresa Station in South San Jose and the Alum Rock Station in East San Jose just south of Alum Rock on Capitol Avenue. The line is approximately 27 miles long and serves 38 stations. It operates every 15 minutes on weekdays and weekends.

Mountain View–Winchester Line
The Mountain View-Winchester Line operates between the Mountain View Multi-Modal Station on the northern edge of downtown Mountain View and the Winchester Station in Campbell. The line is approximately 22 miles long serving 37 stations. It operates every 15 minutes on weekdays and every 30 minutes on weekends. The segment of the line between the Convention Center in Downtown San Jose and the Tasman Station in North San Jose is served in conjunction with the Alum Rock-Santa Teresa Line.

Ohlone/Chynoweth-Almaden Line
The Ohlone/Chynoweth-Almaden Line operates between the Almaden Station in Almaden Valley and the Ohlone/Chynoweth Station in South San Jose. This line is slightly over one mile in length serving 3 stations and operates every 15 minutes on weekdays and weekends.

Light Rail Fleet

The light rail system operates a relatively consistent number of trains throughout the year, with some fluctuation when San Jose State University (SJSU) is not in session. While the numbers of cars vary slightly depending on time of day, the number of trains running remains the same. Service hours are also consistent through the year. The light rail fleet consists of 100 cars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Trains</th>
<th>Number of Cars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-F: AM Peak</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-F: Midday</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-F: PM Peak</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1: Number of Trains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Daily Service Hours</th>
<th>Annual Service Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>420:00</td>
<td>107,100:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>330:25</td>
<td>17,181:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>330:25</td>
<td>19,164:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2: Service Hours
Ridership
Over the course of the last three years, ridership levels have been increasing on the light rail system. In October of 2008 ridership was up 52% from October of 2005, 12% from 2006 and 18% from 2008.
## Rail System Overview

### Figure 4-4: Average Weekday Ridership by Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALMADEN STATION</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUM ROCK STATION</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASCOM STATION</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYPOINTE STATION</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAYSHORE NASA STATION</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERRYESSA STATION</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLOSSOM HILL STATION</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONAVENUTA STATION</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BORREGAS STATION</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRANHAM STATION</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPBELL STATION</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPITOL STATION</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMPION STATION</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDREN'S DISCOVERY</td>
<td>734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISCO STATION</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIVIC CENTER STATION</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPONENT STATION</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONVENTION CENTER STATION</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTTLE STATION</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROPLEY STATION</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROSSMAN STATION</td>
<td>533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURTNER STATION</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRidon STATION</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVELYN STATION</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIR OAKS STATION</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRUITDALE STATION</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISH STATION</td>
<td>1265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT AMERICA STATION</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT MALL STATION</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAMILTON STATION</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSTETTER STATION</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-880 STATION</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANTOWN/AYER STATION</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARINA COURT STATION</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LICK MILL STATION</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCKHEED MARTIN STATION</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCKEE STATION</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METROAIRPORT STATION</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDDLEFIELD STATION</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOFFETT PARK STATION</td>
<td>1038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTAGE STATION</td>
<td>589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOUNTAIN VIEW STATION</td>
<td>1318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAKRIDGE STATION</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHLONE-CHYNOWETH STATION*</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLD IRONSIDES STATION</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORCHARD STATION</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENITENCIA CREEK STATION</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE STATION</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAMWOOD STATION</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIVER OAKS STATION</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN ANTONIO STATION</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN FERNANDO STATION</td>
<td>1234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA CLARA STATION</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANTA TERESA STATION</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNELL STATION</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST JAMES STATION</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMIEEN STATION</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASMAN STATION</td>
<td>1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIENNA STATION</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA STATION</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHISMAN STATION</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINCHESTER STATION</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Light Rail Systems Analysis

The VTA Light Rail System Analysis is a comprehensive evaluation of the light rail system, its current constraints, strengths and weaknesses, and its ability to attract new ridership. On the basis of this evaluation, strategies will be proposed to enhance the effectiveness, usefulness and efficiency of the light rail system.

The Light Rail System Analysis will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the infrastructure and operational flexibility of the existing light rail system and an evaluation of operational impacts and user benefits of the planned extensions and other capital improvements. The study began in September of 2008 and is expected to be completed in approximately 12 months.

The Light Rail System Analysis will consist of three inter-relating components: market analysis, operations analysis and capital needs. A project team made up of VTA staff and consultants has initiated several tasks to analyze boarding activities, Park and Ride lot utilization, rail-to-rail transfer activities, and existing ridership patterns. Service change proposals recommended by this analysis will be incorporated into future Annual Transit Service Plans.
Overview of January 2008 New Bus Service

As a result of the COA process service changes to almost all VTA routes were implemented in January of 2008. All changes and recommendations were based on a market and performance analysis of bus ridership in Santa Clara County. The New Bus Service includes more frequent service on many core routes, expanded express bus service and a significant increase in low-fare community bus routes. In addition to the scheduling or route alterations for 57 routes, service was discontinued on seven underutilized routes. Table 5-1 shows how bus ridership has increased since the implementation of the New Bus Service.

Average weekday bus ridership for FY 2009 through January 2009 is 114,019. The first quarter saw significant ridership increases throughout the system: Core (14%), Community Bus (38%), Express (37%), and Limited (36%).

Table 5-1: 2008 Average Weekday Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>Change From 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>98,478</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>104,685</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>108,893</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>109,992</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>112,565</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>112,784</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>114,916</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>108,218</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>124,280</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>124,365</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>116,234</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>101,230</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Weekday Ridership

Average weekday ridership (AWR) is the average number of riders for all days Monday through Friday and excludes the weekends. All figures in this chapter are averages from July to October, 2008. Weekday ridership figures are used for analysis as the majority of public transit use occurs during this time. However, weekend ridership averages are factored into bus service changes and viewed as a part of the overall system ridership. The following charts provide a snapshot of how VTA passengers use the bus system.

The majority of bus ridership occurs on the core network with 75.8% of all riders using this type of bus service. Line 22 in the core network carries the most riders per day accounting for over 14% of the total number of riders in the bus system. All other routes in the core network carry approximately 1,000 to 8,500 riders on an average weekday and the 16 busiest routes run on the core system. The top three busiest routes are the 22, 23 and 25.

![Figure 5-2: Ridership by Route Type](image)

### Table 5-2: Ridership by Day of Week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Average Number of Riders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekday</td>
<td>118,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>64,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>49,965</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5-3: Weekday Ridership by Time of Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Day</th>
<th>Average Number of Riders</th>
<th>Percentage of Riders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peak</td>
<td>56,078</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midday</td>
<td>47,341</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evening</td>
<td>10,743</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night</td>
<td>3,896</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bus</td>
<td>Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>Percentage of All Ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,184</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder</td>
<td>Weekday Ridership</td>
<td>Percentage of All Ridership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,721</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-5: Weekday Ridership by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Percentage of All Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>2,928</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara County</td>
<td>2,796</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cupertino</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz County</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>1,404</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Gatos</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Hill</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>5,240</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>6,492</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>3,552</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>9,479</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>85,707</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>9,713</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5-6: Weekday Ridership by Transit Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Average Bus Ridership</th>
<th>Average Light Rail Ridership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastridge</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>2,879</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Street</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>Gilroy</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Mall</td>
<td>Milpitas</td>
<td>1,911</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockheed Martin</td>
<td>Sunnyvale</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>Palo Alto</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penitencia Creek</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>Mountain View</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Jose Diridon</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>815</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Fair</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester</td>
<td>Campbell</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Service Evaluation**

Service Performance Standards as adopted in the Transit Sustainability Policy are the primary criteria for the evaluation and recommendation process of the Annual Transit Service Plan. These standards apply to both existing and new services. In the case of existing services, the standards are used to identify under-performing lines and make recommendations for improvement. In the case of new service, the standards are used in the development of recommendations for service refinements, modal alterations, or implementation. These standards are outlined in Chapter 1.

**Fiscal Year 2009 Bus Performance**

The charts on the following pages show performance of each route by category and day of week against the performance standard. **Performance standards are calculated as the average number of boardings per revenue hour for each type of service.** Different standards are calculated for weekdays, Saturdays and Sundays. **The minimum standard for all lines is 15 boarding per revenue hour.** All data is from the first quarter of Fiscal Year 2009. Data for ridership during peak, midday and off peak hours is for weekdays only, with the exception of Lines 12 and 43, which operate only on weekends. Tables 6-1 and 6-2 show time ranges for each period of the day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-1: Weekday Service Hour Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peak</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Midday</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off Peak</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-2: Weekend Service Hour Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Morning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Night</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Late Night</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Core Routes**

Of the 19 lines in the core network ten meet the performance standard during the weekdays. Below standard lines include the 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 71, 72, 73 and 77. On the weekends under-performing lines are the 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 64, 70, 71, 72 and 73. Proposals for service change are outlined in detail in the Recommendations Chapter. With the exception of the 22, 66, 68, 71, 72 and the 77, most routes have a lower number of boardings on the weekends. The 22, 23, 66 and 68 consistently perform well and raise the standard higher for the core network. The core network carries the most riders than any other type of service in the bus system. Many of those riders use the 22. Other popular lines include the 23, 25, 66, 68, 70 and 522. Many of the routes in the core system carry almost the same number of people in the midday as they do during peak hours. Some of the lines carry even more people midday than during peak times. This indicates that riders using this portion of the system are diverse in needs.

**Table 6-3: Weekday Core Ridership by Time of Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7,075</td>
<td>6,490</td>
<td>3,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3,696</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,313</td>
<td>1,881</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1,627</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>2,967</td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>1,979</td>
<td>799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,765</td>
<td>2,834</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>1,145</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>1,179</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>41,129</td>
<td>37,313</td>
<td>11,140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6-1: Weekday Core Ridership by Time of Day**
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Figure 6-2: Core Routes Weekdays

Figure 6-3: Core Routes Saturdays

Figure 6-4: Core Routes Sundays
Local Routes

There are fewer routes in the local network and they have a lower standard than the core network. Local routes that perform poorly on the weekdays also do not meet the standard on the weekends. Routes 27 and 40 are the exception to this and meet the Sunday performance standards while not meeting the standards for weekdays and Saturdays.

The local routes are designed to serve minor trip generators and therefore carry a much smaller number of riders on an average weekday than the core network does. Lines 35 and 82 carry the most number of people, while all other local routes carry between 1,000 and 1,200 people. The number of people traveling during peak hours is not much larger than those using these routes during the midday.

Table 6-4: Weekday Local Ridership by Time of Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>4,178</td>
<td>3,866</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-5: Weekday Local Ridership by Time of Day
Figure 6-6: Local Routes Weekdays

Figure 6-7: Local Routes Saturdays

Figure 6-8: Local Routes Sundays
**Feeder Routes**

Feeder routes serve the purpose of connecting small scale trip generators to the core network and larger transit system. Unlike other types of routes more people ride these lines during the midday rather than during peak hours.

Half of the feeder routes meet the performance standards on the weekdays and three meet them on the weekends. The feeder network includes Line 12 which runs only on the weekend and consistently performs above the standard. The 51, 52, 53 and 76 run only on the weekdays. While the 51 and the 53 meet the standard, the 52 and the 76 are well below the standard of 23 boardings per revenue hour. The 10 and 31 are consistently below the standard, where as the 33 underperforms on the weekdays and barely meets the standard on the weekends. The 46 and 47 both do better on the weekdays than they do on the weekends, though the 47 maintains the standard throughout the week. Recommendations for all underperforming lines, with the exception of the 76 are proposed.

Line 12 operates only on the weekend and Line 43 operates only on Sundays. For this reason ridership activity for these two lines has been separated.

**Table 6-5: Weekend Ridership by Time of Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6-6: Weekday Ridership by Time of Day**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6-9: Weekday Feeder Ridership by Time of Day**
Figure 6-10: Feeder Routes Weekdays

Figure 6-11: Feeder Routes Saturdays

Figure 6-12: Feeder Routes Sundays
Community Bus and Shuttle Routes

The majority of the community bus and shuttle routes meet or are close to meeting the absolute minimum of 15 boardings per revenue hour. The routes that fall short of this minimum or the standard of 18 boardings per revenue hour will undergo minor changes or marketing efforts to boost ridership. Line 15 has maintained extremely low ridership despite changes to service, marketing campaigns and public outreach. Due to this low ridership the route will be discontinued. The following chapter has more details on service change recommendations.

Community Bus routes and Shuttles utilize a smaller vehicle than the buses used on the other routes. These lines typically carry fewer riders than the average feeder or local bus. Lines 32, 37 and the DASH do exceptionally well, transporting almost twice as many people in a day as any of the other lines in the network. The ridership leans more towards peak hours, but many of the lines also have a healthy midday ridership base.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great America</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Oaks</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>4,228</td>
<td>3,320</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-13: Weekday Community Bus & Shuttle Ridership by Time of Day
Figure 6-14: Community Bus and Shuttle Routes Weekdays

Figure 6-15: Community Bus and Shuttle Routes Saturdays

Figure 6-16: Community Bus and Shuttle Routes Sundays
Express Routes

Many of the express routes do not meet the performance standard of 22 peak boardings per trip, but are close to meeting this standard. Express lines 102, 120, 121, 122 and 168 are performing well as are the Limited Stop Lines 304, 328 and 330. Marketing of other routes will be implemented to increase the ridership levels.

The express routes are intended for people who travel great distances and want to do so in a shorter period of time. To achieve this aim the express routes have fewer stops and operate at peak hours primarily on expressways. The majority of riders are commuting during peak hours and the schedules of these routes reflect this travel demand. The 180 is an exception to this trend; it operates as an all-day express and has a steady ridership base throughout the day.

Table 6-8: Weekday Express Ridership by Time of Day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>Off Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>3,387</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6-17: Weekday Express Ridership by Time of Day
*Note: Standard for express routes is 60% of seating capacity. The seating capacity for a 40-foot VTA bus is 37. 60% of 37 equals 22.2. The standard for Limited Express routes is calculated as boardings per revenue hour.
**Light Rail**

Light rail consistently performs well and carries the greatest number of riders during the peak hours. No changes are recommended as a part of this plan as light rail service will be studied separately. (See Rail System Overview Chapter for details.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak</th>
<th>Midday</th>
<th>Off Peak</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alum Rock - Santa Teresa</td>
<td>11,414</td>
<td>6,043</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>22,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View - Winchester</td>
<td>8,238</td>
<td>3,269</td>
<td>3,646</td>
<td>15,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ridership</td>
<td>19,652</td>
<td>9,312</td>
<td>8,626</td>
<td>37,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6-9: Weekday Light Rail Ridership by Time of Day**

![Figure 6-20: Weekday Light Rail Ridership by Time of Day](image-url)
**Figure 6-21: Light Rail Weekdays**

![Bar chart showing boardings per revenue hour for Alum Rock-Santa Teresa and Mountain View-Winchester routes on weekdays.](image)

- **Alum Rock-Santa Teresa**
  - Boardings: 99
  - Standard: 94 Boardings
- **Mountain View-Winchester**
  - Boardings: 89
  - Standard: 94 Boardings

**Figures 6-22 & 6-23: Light Rail Saturdays & Sundays**

![Bar charts showing boardings per revenue hour for Alum Rock-Santa Teresa and Mountain View-Winchester routes on Saturdays and Sundays.](image)

- **Alum Rock-Santa Teresa**
  - Boardings: 66
  - Standard: 69 Boardings
- **Mountain View-Winchester**
  - Boardings: 59
  - Standard: 63 Boardings
RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations have been made upon careful examination of each route based upon Board adopted performance standards and policies. These recommendations were arrived at through a review of potential new services, an assessment of opportunities for service refinement and resource reallocation, and route specific service evaluations. Public comment, received both throughout the year and during the public outreach process contributed greatly to the final recommendations.

Major Service Proposals

Lines 14 & 17: Gilroy Community Buses

Currently Line 17 operates as a large one-way loop serving Kaiser and Valley Health Center on the south end of the route and St. Louise Hospital and a Social Services facility on the north end. Line 14 runs a west/east route serving the Gilroy Crossings Shopping Center. In order to make the Line 17 route more convenient it would be changed to two-way service from the Social Services facility on Tomkins Court to the Gilroy Transit Center. The weekday frequency for Line 17 would be improved to operate every 30 minutes from its current frequency of every 60 minutes. The line would operate on weekdays only, from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.

Figure 7-1 : Lines 14 & 17 Current Service
Line 14 would fill the service gap left by the 17 via the newly opened bridge along Camino Arroyo. It would be extended to two-way service between the Gilroy Transit Center, the outlet stores, the Kaiser Clinic, Valley Health Center and St. Louise Hospital. It would operate from 7:30 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. on weekdays, 9:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on Saturdays and 9:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. on Sundays. Currently, the line runs every 60 minutes during the weekdays, which would be improved to every 30 minutes.

A three-year Lifeline Grant has been approved by the VTA Board, which covers 80% of these service improvements. The grant also provides for bus stop improvements and promoting the new service. MTC approval of this grant is still pending.

**Figure 7-2 : Lines 14 & 17 Proposed Service**
**Line 15: Morgan Hill Community Bus**

Community Bus services in Morgan Hill and Gilroy, including Line 15 was studied and implemented in July of 2007. VTA staff, the City of Morgan Hill and other stakeholders met to develop service changes to improve ridership levels. Line 15 has been a long time low performing VTA route and was converted, along with Line 16 to Community Bus service. Other changes included extending the route to the new Centennial Recreation Center and the housing developments along LeCrosse and Watsonville Road during the midday. Service to Holiday Lakes Estates was retained for school trips.

An extensive marketing campaign was implemented in South County to attract more passengers to these routes. Despite service changes and marketing efforts Line 15 continues to perform well below minimum standards. This line is proposed to be discontinued due to poor ridership performance.

*Figure 7-3: Line 15 Current Service*
Figure 7-4: Line 15 Average Riders by Trip Eastbound

Figure 7-5: Line 15 Average Riders by Trip Westbound
Line 37: Capitol Light Rail Station to West Valley College Community Bus

Currently Line 37 does not operate on Saturdays. To improve VTA west/east coverage in this area, service would be implemented between the Capitol Light Rail Station and the Winchester Light Rail Station along Hillsdale Avenue. This new Saturday service would operate every 60 minutes between the stations.

Figure 7-6: Line 37 Current Service
**Recommendations**

**Line 45: Alum Rock Light Rail Station to Penitencia Creek Light Rail Station Community Bus**

Prior to New Bus Service implementation in January 2008, the routing of Line 45 was an extension of Line 64. Due to lower ridership the new Line 45 was created as a community bus route. To date it is still performing well below the ridership standards. In an effort to use these resources where they are needed most, service frequency would be reduced on weekdays and Saturdays to operate every 60 minutes instead of 30 minutes as it currently does. On weekdays, this route would operate until 7:30 p.m. On Saturdays, service would operate from 8:30 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. and Sunday service would operate from 9:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

**Figure 7-7: Line 45 Current Service**

![Line 45 Current Service Map](image)
Figure 7-10: Line 45 Riders by Trip for Saturday Northbound

Figure 7-11: Line 45 Riders by Trip for Saturday Southbound
Line 63: Almaden Expressway & Camden to San Jose State University

Currently this line runs every 30 minutes on Saturdays. The Saturday ridership levels are on average below the performance standard for routes in the local network. Service will be changed to operate every 60 minutes to address this low ridership.
Figure 7-13: Line 63 Riders by Trip for Saturdays Northbound

Figure 7-14: Line 63 Riders by Trip for Saturdays Southbound
**Line 64: Almaden Light Rail Station to McKee & White**

On Saturdays, Line 64 operates every 30 minutes with additional trips to provide 15 minute service between San Jose Diridon and McKee & White. The average peak load on these trips is 6 riders. It is proposed that Saturday service operate every 30 minutes over the entire line with the elimination of the extra trips between McKee & White and San Jose Diridon.

![Figure 7-15: Line 64 Current Service](image)
**Line 66: Kaiser San Jose to Milpitas/Dixon Road**
**Line 68: Gilroy Transit Center to San Jose Diridon Transit Center**

Ridership on Lines 66 and 68 increased by 15-20% in 2008. The higher ridership levels have led to more demand for frequent service. Currently, not all of the trips serve all stops and the routes run at different frequencies throughout the day. These lines are important arterial routes in the Core network. In order to make both routes more convenient and address current overload situations, both lines would be modified to operate every 15 minutes all day over the entire route on weekdays.

**Figure 7-16: Line 68 Current Service**
Figure 7-17: Line 66 Current Service
**Line 88: Palo Alto Veterans Hospital to Middlefield & Colorado**

As an outcome of the COA process, VTA engaged in a community based planning study to determine how to best integrate VTA’s bus service with shuttles provided by Stanford University (Marguerite Shuttle) and the City of Palo Alto. Line 88 has historically exhibited low ridership that needed to be addressed. As a result of the study, the Line 88 service was implemented as a Community Bus in July 2008. Service was improved to operate every 30 minutes (from every 60 minutes) in the peak hours and the routing was modified. Service to Gunn High School, the major generator on the route was also improved and has done well. However the other Line 88 trips continue to perform poorly, carrying an average of 4 passengers per trip. These light loads do not justify continuing the 30 minute peak frequencies. It is proposed that service return to operating every 60 minutes on weekdays. Special routing on selected trips to Jordan Middle School would be discontinued but no changes are proposed to the main trips serving Gunn High School.

![Figure 7-22: Line 88 Current Service](image-url)
Figure 7-23: Line 88 Ridership by Trip Northbound

Figure 7-24: Line 88 Ridership by Trip Southbound
**Lines 89: Palo Alto Veterans Hospital to California Avenue Caltrain Station**

Line 89 has been operating as a Community Bus. However, due to high ridership a larger, 40 foot bus has been substituted on many of the trips to increase the load capacity. Instead of operating both community buses and large buses, this line would be converted from a Community Bus line to a regular bus line with standard VTA fares.

**Figure 7-25: Line 89 Current Service**
Line 180: Fremont BART Station to Great Mall/Main Transit Center  
Line 181: Fremont BART Station to San Jose Diridon Transit Center

Current Service
Express Line 180 presently operates every 15 minutes on weekdays from the Fremont BART Station to the Great Mall in Milpitas with non-peak service extended to the San Jose Diridon Transit Center. During the peak periods when the Express Line 181 operates, Line 180 only operates to the Great Mall and does not continue to downtown San Jose. On weekends Line 180 operates to the Great Mall and downtown San Jose every 30 minutes.

Express Line 181, which started in January 2008 as part of the New Bus Service implementation, operates on weekdays during the peak morning and afternoon periods. It runs every 15 minutes directly from Fremont BART to downtown San Jose, not stopping at the Great Mall. Both routes currently use I-680 from Mission Boulevard to access Fremont.

Original Proposal
VTA originally proposed that both lines would be modified to operate via Stevenson Boulevard and I-880 instead of using Mission Boulevard to I-680. This proposal would take advantage of the recently opened HOV lane and completion of the Mission Boulevard interchange. It would result in one way trip time savings of about 10 minutes for the Express 181.

On weekdays, Line 180 would operate every 30 minutes all day instead of every 15 minutes between the Fremont BART Station and the Great Mall Transit Center only, not continuing to downtown San Jose during the midday period. On weekends, this line would continue to operate between Fremont and downtown San Jose via the Great Mall.

Line 181 would be modified to operate every 15 minutes, all day, in both directions, until 7:00 p.m. between the San Jose Diridon Transit Center and the Fremont BART Station. Currently it operates during peak hours only. This direct route has shown strong ridership and has become popular with downtown employees, students and visitors.

A Park & Ride lot along Stevenson is needed to accommodate the new routing to I-880, and as parking at the Fremont BART station has become difficult for most passengers. Previously passengers could easily park at the Fremont BART Station for free; however BART has implemented paid parking which is essentially restricted to BART riders. Also the BART parking fills to capacity very early. Passengers have found other parking within Fremont including at a nearby park. VTA staff had been working with the City of Fremont to identify a park & ride location. After reviewing numerous alternatives, a location at the Fremont Civic Center at the corner of Stevenson and Civic Center Drive has been identified. The city has numerous parking pressures in the coming years including accommodating BART parking from the Fremont Station when the construction to Warm Springs starts. 50 spaces are to be provided through 2010, after that further discussions will be needed based on the BART parking needs.
During the public comment period, which included a survey of passengers using the various park & ride locations on these routes, many riders objected to changing both lines to operate on I-880 as opposed to I-680, as it would inconvenience those going to the Great Mall as well as those who are using the parking locations along Mission Boulevard (at Gallaudet, Callery and I-680). To accommodate these riders, the proposal has been changed to include a rerouting of only the Express 181 to use I-880 and keeping Express 180 on Mission Boulevard and I-680. Some persons also commented on discontinuing the operations of Express 180 south of the Great Mall as this would require a transfer to light rail to go downtown or use of the Express 181, which is being proposed to operate all day to downtown San Jose.

**Revised Proposal**

Express 180 would continue to operate on the existing routing on Mission Boulevard between Fremont BART and the Great Mall. It would operate every 30 minutes all day on weekdays and hourly in the evenings until approx. 10:30 p.m. There would be no change to the weekend service, which would go to both Great Mall and downtown San Jose every 30 minutes. On weekends, a new 7:42 p.m. southbound trip would be added.

Express 181, which currently operates during peak hours only, would be modified to operate every 15 minutes all day in both directions until 7:00 p.m., between the Fremont BART Station and the San Jose Diridon Transit Center. Line 181 would be modified to operate via Stevenson and I-880 instead of Mission Boulevard and I-680. A new Park & Ride location will be available at Stevenson & Civic Center Drive.
Figure 7-26: Lines 180/181 Average Riders by Stop Northbound

Figure 7-27: Lines 180/181 Average Riders by Stop Southbound
Figure 7-28: Lines 180 Average Riders by Trip Northbound

Figure 7-29: Lines 180 Average Riders by Trip Southbound
Figure 7-30: Lines 181 Average Riders by Trip Northbound

Figure 7-31: Lines 181 Average Riders by Trip Southbound
Figure 7-32: Lines 180/181 Existing Service
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Figure 7-32: Lines 180/181 Existing Service
Figure 7-33: Lines 180/181 Proposed Service
Community Bus Studies

In addition to the major recommendations made in this plan there are five areas of study for community buses proposed for the coming year: Mountain View, Santa Clara Kaiser, Milpitas, San Jose/Line 11 and Almaden Valley/Line 13.

VTA’s Community Bus service is planned to meet the needs of individual communities and neighborhoods, improve general circulation within a local area and provide access to arterial bus routes, light rail or transit centers. Community Bus service is typically deployed in lower-density residential developments and central business districts to provide connections amongst housing, schools, shopping malls, employment centers and recreational areas. It is also provided in areas not physically conducive to operating standard bus service or areas exhibiting lower ridership demand.

Through a collaborative planning, outreach and community involvement process VTA service planning staff works closely with cities and communities to design the Community Bus routes and schedules. Local stakeholders provide input over 2-3 meetings to develop the service, which is then reviewed in public meeting sessions. VTA also coordinates joint promotional opportunities for the new service with the local communities. A final plan is submitted to the VTA Board for adoption and implementation if needed. Actual implementation date for any service changes proposed by these studies is based on when the study is complete and has yet to be determined.
Community Bus Planning & Implementation Process

Phase I - Planning
- Review ridership and performance levels.
- Service Design Guidelines used to plan changes to service.
- Potential changes to service identified in Draft Annual Transit Service Plan.

Phase II - Outreach
- Community outreach coordinated to discuss potential changes.
- City Staff, City Council and VTA identify stakeholders.

Phase III - Implementation
- Final recommendations reviewed by VTA staff and included in the Draft Annual Transit Service Plan.
- VTA Board review and approval.
- Marketing and promotions implemented.

Community Involvement
Local stakeholders engage their community.

Phase II - Meeting 1
- Describe process.
- Provide ridership and performance information.
- Listen: Collect useful data from participants. (e.g. customer needs, key areas to serve & bus stops)
- VTA Homework: Develop alternative(s) for community review.

Phase II - Meeting 2
- Consensus Exercise: Engage participants in group discussion to review alternative(s) and develop a preferred alternative.
- VTA Homework: Further develop preferred alternatives into final proposal.

Phase II - Meeting 3
- Review and agree upon final proposed Community Bus service.
- Discuss other related planning issues such as marketing and image development.
- Optional Tour: Have vehicle available to tour proposed route.

Phase II - General Review (if necessary)
- Continue consensus building process.
- Schedule general public review meeting(s) and obtain input via email and website.

Mail/email additional resources to participants.
**Mountain View**

The City of Mountain View is interested in improving Community Bus service in their downtown area. Currently Lines 32, 35, 40, 51 and 52 serve the immediately surrounding area. Community Bus Line 34 serves downtown during the midday period on weekdays and could potentially be modified to meet the local needs better. Community Bus Line 32 may also have potential to meet some of the travel into downtown. The study would review various service options within the current resources.

![Figure 7-35: City of Mountain View Current Service](image-url)
**Santa Clara Kaiser**

VTA Line 81 currently serves the Santa Clara Kaiser facility only from east/west directions. VTA and community input have identified a need for north/south service from the El Camino to the medical facility campus. The new community bus route would provide a convenient, direct connection from the core service VTA operates on the El Camino, such as Line 22 and Rapid 522. A study will be conducted to determine how to route the new line and where bus stops will be located. Early discussions with Kaiser administration staff have indicated their support of the route. Ideas to support the route such as employee/patient surveys, promotions, Eco Pass participation and direct funding have been discussed. Discussion with City of Santa Clara staff on the proposed service is underway as well.

---

**Figure 7-36: Santa Clara Kaiser Current Service**

![Map of Santa Clara Kaiser current service routes](image)
**Milpitas**

Lines 33, 46, 47 currently serving the Milpitas operate with regular 40 foot buses. In many respects these lines have characteristics of Community Bus routes that VTA operates in other areas of the county. Also, for most of the day, except for school trips, ridership levels do not warrant the larger buses.

Recently, new developments along Main Street (seniors housing, library, Valley Health Center, high density apartments) were the catalyst for review of local bus service in the City of Milpitas. VTA has started to develop a Community Based Transportation Plan for Milpitas as required by MTC. A part of that planning effort will include reviewing local Milpitas bus services in order to address the changing needs of the City and the possible conversion to Community Bus services.

![Figure 7-37: City of Milpitas Current Service](image)
San Jose: Line 11

As a result of the COA, Community Bus Line 11 was created to replace Lines 82 and 85 that served the area just north of downtown. The line also serves the Northside Community Center and the San Jose Market Center. VTA worked with the neighborhood and the City Council Office to plan and implement this route. Due to lower than expected ridership performance on some sections of the route, a study that re-engages the community to explore potential service changes is proposed.

Figure 7-38: City of San Jose: Line 11 Current Service
Almaden Valley: Line 13

Community Bus Line 13 connects the Almaden Valley to the VTA’s core transit service, light rail and the Oakridge Mall. However, it has been performing below minimum standards. A study to consider re-routing and other service changes is proposed in order to increase ridership and productivity. Initial discussions with the local Council Office have been held to identify community stakeholders to participate in the planning process.
Minor Service Proposals

The following proposals are considered minor changes to the bus service system as they do not trigger any of the requirements for VTA Board approval (See Introduction). These proposals are indicative of the service changes that VTA makes every quarter to improve our transit system. Service adjustments of this nature are reported to the VTA’s Transit Planning and Operations Committee. These proposals have been included in the public and community outreach process, so input and comments could be solicited. They will be implemented in July 2009.

Table 7-1: Minor Service Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Service Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Delete the 11:47pm eastbound trip on weekdays and weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Move southbound 5:12am and northbound 5:20am weekday trips 23 minutes later. Delete the 6:40pm northbound and 7:13 southbound trips on weekdays. Start the 5:46am southbound trip at Via Valiente &amp; Almaden on weekdays and the southbound 9:05am trip at Via Valiente &amp; Almaden on weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Delete the short 6:08am and 6:50am trips on weekdays and the 7:50am trip on Saturdays. Combine the 6:26pm &amp; 6:53pm trips into one trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Delete the 4:38am weekday westbound trip. Add an extra eastbound trip between 7:11pm &amp; 10:15pm trips on Saturdays. Add an extra eastbound trip between the 8:07pm &amp; 9:44pm trips on Sundays. Add an extra westbound trip between the 7:53pm &amp; 8:54pm trips on Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Combine the 5:04am, 5:21am &amp; 5:38am eastbound trips into 2 trips on weekdays. Add 2 extra trips between the 7:58pm &amp; 10:14pm eastbound trips on weekdays. Add an extra eastbound trip between the 6:05pm &amp; 7:08pm trips on Saturdays. Add an extra westbound trip between the 6:50am &amp; 7:49am trips on Saturdays. Add an extra eastbound trip between the 6:09pm &amp; 7:10pm trips on Sundays. Add new 5:02pm &amp; 5:32pm westbound trips on Sundays. Add an extra westbound trip between the 7:20am &amp; 8:19am trips on Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Service Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 25   | Add an 8:53am eastbound trip from Valley Medical College and extend the 6:39am & 7:37am westbound trips to De Anza College on Saturdays.  
Add an 8:53am eastbound trip from Valley Medical College on Sundays. |
| 26   | Add 4 westbound am and 4 eastbound pm short trips between Lockheed Martin and El Camino on weekdays.  
Start the 5:49am eastbound trip at Curtner light rail station on weekdays.  
Delete the 6:20am westbound & 6:45am eastbound short trips on weekdays. |
| 27   | Delete the 9:23pm westbound trip on weekdays.  
Delete the 9:04am eastbound trip on Saturdays. |
| 31   | Move the 6:10am southbound trip & the 6:29am northbound trip later and delete the 6:53am northbound short trip on weekdays.  
Delete the 9:23pm westbound trip on weekdays. |
| 33   | Delete the 9:04am eastbound trip on Saturdays.  
Combine the 9:00am & 9:30am trips on Saturdays. |
| 35   | Move the 7:20am southbound trip approximately 15 minutes later on Saturdays.  
Delete the 6:32pm, 7:33pm & 8:33pm eastbound trips and the 7:16pm & 8:16pm westbound trips on weekdays. (Change to hourly service on weekday evenings.)  
Start the 6:02am eastbound trip at Winchester and move to 15 minutes later on weekdays. |
| 37   | Delete the 8:23am & 6:25pm southbound trips and the 8:44am & 6:44pm northbound trips on Sundays.  
Delete the 7:05am and the southbound 6:05pm trips on Saturdays and the northbound 7:05am trip on Sundays.  
Start the 6:04am trip at Winchester and move to 15 minutes later on weekdays. |
| 45   | Delete the 7:31 southbound trip on weekdays.  
Delete the 8:23am & 6:25pm southbound trips and the 8:44am & 6:44pm northbound trips on Sundays.  
Delete the northbound 7:05am and the southbound 6:05pm trips on Saturdays and the northbound 7:05am trip on Sundays. |
| 48   | Change the route to interline with route 49 in Los Gatos and serve Good Samaritan Hospital.  
Combine the 5:49am & 6:05am northbound trips on weekdays.  
Start the 6:04am trip at Winchester and Knowles on weekdays.  
Start the 6:12am southbound & the 6:31am northbound trips 5 minutes earlier on weekdays.  
Delete the 10:35pm southbound trip on Saturdays and the 9:35pm southbound trip on Sundays. |
<p>| 49   | Delete the 7:46pm &amp; 8:46pm northbound and the 7:23pm &amp; 8:23 pm southbound trips on weekdays. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Service Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Add a 3:10pm southbound &amp; 3:31pm northbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Combine the 5:32am &amp; 5:51am southbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extend the 8:40am southbound trip to De Anza College on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Combine the 7:42pm &amp; 8:21pm northbound trips and the 7:53pm &amp; 8:20pm southbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Add a 9:28am northbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start the 5:21am southbound trip at Scott &amp; Space Park and move 15 minutes later on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Extend the 8:23am northbound trip to Great America on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 8:20am northbound trip on Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Delete the 9:38pm southbound and the 10:12pm northbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move the 5:39am northbound trip earlier and the 7:12pm northbound trip later on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 6:52am northbound trip on Saturdays and Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reroute to operate on Sierra to Piedmont east of Capitol Ave: switch the segment east of Capitol Ave with the 62.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Delete the 5:23am northbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move the 6:21am northbound trip approximately 15 minutes later on Saturdays and Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reroute to continue on Berryessa east of Capitol Ave. to Piedmont: switch the segment east of Capitol Ave with the 61.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Combine the 5:17am &amp; 5:56am northbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 5:51am southbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine the 7:21pm &amp; 7:51pm southbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Move the 5:16am northbound trip later and delete the 5:59am northbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 12:04am northbound trip on weekdays and Sundays and delete the 6:55am northbound trip on Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Add an extra trip between the 5:13pm &amp; 7:38pm southbound trips on weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add an extra trip between the 5:22pm &amp; 7:24pm northbound trips on weekends.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Service Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Add an extra trip between the 6:08pm &amp; 7:53pm southbound trips on weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add an extra trip between the 4:50pm &amp; 7:00pm northbound trips on weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Delete the 4:37am northbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start the 6:13am &amp; 6:42am northbound trips at Capitol light rail station on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 11:03pm southbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start the 6:50am &amp; 7:24am northbound trips at Capitol light rail station on Saturdays and Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Delete the 5:08am northbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine the 5:59am &amp; the 6:18am northbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete one northbound trip between the 5:48pm &amp; 8:41pm trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine the 7:41pm &amp; the 8:11pm southbound trips on the weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine the 6:38pm &amp; the 7:08pm southbound trips on Saturdays and Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Combine the 5:41am &amp; the 5:56am northbound trips and the 6:26am &amp; 6:41am southbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine the 6:07pm &amp; 6:37pm northbound trips on Saturdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 6:24am southbound trip on Saturdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combine the 6:07pm &amp; 6:37pm northbound trips on Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Delete the 5:35am southbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add a 6:45am southbound trip from 2nd &amp; Santa Clara on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Start the 6:30am northbound trip at Senter &amp; Monterey on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 9:58pm northbound and the 10:31pm southbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 6:14am northbound and 6:53am southbound trips on Saturdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move the 6:59am northbound &amp; the 7:41am southbound trips later, combine the 7:37am &amp; the 8:21am northbound trips and delete the 8:29am southbound trip on Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Combine the 5:08am &amp; 5:33am northbound trips and the 6:08am &amp; 6:26am southbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Service Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Delete the 5:25am westbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Move the 5:30am eastbound trip later and delete the 6:00am eastbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 6:38pm eastbound trip as well as the 6:35pm &amp; 8:59pm westbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 7:02pm &amp; 7:49pm eastbound and the 6:54pm &amp; 7:54pm westbound trips on Saturdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Combine the 5:30am &amp; 6:00am southbound trips on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delete the 9:11am northbound trip on Sundays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Delete the 6:00am southbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Add a 7:42pm southbound trip on weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Add a 6:26pm southbound trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Add northbound trips to arrive at BART at 7:10pm &amp; 7:40pm on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Extend route to Great Mall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DASH</td>
<td>Delete the 6:16am trip on weekdays.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Hours Summary

In keeping with the Transit Sustainability Policy, an analysis of the number of hours reallocated by modifying service is prepared. This helps show how service is distributed amongst the various types of bus services that VTA operates. The goal for the Annual Transit Service Plan in 2009 was to maintain a cost neutral service plan. Table 7-2 shows how services are proposed to be reallocated for each bus route type. As with the COA and the New Bus Service, we continue to improve the Core network of routes, which carries about 75% of VTA’s daily bus passengers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Weekday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Total Annual Hours Change</th>
<th>Current Total Annual Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>-11.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14,166</td>
<td>936,027.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>-20.9</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-3,767</td>
<td>124,118.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeder</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1,373</td>
<td>93,090.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bus</td>
<td>-21.2</td>
<td>-7.7</td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>-5,953</td>
<td>138,453.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Express/Limited</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>-4,936</td>
<td>97,405.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A negative number indicates hours reduced from service or a savings to VTA and a positive number indicates hours added to service.
In addition to conducting public outreach for service changes, VTA promotes service to targeted markets to increase VTA ridership. This is a critical phase of the service development process. Many services and routes which are new, modified or underperforming benefit from a marketing and promotional effort. The following describes some of the recent, major campaigns and outlines marketing efforts that are proposed in the coming months to support the changes in the Annual Transit Service Plan.

2008 Campaigns

In 2008, several campaigns were implemented to increase awareness of VTA service and travel options.

Express Bus Promotion

The Express Bus campaign was developed to raise awareness of, and build ridership on VTA Express bus lines serving South County and Fremont/East Bay commuters. In March, 2008, a direct-mail promotional piece was mailed to homes in Gilroy, San Martin, Morgan Hill and select areas of Fremont. The mailer included coupons offering five free rides on Express Bus Lines 120, 140, 168, 180 and 181. In addition, an email campaign to local employers was implemented to boost participation in the campaign. A comprehensive, two-month advertising schedule was launched that included newspaper ads, Comcast TV commercials, a web banner ad on Mercurynews.com and an article written in VTA’s “Take-One,” an on-board passenger newsletter. A total of 1,368 coupons were redeemed during the promotional period.

Core Bus Promotion

A marketing campaign was developed to increase ridership on the Core Bus Network and to promote the Core Bus Network’s improved service frequencies. The network, promoted as “VTA’s Frequent 15,” consists of 15 bus lines with 15 minute or less frequencies. This extensive campaign ran from June through July 2008. It included print ads in twenty two local, community and multi-lingual newspapers; English and Spanish
radio ads; Comcast Cable, Univision and Telemundo network TV commercials; online ads in the Mercurynews.com and vta.org websites; transit ads including light rail stations posters, bus shelter ads, interior carcards, exterior bus advertisements; and an article written in “Take-One.”

Community Bus Promotion

A marketing campaign to raise awareness and build ridership on VTA’s Community Bus lines was implemented from July through October 2008. The campaign, with the slogan “Take a ride ‘round town on your Community Bus!” highlighted the value and convenience of traveling on community buses to get to local destinations. The campaign included a web banner on VTA.org and a promotional web page that included detailed information on all Community Bus routes. The campaign utilized a wide array of media including interior carcards, bus tail posters, light rail station posters, radio and Comcast Cable TV ads, print ads in local, community and multi-lingual newspapers, Skyscraper banner ads on Pump Top TV’s gas station network and cinema advertising.

Park & Ride Promotion

In an effort to highlight multi-modal connections to VTA and raise the public’s awareness of VTA’s Park & Ride lots, a promotion was launched in July 2008. The campaign emphasized the ease and convenience of connecting to VTA’s extensive network of bus and light rail service by driving, walking, carpooling or biking to any Park & Ride lot. Print ads in fifteen local community newspapers and a featured article in the September issue of VTA’s Take One onboard passenger newsletter were used in the campaign.

Figure 8-3: Community Bus Promotion Poster

Figure 8-4: Park and Ride Advertisement
**Eco Pass Promotion**

In August, an Eco Pass marketing campaign was launched that targeted Santa Clara County-based employers. Eco Pass is a discounted employer benefit that allows employees full access to VTA bus and light rail. With Eco Pass, employees can use VTA’s services anytime, eliminating the substantially high cost of driving solo. The campaign highlighted Eco Pass as an effective and cost-efficient tool for reducing traffic congestion, air pollution and as a viable solution to ever increasing commuter costs. Eco Pass was promoted by launching a web banner on VTA.org, publishing print ads in several community newspapers, and mailing informational brochures to employers and residential communities within close proximity to VTA services.

**Figure 8-5: Eco Pass Car Card**

![Eco Pass Car Card](image)

**Summer Blast Pass**

VTA’s Summer Blast Pass (SBP), a three month (June-August) discounted transit pass marketed to youth riders, was promoted May through August 2008. Now in its fourth year, the SBP had its most successful year showing an 18% increase in pass sales compared to 2007 sales. The Pass was marketed to parents and youth using a variety of media vehicles. Commercials were placed on Comcast Cable TV and local radio stations; and print advertisements were placed in the San Jose Mercury News and in twenty high school newspapers. The campaign also utilized Westfield Shopping Mall floor decals and food court table tents; movie theater ads; local school flyers and posters; and banner ads displayed on VTA’s website. Promotional messages were displayed on VTA Bus and Light Rail interior carcards, exterior busboards, light rail station posters and “Take-One.”

**Figure 8-6: Summer Blast Advertisement**

![Summer Blast Advertisement](image)
Convention Pass Promotion

To promote VTA’s Convention Pass Program, a sales referral/quota-based contest was implemented and ran from February through May 2008. The contest was aimed at hotels and local convention and visitors bureaus. Participants were provided marketing materials and assistance to inform current and potential clients about VTA’s Convention Pass. Participants that either purchased the most convention passes or provided referrals that resulted in the highest number of convention passes sold during the promotional period, won the contest. The winning participant received carcard advertisements on all VTA Bus and Light Rail vehicles and on twenty station posters for a period of one month. In addition, the winner was promoted in a digital postcard emailed to 30,000 event planners who are members of Meetings and Conventions Magazine. The digital postcard included the winner’s advertisement and link to their website as well as VTA’s Convention Pass advertisement and link to the VTA website. Other promotional efforts included a direct mail campaign. The promotional collateral included a visitor’s destination brochure and highlighted local destinations that are accessible by VTA Light Rail.

Figure 8-7: Convention Pass Poster
2009 - 2010 Campaigns

Starting July 2009, the Fiscal Year 2010 Marketing efforts will continue to involve key promotional partners, build on the positive environmental benefits of public transportation and focus on specific markets and services to improve ridership and route performance.

Partnerships

Promotional partnerships provide VTA with added exposure through resource trade. In 2008, VTA entered into 28 promotional partnerships. VTA plans to continue working with all existing partners and develop several new ones. The majority of promotional partnerships include utilizing VTA vehicles, shelters, stations, etc. to highlight the community events, while promoting VTA as the preferred mode of transportation. Planned partnerships for FY 2010 include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>San Jose America Festival, San Jose Jazz Festival, Morgan Hill Independence Day Parade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Aids Walk, Tapestry Arts Festival, Mountain View Art &amp; Wine Festival, Mariachi Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Rock &amp; Roll Half-Marathon, Spirit of Japantown Festival, San Jose Sharks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Downtown Ice, Holiday Lights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Toys for Tots, San Jose Holiday Parade, Christmas in the Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>San Jose State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>Amgen Bike Tour of California, American Heart Association Wear Red Day, San Jose Giants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>US Census, San Jose Earthquakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Bike to Work Day, Cinco de Mayo Parade, San Jose Downtown Farmer’s Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Tamale Festival, Music in the Park, Juneteenth Festival, Mountain View A La Carte and Art</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental Messaging

All Fiscal Year 2010 campaigns will focus on the environmental benefits of utilizing public transportation. All light rail vehicles will display large exterior posters as shown below. This is one of four different posters. All other promotions will also include the tagline Take VTA: Healthier Planet Healthier You.

Regional Transit Campaign

The Low Car Diet and Answer the Call regional campaigns are scheduled to launch April 2009. The partnering agencies include VTA, SamTrans, Muni, and AC Transit. This multi-agency campaign is the first joint promotional effort to include more than two Bay Area transit providers. Through pooled resources, the campaign will include interior and exterior bus advertising, station and shelter ads, radio and television commercials and print advertisements. Because this campaign
centers on a social, non time sensitive message, after an initial two-month run in April and May, the radio and television commercials, and traffic sponsorships will continue throughout the year to support other targeted campaigns.

**E Commerce Pilot Program**

This pilot program will test the functionality, practicality and utilization of online pass ordering. A special Fourth of July Day Pass, priced at twice a regular one-way fare, valid for all VTA bus and light rail service will be available via VTA’s website. A promotional campaign will be launched utilizing print, broadcast and online advertising to promote the special pass and online ordering. July 4th and other special events have proven to be successful in attracting new riders to try VTA services.

**Summer Blast Pass**

Since 2005, VTA has offered a discounted, three-month pass (June – August) for youth 17 and under. VTA partners with local attractions, malls and eateries to offer pass holders additional benefits. The Summer Blast Pass will be promoted through schools, theater ads, radio, television and malls. Promotional materials feature all the summer activities and entertainment youth and teens can get to via VTA.

**Rider Appreciation and Benefits**

VTA riders will be offered additional benefits including discounts at local retailers and restaurants and attractions throughout the county. The VTA Take One monthly rider newsletter will feature monthly benefits to riders. Some issues will include clip out coupons and others will feature offers available to VTA pass holders.

**Eco Pass**

VTA’s Eco Pass Program provides employers and residential communities a discounted transportation program. All employees or residents are enrolled in the program, with the total cost based on number of individuals in the program and the level of service to and from the business or community. VTA promotes the Eco Pass program through printed materials, the VTA website,
e-newsletters, website advertising, business communications, community events and employer
presentations. This continues to be a success program in attracting more commuter use of our
services.

**Targeted Service Campaigns**

In Fiscal Year 2010 a minimum of three service campaigns will be implemented. These campaigns
feature specific aspects of the VTA bus and light rail system. A campaign will be launched fall
2009 that features VTA’s core bus routes and express service, targeting local business commuters
and students. A winter campaign will focus on promoting light rail service to holiday activities,
shopping and community events. An early spring 2010 campaign will promote Community Bus
Service and target residents living in the county’s smaller outlaying communities. The Community
Bus promotion will include partnerships with local business and highlight destinations in featured
communities. Each of the three campaigns will articulate the ecological and economical benefits of
public transportation.

Each of these campaigns will also seek to improve ridership on these service types. Table 8-1
shows routes with ridership performance that could improve with marketing and promotional
campaigns. Each of these routes has ridership levels below current performance standards. In
many cases the ridership performance of these routes is just slightly below the standard and other
measures such as modifying frequency or hours of service are not yet appropriate. (See Service
Evaluation Chapter.)
### Table 8-1: Routes to Promote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Routes</th>
<th>Underperforming Service Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Weekdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Weekdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Weekdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>Saturdays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeder Routes</th>
<th>Underperforming Service Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Bus Routes</th>
<th>Underperforming Service Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Weekdays &amp; Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Weekdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Weekdays, Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Weekdays &amp; Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Weekdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Express Routes</th>
<th>Underperforming Service Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Routes</th>
<th>Underperforming Service Days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Weekdays &amp; Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Saturdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Weekdays, Saturdays &amp; Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Sundays</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Title VI Evaluation

In accordance with the May 13, 2007, Final Federal Title VI Circular (FTA C 4702.1A), this Title VI Evaluation has been completed for VTA’s 2009 Annual Transit Service Plan, to be implemented starting on July 13, 2009. In order to comply with 49 CFR Section 21.5(b)(2), 49 CFR Section 21.5(b)(7) and Appendix C to 49 CFR part 21, recipients of financial assistance from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) shall evaluate significant 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. For service changes, this evaluation requirement only applies to “major service changes.” This approach must include:

- A description of the methodology used to determine the impact of the service change (Methodology).
- A determination as to whether the proposed change would have discriminatory impacts (Evaluation).
- A description of what, if any, action was taken by the agency in response to the analysis conducted (Implementation).

Methodology

VTA’s methodology uses the guidance information provided in the circular to assess the effects of the proposed service changes on minority and low-income populations. Our approach is based on evaluating the impacts to routes that have minority or low income population greater than the service area average.

We have defined a route subject to Title VI analysis is defined as one that has 50% of more of its length in an area (census tract or traffic analysis zone) where the total minority population or low-income population is greater than the service area average. Overall, our Title VI methodology is based on criteria that guided the development of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis and now guides the Annual Transit Service Plan.

- VTA’s approach is system wide and is meant to improve travel in the core areas where transit demand is greatest, augmented with specialized services (community bus, express) to fulfill certain travel niches. Concentrations of minority and low-income populations are well served by this approach based on our market analysis and onboard surveys, conducted as part of the Comprehensive Operations Analysis. Travel within the core market throughout the day (not just peak periods) was identified as being important to our passengers.
- The plan does not decrease or increase the overall service hours provided. Rather it focuses on deploying service to areas that demand or market analysis shows will result in the highest ridership. Service hours from unproductive services that are eliminated or reduced would be used to add new routes or improve existing well performing routes. Concentrations of minority and low-income populations, which are transit dependent, show high use of the more popular
transit services.

- VTA’s service area population overall is a minority population. In the 2006 On-Board Survey, 63% of our passengers reported they had “no other way” to make their trip on transit, thus indicating they are transit dependent.

Our methodology also incorporates the chapters of this Plan titled “Public Outreach”, “Service Evaluation” and “Ridership”. These sections are included to provide an explanation of the outreach and service planning process. Involvement by passengers, potential passengers and community groups including those representing minority and low-income populations were an important part of the process.

**Evaluation & Implementation**

Of the 12 bus lines with recommended major changes, nine are subject to Title VI evaluation: Community Bus Lines 14 and 17 in Gilroy, 15 in Morgan Hill, and 45 in East San Jose; Core Lines 64, 66 and 68; and Express Lines 180 and 181 from Fremont. For detailed descriptions of the changes to each route consult the “Recommendations” chapter of this Plan.

Community Bus Lines 14 and 17 operate in Gilroy and currently run as one-way loops: Line 14 serves the Gilroy Transit Center and the Gilroy Crossings Shopping Center and Line 17 serves the Social Services Facility, Gilroy Outlets and St. Louise Hospital. The lines would be changed to serve as two-way routes with north/south service to the same facilities. The change results in an additional service (improved from 60 minute to 30 minute frequency) on both routes. This service addition is funded through a Lifeline grant. Lines 14 and 17 are shown in Figure 9-1 as routing changes.

Community Bus Line 15 in Morgan Hill serves Jackson Oaks and the Holiday Lake Estates, the Morgan Hill Caltrain Station, downtown and part of the Monterey Corridor (See inset map in Figure 9-1). Line 15 has continuously performed below the minimum performance standards: the average trip load is less than six passengers. For this reason the route would be discontinued. Marketing efforts and outreach to improve the service were conducted in July of 2007 and again after the implementation of the New Bus Service in 2008. The ridership has not improved. Community meetings have been held as a part of this Plan to discuss the termination of the route as well as other service changes in South County.

Prior to the COA Community Bus Line 45 was an extension of Line 64. Due to low ridership the new Line 45 was created as a community bus route. To date it is still performing poorly. Community meetings and emails revealed that people were generally displeased with the reduction in service. However, the proposed reductions will allow VTA to reallocate these under-utilized resources to lines in other minority and low income areas such as on Lines 66 and 68. VTA will research possible Lifeline funding in order to improve future service in this area. (See Service Change Routes in Figure 9-1.)
Saturday service on Line 64 will be reduced from a frequency of every 15 minutes to every 30 minutes between McKee and White. The ridership on the extra trips provided by 15 minute service is very low: the average peak load is 6 riders. This service recommendation was presented at several community meetings. (See Service Change Routes in Figure 9-1.)

Ridership on Lines 66 and 68 has been very high. Currently, not all the trips serve all stops and route frequency varies. Both lines will be made more convenient to use by increasing service to every 15 minutes over the whole route all day. Public feedback regarding this change has been overwhelmingly positive. (See Service Change Routes in Figure 9-1.)

See the Recommendations section of this Plan for a detailed description of the complication, proposed changes for Express Lines 180 and 181. New routing for Line 181 will improve travel times to downtown San Jose and new service throughout the day is also proposed. Based on public input the current routing for Line 180 using Mission Boulevard and I-680 will remain.

Overall, a net 5,445 annual service hours are being added to these Title VI routes as a result of these proposed changes. Since this plan is cost neutral, these service hours are being reallocated from non-Title VI routes. In general the proposed changes to Title VI routes are either service enhancements or reductions to service based on poor ridership performance. Our implementation strategies for these changes will include a high level of public outreach and marketing in advance of making the changes, planned for July 2009. The New Bus Service implementation in January 2008 has shown that a comprehensive public marketing effort, which also includes the use of trained ambassadors to provide field level information to passengers, has resulted in a successful launch. We will continue with this approach for the implementation of the proposals described here.

**Table 9-1: Title VI Routes Change in Annual Hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Hours Removed</th>
<th>Hours Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3533</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>-5049</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>-1435</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>-2683</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>-2330</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-15,030</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,475</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9-1: Title VI Routes
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief CMA Officer, John Ristow

SUBJECT: Sustainability Program Update

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

The VTA sustainability program began in July 2007 with the approval of funds to support staff
time and small-scale capital improvements to VTA facilities and vehicles. A Sustainability
Team was also established in July 2007 to provide overall direction for the program. The Team
meets monthly and includes representatives from operations, facilities, risk management,
contracts, marketing, construction and environmental planning to assist in evaluating and
implementing improvements and programs.

On February 7, 2007 the VTA Board of Directors formally approved the VTA Sustainability
Program. The Program goal is "To proactively reduce the consumption of natural resources, the
creation of greenhouse gases, and the generation of pollution in the provision of public
transportation services." The Program includes reporting back to the VTA Board of Directors
annually on the status. This agenda item is the first annual update on the progress of the
Sustainability Program.

DISCUSSION:

The Sustainability Program has been a collaborative effort of VTA staff from a number of
departments to identify conservation measures and to implement recommendations. The
Sustainability Program accomplishments are highlighted in Attachment A. The
accomplishments are grouped in terms of general activities, energy conservation, water
conservation, solid waste reduction and outreach activities.

A major part of the program has involved working with utilities and other outside resource
agencies. Some of these efforts are highlighted below.

- VTA worked with PG&E on Integrated Energy Audits for all 5 operating division. This
led to the identification of no cost, low cost, and greater investment measures to improve energy efficiency. VTA has been implementing many of these recommendations.

- VTA partnered with the Santa Clara Valley Water District to conduct Irrigation Audits of 3 divisions and 18 park-and-ride lots and on Water Use Surveys of its 5 operating divisions. Replacement of older equipment and installation of new Weather Based Irrigation Controllers at 21 sites will substantially reduce water consumption.

- VTA has partnered with the City of San Jose on distribution of compact fluorescent lights, recycling efforts, and a solar energy installation.

- Participating in a Pilot Solar Installation Project at Cerone Division.

- Substantial outreach efforts have also been undertaken with the "Keep the Valley Green" program and staff conservation education programs.

In June 2007, a $3 million dollar budget was established to support the Sustainability Program for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2009. Approximately $2.25 million has been committed to capital projects and for staff time. The completed and committed capital projects are projected to result in annual operating cost savings of over $800,000. The Sustainability Team is also currently evaluating several future capital projects that would result in additional cost savings. The current budgeting process has not yet determined whether additional funds will be programmed for Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011. If no additional funds are budgeted, the remaining funds of approximately $750,000 will be carried forward and managed to implement additional capital projects, while also providing sufficient staff time to support the program through Fiscal Years 2010 and 2011. However, staff time and capital projects will need to be reduced from the current level of effort.

STANDING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION/RECOMMENDATION:

The Congestion Management Program & Planning Committee considered this item at the March 19, 2009 meeting. The committee asked several questions which were responded to by staff. Boardmember Kishimoto requested information on VTA's total carbon emissions which staff will provide. General support was expressed for the program.

Prepared By: Tom Fitzwater
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS  
(July 1, 2007 to March 2, 2009)

GENERAL ACTIVITIES

• Since July 2007, the Sustainability Team has met monthly to evaluate actions and implement programs. The Team consists of VTA staff from operations, facilities, risk management, technology, marketing, environmental planning, contracts and construction.
• In February 2008, VTA Board of Directors adopted the Sustainability Program.
• In February 2009, VTA submitted an application for Green Business Certification of its River Oaks Division.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

• Partnered with PG&E to complete evaluations of VTA’s electrical and natural gas usage at its 5 Divisions. VTA has implemented the following recommendations that are documented in Integrated Energy Audit reports:
  − Replaced lighting at Cerone Division’s Buildings A, B, and F; and Chaboya Division’s Fuel Island with a variety of energy efficient fixtures including T-8’s, T-5’s, and LEDs. Anticipated savings: 107,000 kWh and $11,000 per year.
  − Preparing RFP to replace recommended lighting fixtures at all divisions.
  − In February 2009, completed modifications to VTA’s River Oaks Division to enable participation in the Automated Demand Response Program. Received $35,000 in technical and participation incentives to help fund the modifications.
• Purchased 10 Ford Escape and 5 Toyota Prius hybrids and retired 15 older vehicles. Estimated to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 73 tons.
• In November 2007, VTA agreed to participate in a solar assessment of the Children’s Discovery Museum Light Rail Station in partnership with the City of San Jose.
• Replaced 60 CRT monitors with LCD monitors. Anticipated savings: 5,000 kWh and $700 per year.
• In April 2008 partnered with City of San Jose on “Change a Light, Change the World” Energy Star program and distributed over 800 CFLs to employees.
• In September 2008, completed a solar assessment of the Guadalupe Division and North Yard. Identified that these sites could accommodate a 1.5 MW system at a cost of $12.5 million with a 13 year payback period. VTA is currently evaluating funding options.
• Installed lighting occupancy sensors in meeting rooms at River Oaks.
• In November 2008, began testing the feasibility of turning off auxiliary power systems for light rail vehicles parked at the Guadalupe Division. Due to a power failure at a substation at the Guadalupe Division in late November 2008, VTA has suspended this test until the cause
of the power failure has been confirmed. Anticipated savings of 1,837,1197 kWh and $310,000 per year.

- In February 2009, VTA’s Information Technology programmed desktop computers to automatically go into hibernation mode after 2 hours of no activity.
- Currently investigating utility management software to monitor and track VTA’s numerous utility accounts.
- Purchased a submeter for the Guadalupe Division that helped identify $107,000 in overcharges in P.G.&E.’s billing.
- Continuing to partner with Sustainable Silicon Valley to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.
- Installed a Biodiesel Tank at North Yard to conduct tests on bus performance.
- Participating in a 12-18 month Pilot Solar Installation at Cerone Division expected to result in saving of over $10,000 per year.

WATER CONSERVATION

- In partnership with the Santa Clara Valley Water District, conducted Irrigation Audits of water usage at River Oaks Division, Cerone Division, North Division, and 18 Park-and-Ride Lots. VTA has implemented the following recommendations in the Landscape Irrigation Evaluations:
  - In November 2008, awarded a contract to install weather-based irrigation controllers at 21 facilities. All controllers should be installed by March 2009. Anticipated savings: 12,197,521 gallons of water and $37,000 per year.
  - Replaced sprinkler nozzles with MP Rotators, which distribute water more efficiently and more uniformly, at the Penintencia Creek Park-and-Ride, the Hostetter Park-and-Ride, the Great Mall Park-and-Ride, and the River Oaks Division.
- In partnership with the Santa Clara Valley Water District, conducted Water Use Surveys of its 5 divisions. VTA has implemented the following recommendations in the reports:
  - Replaced over 55 toilets and urinals, 10 showerheads, and 25 aerators with low flow equipment.

SOLID WASTE REDUCTION

- In February 2008, implemented a paper recycling program at offices leased from Hynix.
- In April 2008, started a pilot project to fund the replacement of Styrofoam plates and to-go boxes in the cafeteria with environmentally-friendly products. Replaced 31,000 pieces of Styrofoam.
- In 2008, VTA’s Board Office implemented changes that dramatically reduced the number of mailings of agenda packets and minutes.
- In August 2008, VTA Project Controls created a repository of deliverables and replaced hard copy reports with an email link to the documents in the repository.
- In August 2008, expanded the battery recycling program at the River Oaks Division.
- In September 2008, held a Recycling Celebration that featured eco-trivia and free locally grown produce.
- Working with Allied Waste to implement a composting program at the River Oaks cafeteria in April 2009.
- In February 2009, VTA Information Technology installed an automatic duplex printing setting on 88 duplex-capable printers.
• In January 2009, VTA’s Information Technology kicked off a project to facilitate the transition to paperless workflow for many VTA internal forms.

OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

• Developed “Keep the Valley Green” logo and program for light rail vehicles, buses and other VTA vehicles.
• Established a Sustainability web page on VTA.org.
• Placed link to VTA’s Sustainability web page on FTA’s website.
• Wrote monthly column in employee newsletter titled “Green Tips”.
• Circulated numerous “Green” press releases.
• Distributed frequent emails to staff highlighting timely sustainability issues.
• Hung posters and notices throughout River Oaks campus to promote water conservation and waste reduction.
• In October-December 2008, conducted an Employee Transportation Survey to identify measures to improve employee commute options.
• Supported bicycle eLocker program to provide more efficient use of bicycle lockers.
• In January 2009, began working with VTA Information Technology to create a “green portal” to improve internal access to information about VTA’s Sustainability Program.
• Sent “Spare the Air” Alerts to all employees in partnership with the Bay Area Air Quality Management Board.
BOARD MEMORANDUM

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
   Board of Directors

THROUGH: General Manager, Michael T. Burns

FROM: Chief External Affairs Officer, Greta Helm

SUBJECT: Monthly Legislative History Matrix

FOR INFORMATION ONLY

BACKGROUND:

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

DISCUSSION:

The big news in Sacramento is that Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger and the Legislature successfully enacted an intricate package of 33 bills that attempts to close the massive $40 billion gap between state revenues and spending over the next 17 months, while at the same time stimulating the economy by accelerating some public works projects and giving tax breaks to some businesses. Action came three months after the Governor declared a fiscal emergency and called on lawmakers to convene a special session to solve the state’s budget crisis.

In general, the enacted budget package takes a three-pronged approach, with $12.8 billion in temporary tax increases, $15 billion in spending cuts, and $11.4 billion in borrowing. It also includes a $1 billion reserve.

Temporary Tax Increases: The budget package consists of four temporary tax increases. How long they would be in effect would depend on whether California voters approve a constitutional amendment appearing on a special election ballot scheduled for May 19 to impose a limit on future state spending. The four temporary tax increases, which are expected to generate $12.8 billion over 17 months, call for the following:

1. Raising the state sales tax by 1 percent, effective April 1, 2009. This tax increase would sunset on June 30, 2012, if the voters approve the spending cap. If the voters reject the
spending cap, then it would expire one year sooner, on June 30, 2011.

2. Raising the vehicle license fee (VLF) from 0.65 percent of the market value of a vehicle to 1.15 percent. The revenues generated from this increase would be split between the General Fund and a new special account dedicated to funding local public safety programs. The VLF rate increase would become effective for registrations beginning May 19, 2009, and would expire on June 30, 2013, if the voters approve the spending cap. Without the spending cap, the rate increase would expire two years sooner, on June 30, 2011.

3. Imposing a 0.25 percent rate increase for personal income taxes, effective starting in tax year 2009. This rate add-on would apply through tax year 2012 if the voters go along with the spending cap. If the spending cap is rejected, then it would apply to tax years 2009 and 2010. Furthermore, if the state receives funding through the federal economic stimulus bill that offsets at least $9.1 billion of General Fund costs, then the rate increase would be reduced to 0.125 percent.

4. Reducing the dependent credit allowed against personal income taxes to the federal level of $99 instead of $309 beginning in the 2009 tax year. The dependent credit reduction would apply through tax year 2012 if the voters approve the spending cap. It would expire two years sooner, applying only to tax years 2009 and 2010, if the spending cap is rejected.

**Spending Cuts:** The budget package includes $15 billion in reductions that would impact every aspect of state government. The key cuts are as follows:

- $8.6 billion from K-12 education.
- $264 million from the University of California and California State University systems.
- $673 million from eliminating cost-of-living increases for recipients of CalWORKs and SSI/SSP grants.
- $1.4 billion from the elimination of two paid holidays, from two furlough days per month through June 2010, and from cuts in overtime pay for state employees.
- $181 million from state prison medical care.
- $146 million from the courts.

If California does not receive funding through the federal economic stimulus bill that offsets at least $9.1 billion of General Fund costs, then there would be further cuts to Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, in-home support for seniors, SSI/SSP, and the courts.

**Transportation:** The State Transit Assistance Program (STA) took the brunt of the cuts in transportation. For FY 2009, STA funding was sliced from $306 million to $153 million. In addition, the budget package calls for using all STA money to pay for yellow school bus service and debt service on transportation-related bonds for the next four fiscal years, through FY 2013. Meanwhile, Proposition 42 funding for local streets/roads and the STIP would remain intact for the current fiscal year and for FY 2010. Finally, $100 million in annual tribal gaming revenues that were intended to repay various state transportation accounts for prior-year loans to the
General Fund would remain in the General Fund for FY 2009 and FY 2010.

**Borrowing:** The budget package calls for $11.4 billion in loans as follows:

- Borrowing $5 billion from the state lottery, subject to voter approval.
- Selling $5.9 billion in reimbursement warrants (RAWs) in July 2009 to be repaid no later than June 30, 2011. The RAWs would not be issued if the state receives more than $9.1 billion from the federal economic stimulus legislation to offset General Fund expenditures.
- Generating an additional $433 million for the General Fund through loans and transfers from various special funds over a 17-month period.

**Ballot Measures:** The budget plan depends on the approval of five key ballot measures to be considered by the voters during a special election scheduled for May 19. If these measures do not pass, then the plan will likely begin to fall apart. These ballot measures are as follows:

1. Shifting $226.7 million in FY 2010 and up to $234 million in FY 2011 from the Proposition 63 mental health special fund to the General Fund to cover the costs of the Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Program for low-income children. Proposition 63 revenues are generated through a tax on the wealthy.
2. Transferring $340 million in FY 2009 and $268 million annually for five fiscal years starting in FY 2010 from the Proposition 10 special fund for early childhood development efforts to pay for a series of children’s programs that are currently covered by the General Fund. Proposition 10 revenues are generated through a tax on tobacco products.
3. Modernizing the state lottery and allowing future proceeds to be borrowed by the General Fund. The budget package assumes that $5 billion in future lottery revenues would be loaned to the General Fund in FY 2010.
4. Increasing annual K-12 school funding by $9.3 billion in future years in lieu of any maintenance factors that could be required by Proposition 98.
5. Placing a limit on the amount of revenues that could be appropriated for General Fund purposes. This constitutional amendment would require the Department of Finance to forecast a revenue amount for the General Fund for a particular fiscal year derived from the last 10 years of revenue growth amounts. Any revenues exceeding this forecasted amount must be deposited into a newly created Budget Stabilization Fund, which could only be tapped: (1) if revenues are insufficient to cover prior-year expenditures, adjusted for inflation and population; or (2) in cases of a declared emergency. Under this constitutional amendment, money would accumulate in the Budget Stabilization Fund until it equals 12.5 percent of General Fund revenues, at which point the excess funding could be used for one-time expenditures. This ballot measure is tied to the duration of
the four temporary tax increases that were included in the budget package. If it passes, then those temporary tax increases would be extended beyond FY 2010 by one to three years.

Economic Stimulus Provisions: At the insistence of Gov. Schwarzenegger, several bills intended to stimulate the state’s sluggish economy were enacted along with the budget package. The key ones are as follows:

- Providing unlimited authority for public-private partnerships for transportation projects until January 1, 2017.
- Allowing the use of design-build contracting for 10 Caltrans projects, five regional/local transportation projects, 10 redevelopment agency projects, and five state facility projects.
- Providing exemptions from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and permit streamlining for eight specific state highway projects being implemented by Caltrans with Proposition 1B bond money.
- Effective in tax year 2011, allowing multi-state businesses to apportion income to California using only their percentage of sales in California.
- Providing a tax credit for the production costs of movies and TV series that are produced in California.
- Providing a tax credit of $3,000 per full-time equivalent employee hired by small businesses. The credit would be available for the 2009 and 2010 tax years.

Prepared By: Kurt Evans
**State Assembly Bills**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Assembly Bills</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Last Amended</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>VTA Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB 112 (Beall)</td>
<td>Makes several technical corrections to the enabling statutes of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to ensure that VTA has the appropriate statutory authority to work with local jurisdictions on developing funding strategies to address their local street and road maintenance and repair needs.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 116 (Beall)</td>
<td>Amends the enabling statutes of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) to raise the dollar threshold for when VTA must use the formal competitive bidding process to procure materials, supplies and equipment from $25,000 to $100,000, consistent with federal guidelines. Also includes comparable provisions for: (a) the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans); (b) the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit); and (c) the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (Golden Gate Transit).</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 118 (Logue)</td>
<td>Repeals the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 153 (Ma)</td>
<td>Specifies that the California High-Speed Rail Authority constitutes a “governing body” for the purpose of adopting a resolution of necessity pursuant to an eminent domain proceeding. Allows the authority to employ its own legal staff or contract with other state agencies for legal services.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 266 (Carter)</td>
<td>Every five years, requires the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to develop an assessment of: (a) the unfunded costs of programmed state and federally earmarked transportation projects in California; and (b) available funding for transportation purposes and unmet transportation needs on a statewide basis. Requires the assessment to include recommendations on how the state and local transportation agencies may address the transportation funding shortfalls and unmet needs that are identified. Requires the results from the initial assessment to be submitted to the Legislature by March 1, 2011.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Assembly Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACA 9 (Huffman)</td>
<td>Local Governments: Special Taxes</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to allow a local agency to impose, extend or increase any special tax if the tax is approved by the voters by a 55 percent majority. Also allows a local agency to incur indebtedness in the form of general obligation bonds to fund: (a) the construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, or replacement of public infrastructure improvements and public safety agency facilities; (b) the development of affordable housing; and (c) the acquisition or lease of real estate for public infrastructure improvements, public safety agency facilities and affordable housing, if the bond issuance is approved by the voters by a 55 percent majority.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACR 14 (Niello)</td>
<td>Global Warming Solutions Act: Economic Analysis</td>
<td>Prior to any regulatory action being taken consistent with the scoping plan for the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to perform an economic analysis that would give the state a more complete and accurate picture of the costs and benefits of the act’s implementation. Calls upon the governor to use the authority granted by the act to adjust any applicable deadlines for regulations.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Assembly Natural Resources Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Senate Bills</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Last Amended</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>VTA Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 10</strong> (Leno) Local Vehicle Assessment</td>
<td>Authorizes counties and San Francisco to impose a voter-approved local vehicle assessment at a rate not to exceed 2 percent of the market value of each motor vehicle or trailer coach registered within their respective jurisdictions for general revenue purposes if: (a) the board of supervisors approves an ordinance to that effect by a two-thirds vote; and (b) the assessment is approved by a majority vote of the electorate.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Transportation and Housing Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 31</strong> (Pavley) Global Warming Solutions Act: Compliance Revenues</td>
<td>Requires revenues collected pursuant to compliance mechanisms related to the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 that are adopted by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to be deposited in the Air Pollution Control Fund. Allows these revenues to be used for: (a) renewable energy and energy efficiency programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, particularly those programs focusing on low-income consumers; (b) investments in technologies to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, especially technologies that provide pollution reduction co-benefits; and (c) green jobs development and training that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SB 104</strong> (Oropeza) Global Warming Solutions Act: Definition of Greenhouse Gases</td>
<td>Includes nitrogen trifluoride in the definition of “greenhouse gases” under the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. For purposes of implementing the act, requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to designate as a greenhouse gas any anthropogenic gas one metric ton of which makes the same or greater contribution to global warming as one metric ton of carbon dioxide. For anthropogenic gases that are designated as a greenhouse gas, requires CARB to adopt regulations, including emissions limits and emissions reduction measures.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Environmental Quality Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCA 3</strong> (Wyland) Proposition 42 Suspensions</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution to eliminate the ability of the Governor and the Legislature to suspend the transfer of gasoline sales tax revenues pursuant to Proposition 42 from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund (TIF). Prohibits the loaning of TIF revenues under any circumstances. Prohibits the enactment of a statute that would reduce the extent to which gasoline sales tax revenues are deposited into the General Fund for transfer to the TIF for transportation purposes.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Revenue and Taxation Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCA 10</strong> (Ducheny) Constitutional Amendments</td>
<td>Calls for placing before the voters an amendment to the California Constitution regarding statewide initiative measures. Specifically, requires the Secretary of State’s Office to transmit a copy of an initiative measure certified for the ballot that would amend the constitution to both the Senate and Assembly no later than 176 days prior to the election at which the measure is to be considered by the electorate. Within 30 days, allows the Legislature to propose an amended form of the initiative measure by adopting a concurrent resolution. If the sponsors of the initiative measure accept the proposed amendments, requires the Legislature’s proposal to appear on the ballot in place of the certified initiative measure. If the amended form proposed by the Legislature is not accepted, requires information regarding the proposed amended form to be included in the ballot materials related to the initiative measure.</td>
<td>As Introduced</td>
<td>Senate Elections, Reapportionment and Constitutional Amendments Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>JANUARY</td>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>JULY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Statutes signed into law in 2008 take effect.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report bills introduced in the other house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summer Recess begins upon adjournment, provided that the budget bill has been enacted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Budget must be submitted by the Governor to the Legislature on or before this date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Last day to submit bill requests to the Legislative Counsel’s Office.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Last day for bills to be introduced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEBRUARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spring Recess begins upon adjournment.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Spring Recess.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes from Spring Recess.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in the other house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report fiscal bills introduced in their house.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Last day to amend bills on the Assembly and Senate floors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Last day for policy committees to hear and report to the floor non-fiscal bills introduced in their house.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Last day for each house to pass bills. Interim Recess begins at the end of this day’s session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in their house.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Last day for bills to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Last day for the Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before September 11, and in his possession after September 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budget must be passed by midnight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCTOBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Last day for bills to be passed out of their house of origin.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Last day for the Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before September 11, and in his possession after September 11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Budget must be passed by midnight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JANUARY 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legislature reconvenes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee Meeting Minutes of March 19, 2009

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee Meeting Minutes of March 19, 2009

WILL BE FORWARDED UNDER SEPARATE COVER
Audit Committee

Thursday, March 5, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Audit Committee was called to order at 4:02 p.m. by Chairperson Gage in Room 157, County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David Casas, Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Gage, Chairperson</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Pyle</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Sellers</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

CONSENT AGENDA


M/S/C (Pyle/Casas) to approve the Minutes of December 11, 2008.

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

5. **Elect Standing Committee Vice Chairperson**

Chairperson Gage opened the nominations from the floor for the position of Vice Chairperson of the Audit Committee for 2009.

Member Pyle nominated Member Casas to serve as the Vice Chairperson for 2009.

**M/S/C (Pyle/Gage)** to close the nominations and elect David Casas as the Committee’s Vice Chairperson for calendar year 2009.


Joseph T. Smith, Chief Financial Officer, reported the Measure A ballot required an audit of the 2000 Measure A Program be conducted annually by an Independent Auditor to ensure the 2000 Measure A Program’s sales tax revenues are spent in accordance with the intent of the Measure. He noted the audited 2000 Measure A Program Financial Statements were part of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).

Mr. Smith indicated the 2000 Measure A Program Financial Report, Fiscal Year 2008, was also presented at the February 11, 2009, 2000 Measure A Citizens Watchdog Committee.

Leonard Dana, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP (VTD), referenced the 2000 Measure A Program Financial Report, Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2008, and provided a brief overview. He reported VTD issued an unqualified opinion on the 2000 Measure A Program’s Financial Statements. The Report contained a section entitled, Program Summaries, and included information on each project and expenditures to date for the fiscal year. There were no reportable deficiencies or material weaknesses in internal control procedures.

Vice Chairperson Casas inquired if there were any questions raised that were addressed satisfactorily, which could have been a finding. Mr. Dana reported there were no findings.

**M/S/C (Pyle/Casas)** to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to review and accept the 2000 Measure A Program Financial Report for Fiscal Year 2008.


Joseph T. Smith, Chief Financial Officer, reported the Joint Powers Agreement for the administration of the Santa Clara County Congestion Management Program (CMP) also required an audit of the CMP accounts and records be conducted annually by a certified public accounting firm. Mr. Smith noted the CMP’s audited financial statements were also part of the VTA Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).
Leonard Dana, Vavrinek, Trine, Day & Co., LLP (VTD), referenced the Congestion Management Program Independent Auditor’s Report, Financial Statements and Supplementary Information, June 30, 2008, and provided a brief overview. The audit report indicated the CMP’s financial statements present fairly, in all respects, the financial position of the CMP as of June 30, 2008. He reported VTD issued an unqualified opinion on the CMP financial statements. There were no reportable deficiencies or material weaknesses in internal control procedures.

M/S/C (Pyle/Casas) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to review and accept the audited Financial Report for the Congestion Management Program for Fiscal Year 2008 (FY2008).

8. **Internal Audit Program Goals & Objectives**

Michael T. Burns, General Manager, reported the VTA Board of Directors approved a Task Order Contract with Deloitte & Touche, LLC on January 8, 2009, to provide Auditor General Services. The Task Order Contract was for a two-year term with three additional one-year options to perform VTA’s Internal Audit function. The Scope of Work for the first two Task Orders were as follows: 1) develop and recommend goals and objectives for VTA’s Internal Audit Program and 2) develop and recommend an Annual Internal Audit Plan.

Pat Hagan, Auditor General, Deloitte & Touche, LLP, introduced Farah Faruqui, Partner, and Heather Honegger, Senior Manager, Deloitte & Touche, LLP.

Mr. Hagan provided a report on the Internal Audit Program components, highlighting: 1) Objectives of the VTA Internal Audit function; 2) Scope of work of the Internal Audit function; 3) Accountability; 4) Internal Audit function’s responsibilities; 5) Authority of the Internal Audit function; and 6) Standards of Audit practice.

Chairperson Gage queried if the Internal Audit discovers anything illegal, would the Audit Committee be allowed to conduct a Closed Session to discuss the issue. Kevin Allmand, VTA General Counsel, indicated it would have to be leading to potential litigation. Mr. Hagan also indicated the Internal Auditor would work with VTA’s General Counsel to determine the appropriate disclosures and would inform the Audit Committee of any issues. Depending upon the type of issue that could be a potential litigation, a Closed Session would be recommended.

Chairperson Gage indicated if there are any disagreements between the Auditor General and various departments within VTA, both parties be in attendance to present their case to the Audit Committee.

M/S/C (Pyle/Casas) to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors to approve the goals and objectives for the internal audit program at VTA, as proposed by the Auditor General.
OTHER ITEMS

9. Receive Presentation on Risk Assessment Methodology

Pat Hagan, Auditor General, Deloitte & Touche, LLP, directed attention to the presentation entitled, “Auditor General Risk Assessment,” and provided an overview, highlighting: 1) The role of internal audit at VTA; 2) The internal audit process; 3) Risk assessment methodology; 4) Risk assessment executive summary; 5) Risk assessment results; 6) Response to risks; and 7) Proposed audit focus areas for discussion.

In reference to “The Role of Internal Audit,” Chairperson Gage queried if the Auditor General would be conducting interviews at the employee level with regard to processes. Mr. Hagan indicated, “absolutely”. He noted the importance of the interviews and process documentation and the importance of the Auditor General having access to the VTA Chiefs and their operations. Chairperson Gage requested the Auditor General inform him of any obstacles encountered during the interview process.

In reference to the “Overview of Internal Audit Process,” Chairperson Gage requested the Committee members be informed in a timely manner if the Auditor General needs to meet more than on a quarterly basis to discuss areas of concern.

In reference to the “Risk Assessment Methodology,” bulleted item #4 – “Interviewed approximately 30 VTA managers from various departments, including Chiefs, Deputy Directors and other key personnel,” Mr. Hagan thanked the VTA Chiefs and staff for their participation in the audit interview process.

Chairperson Gage mentioned the use of best practices and queried if the Auditor General has experience with other transit agencies with regards to the interview process. Mr. Hagan indicated he is the National Audit Partner for Deloitte & Touche’s public sector practice and has a number of other transit audit clients and transit consulting clients. Additionally, the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has a national transit database, which publishes very good information from all transit agencies including the VTA, so there is good benchmarking data available.

In reference to the “Response to Risks,” Vice Chairperson Casas requested, for future purposes, a bar be included on the graph identifying where each risks falls as contained on the model “heat map” listing the relative impact and vulnerability of key identified risks. He noted if something is going to move materially on the graph, to indicate the rationale, so it can be tracked from year to year.

In reference to the “Proposed Audit Focus Areas for Discussion,” Chairperson Gage queried if the Auditor General would come back with an extensive list of areas reviewed. Mr. Hagan indicated he would come back with a proposed scope of work indicating specific areas and control objectives to be reviewed. Chairperson Gage requested it be matched against the amount of dollars being allocated.

Mr. Hagan noted an annual update on the risks would be provided, showing the movement and hopefully improvement of those risks.
Member Pyle referenced the “Fraud, Waste and Abuse Risk,” and expressed concern regarding the potential lost of money involving these types of situations. Mr. Hagan reported Sarbanes-Oxley is not applicable to governments, but Sarbanes-Oxley has required for-profit companies to set-up a whistleblower program, such as an anonymous tip line.

Vice Chairperson Casas referenced the “Information Technology (IT) Risk, Focus Area - Audit IT Security,” and expressed concern regarding employees with laptops and possible negligence. He requested policies be put in place protecting employee information in case of negligence. Vice Chairperson Casas indicated with regards to IT, when looking at capacity, there is the possibility of integrated servers. He queried if this could be streamlined by making minimum investments, saving on energy and increasing the capacity of the IT group.

Vice Chairperson Casas referenced the “Fraud, Waste and Abuse Risk,” and queried if any travel restrictions have been implemented within VTA. Michael T. Burns, General Manager, indicated travel at VTA has decreased significantly and noted he approves all travel at VTA. He noted a process can be put in place where expense reports are reviewed to ensure they are within the established limits. With regards to travel, Chairperson Casas commented on rate negotiations. He indicated a philosophy should be put in place where there is an understanding of those policies on travel limitations, stipends, etc.

Mr. Burns recommended rescheduling the Thursday, June 4, 2009, Audit Committee meeting to Thursday, May 7, 2009. The Audit Plan would be presented for review and approval at the meeting and forwarded to the June 4, 2009, Board of Directors meeting.

Chairperson Gage requested the June 4, 2009, Audit Committee meeting be rescheduled to Thursday, May 7, 2009, at 4:00 p.m. in Conference Room 157, at 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose.

Vice Chairperson Casas noted he would be unable to attend the May 7, 2009, Audit Committee meeting.

Mr. Hagan reported on the next steps, highlighting: 1) Develop detailed scope of work for priority audit projects; 2) Collaborate with VTA management to develop FY 2010 Audit Plan; 3) Recommend scope, budget and timeline; and 4) Present FY 2010 Audit Plan for discussion and approval at next Audit Committee meeting.

Chairperson Gage requested the Auditor General prepare a two-year Audit Plan.

On order of Chairperson Gage and there being no objection, the Committee received a presentation on Auditor General’s Risk Assessment Methodology.

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

There were no Items of Concern and Referral to Administration.
11. **Committee Work Plan**

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

12. **Committee Staff Report**

   There was no Committee Staff Report.

13. **Chairperson’s Report**

   There was no Chairperson’s Report.

14. **Determine Consent Agenda for the April 2, 2009 Board Meeting**

   **CONSENT:**


   *Agenda Item #8.* Approve the goals and objectives for the internal audit program at VTA, as proposed by the Auditor General.

   **REGULAR:**

   None

15. **Announcements**

   There were no Announcements.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

   On order of Chairperson Gage and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Tracene Y. Crenshaw, Board Assistant  
   VTA Board of Directors
Committee for Transit Accessibility

Wednesday, March 11, 2009

MINUTES

NOTE: MEMBERS MAY TAKE ACTION ON ANY ITEM ON THIS AGENDA.

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) was called to order at 1:06 p.m. by Chairperson Morrow in Building A, Auditorium, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lori Arnberg</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Eljas</td>
<td>Second Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Fernandez</td>
<td>Staff Aide to Ex-Officio Board Liaison Reed</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Gallo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Gouveia</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Grant</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Heatley</td>
<td>Ex-Officio Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Hernandez</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Jensen</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Julian</td>
<td>First Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Langford</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Lasich</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Michels</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Montague</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Morrow</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawna Nourzaie</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. INTRODUCTION OF AUDIENCE MEMBERS

Captain Bob Schiller, Protective Services; Camille Williams, Accessible Services Program Manager; Gail Collins, Special Projects Senior Transportation Planner; Sandra Weymouth, Policy and Administration Manager; Ann Carey, Executive Assistant to the General Manager; Walter Schinkle, South County Advocate; Diem Mehta, Interested Citizen; John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer; Joonie Tolosa, Operations Analysis Manager; David Ledwitz, Management Analyst; Ali Hudda, Deputy Director of Accounting; Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst; Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer; and Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

Walter Schinkle, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding community bus safety issues. Mr. Schinkle stressed the importance to retrain bus operators to comply with VTA’s Securement Policy and safety rules. Chairperson Morrow requested staff speak to Mr. Schinkle after the meeting regarding the issue.

Mike Montague, Interested Citizen, expressed concern regarding the placement level of the system map and schedules at the shelters, noting customers in wheelchairs are unable to view the information. Mr. Montague referenced the station platforms retrofit project, noting signage still exists in the vehicles directing mobility impaired individuals to board VTA’s light rail system by using ramps or lifts. Mr. Montague requested these issues be addressed in a timely manner.

Williams Zhu, Interested Citizen, referenced Line 23 where an operator was engaging in an extensive conversation with a passenger was not concentrating on his driving. Mr. Zhu stressed the importance for drivers to perform their duties and comply with safety rules. Chairperson Morrow requested staff speak with Mr. Zhu regarding the issue.

Dilip Shah, Interested Citizen, stated many disabled individuals visit Valley Medical Center (VMC) and suggested Line 61 and 62 travel into VMC to provide necessary transportation services for VTA’s customers.

David Grant, Interested Citizen, queried if a driver could refuse to pickup a passenger with a walker if two wheelchairs are on a bus and requested the item be agendized on a future agenda for discussion. Chairperson Morrow noted the item would be agendized for the next CTA meeting.

Mr. Grant stressed the importance for drivers to contact Operations Control Center (OCC), noting their vehicle has a full load of passengers and request another vehicle be
dispatched. Chairperson Morrow noted the item would be agendized for the next CTA meeting.

Thomas Slack, Interested Citizen, suggested staff provide a status update on each public presentation issue and concern at the next CTA meeting.

Member Nourzaie arrived at the meeting and took her seat at 1:20 p.m.

4. Minutes of February 11, 2009

M/S/C (Stahl/Gouveia) on a vote of 15 Ayes, 0 Noes, and 1 Abstention to approve the Minutes of February 11, 2009. Member Grant abstained.

5. Chief Operating Officer’s Report

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer, indicated the Chief Operating Officer’s Report was contained in the CTA Agenda packet. Mr. Ristow reported on the Federal Economic Stimulus Bill American Recovery and Reinvestment Act 2009, noting the bill was approved on February 17, 2009 for $787 billion.


VTA receives formula federal grants from the Mass Transit Formula Grants (MTFG). MTC is the receiving agent of $340 million and will determine what transit agency and project will receive funding. MTC determined that approximately $47.3 million will be allocated to VTA for Transit Rehabilitation but VTA will not receive funding for Regional Transit Projects.

Mr. Ristow reported $2.57 billion is available to California for Highways and Bridges, where Caltrans will receive $1.799 billion and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) will receive $771 million.

Santa Clara County will receive approximately $12 million for Highway and Road Expansion Projects, which includes the Ramp Meters on Interstate 280 and $26.5 million for City and County Road Rehabilitation Projects. VTA Transit Capital Rehabilitation Projects will receive approximately $47.3 million, which includes VTA Hybrid 40’ Bus Replacements and VTA Hybrid Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Vehicles.

Member Gouveia expressed concern that the bill does not include paratransit projects.

Member Shah stressed the importance to purchase additional community buses and charge a fare to provide service to the community by traveling deeper into routes.

Member Slack asked how many jobs the Federal Economic Stimulus Bill will create within the Bay Area. Mr. Ristow responded staff will report back to the Committee with the information.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Mr. Ristow noted the bill has the ability to create thousands of jobs within Santa Clara County.

Chairperson Morrow requested staff provide the list of the bus manufacture bidders to the Committee.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Chief Operating Officer’s Report.

**BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER**

6. **Protective Services Overview**

Captain Robert Schiller, Protective Services, reported VTA’s security resources provide customers with a safe transit system. VTA has contracts with both the Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Office and a private security service vendor for unarmed and armed security officers. VTA employs fifteen deputies, two sergeants, and one captain from the Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Office. The Sheriff’s Office provides VTA with patrol deputies, crime investigation detectives, and plain clothes officers.

Captain Schiller reported VTA’s Operations Control Center (OCC) staffs a 24 hour per day, 7 days per week monitoring system, which provides information to both sheriff officers and private security service officers of safety issues.

The unarmed private security officers work stationary posts at VTA’s operating divisions and are posted at high use transit centers. The armed private security officers are mobile and available to assist at various light rail stations and transit centers. The armed private security officers are also assigned to VTA’s Downtown Customer Service Center and with revenue collections.

Captain Schiller noted that paying to ride VTA’s light rail system is based on the honor system. Fare inspectors ensure fare compliance on VTA’s system and report criminal occurrences. He reported the fare evasion rate was 5.9 percent for January 2009.

VTA provides annual reports to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) each year regarding Part 1 and Part 2 crimes. Part 1 crimes are the more serious crimes and include homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, and theft. Part 2 crimes include vandalism, drug abuse, drunk driving, and other crimes.

Captain Schiller stated there were no reported homicides or forcible rapes on VTA’s transit system during calendar year 2008 but there were 21 robberies and 3 attempted robberies. The ages of the victims of the crimes ranged from 11 years old to 79 years old. There were four victims of robberies aged 60 years old or older and two of the victims were disabled. The robberies occurred on or near buses, light rail trains, and stations. Captain Schiller stated aggravated assaults involve the use of a weapon, noting four aggravated assaults were reported within VTA’s service system during calendar year 2008.

Second Vice Chairperson Eljas stressed the importance to provide a safe environment for the senior and disabled population who utilize VTA’s transit system.
Member Grant referenced an incident on Line #54 where the driver approached a passenger and insisted the passenger provide their name to the driver. Member Grant expressed concern and queried if the actions represent an assault incident. Captain Schiller responded staff would conduct an investigation and interview all parties involved in the incident. The case would then be forwarded to the district attorney to determine if it is a law violation.

Chairperson Morrow stressed the importance for drivers to be kind, courteous, and provide good customer service to the community.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Protective Services Overview.


Joonie Tolosa, Operations Analysis Manager, reported total overall system ridership has increased by 8 percent despite a decrease in fuel prices, noting bus ridership increased 8.4 percent and light rail ridership increased 6.7 percent as compared to last year.

Mr. Tolosa stated daily service reliability performance in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009 second quarter was 99.71 percent, which is the highest fiscal-year-to-date in VTA history. Bus miles between major mechanical schedule losses improved 7.2 percent compared to last year. Light rail miles between major mechanical schedule losses increased by 38.9 percent compared to last year. Light rail on time performance remained stable at 88.9 percent and bus on time performance decreased from 89.6 to 87.8 percent.

Mr. Tolosa noted VTA’s farebox recovery ratio during the first six months of FY 2009 was 14.3 percent. Through the first six months of FY 2009, paratransit ridership increased 3 percent. The net operating cost for Paratransit (Outreach) during the first six months of FY 2009 was $13.4 million, which is up 2 percent compared to last fiscal year.

Member Stahl referenced a situation where a student contacted VTA’s Customer Service regarding Route 81 and the Information Service Representative (ISR) was unable to identify the route or provide directions to the customer. Member Stahl stressed the importance to train the ISRs to relay accurate information to customers.

Chairperson Morrow expressed his appreciation to OUTREACH Paratransit Services on their diligent efforts to reduce paratransit costs.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Transit Operations Performance Report: 2009 Second Quarter (July 1, 2008 – December 31, 2008).

8. **Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Update: March**

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, and Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, provided a brief overview VTA’s Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) update. Ms. Loft reported on the second ACE meeting held on Wednesday, February 25, 2009 where relevant sections of VTA’s Organizational and Financial Assessment, the California Bureau of State Audits Report, process scope, best practices, and Advisory Committee framework were reviewed and discussed by the ACE subcommittee. The next ACE meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, March 25, 2009.
Member Grant expressed concern that CTA has not received regular updates on the ACE subcommittee meetings or receives the ACE Subcommittee meeting information packets. Ms. Loft responded CTA’s ACE Subcommittee members are responsible to provide updates to the CTA Committee.

Member Fernandez, Staff Aide to Ex-Officio Board Liaison Reed, left the meeting at 2:20 p.m.

Chairperson Morrow noted the CTA ACE Subcommittee is comprised of five CTA members who are available to provide updates to the Committee.

Ex-Officio Member Heatley, CTA ACE Subcommittee member, stated the ACE Subcommittee packet information can be distributed to the CTA Committee.

Chairperson Morrow stressed the importance to merge together into one agenda item the ACE Update and the CTA ACE Subcommittee report. Chairperson Morrow expressed concern and queried when the revised Draft CTA Mission Statement would be agendized for discussion.

James Unites, Operations Planning Program Manager and Staff Liaison, responded the revised Draft CTA Mission Statement is scheduled for May 13, 2009 CTA Meeting.

Chairperson Morrow expressed concern that CTA has not had the opportunity to revise their Draft Mission Statement, noting the delay has the potential to develop several problems within the ACE process.

The CTA Committee stressed the importance to approve the revised Draft CTA Mission Statement. Chairperson Morrow read the proposed modification of the Draft CTA Mission Statement into the record: “The Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) advises the Board of Directors and staff on transportation options and all matters under VTA’s purview pertaining to equal access, accessibility, availability, and affordability to public transportation to meet the mobility needs for individuals with disabilities, seniors, and economically disadvantaged persons.”

Deborah Harrington, Board Secretary, advised the Committee to postpone action on the proposed modification of the Draft CTA Mission Statement. Ms. Harrington stated the ACE Update is an information item and it would be prudent to agendize the proposed modification of the Draft CTA Mission Statement to the April 8, 2009 CTA Meeting in order to be in compliance with the Ralph M. Brown Act.

Chairperson Morrow concurred with Ms. Harrington and deferred the proposed modification of the Draft CTA Mission Statement to the April 8, 2009 CTA Meeting.

The Committee referenced the note at the beginning of the CTA Agenda where it states: “NOTE: MEMBERS MAY TAKE ACTION ON ANY ITEM ON THIS AGENDA” and expressed concern that the Committee would not be allowed to make a motion to modify the Draft CTA Mission Statement.

Ex-Officio Member Heatley stressed the importance to forward the CTA ACE Subcommittee meeting information to the CTA Members at the April 8, 2009 CTA Meeting.
On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the March Advisory Committee Enhancement Update.

9. Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee

The Committee stressed the importance to reexamine the intent of the CTA Report provided to the Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee, noting CTA plays a vital role as an Advisory Committee to the Board of Directors. Chairperson Morrow responded he is working to address this concern with TPO Chairperson Greg Sellers.

Member Grant queried why VTA opted to utilize internal staff instead of hiring a consultant to work on the ACE process. Ann Carey, Executive Assistant to the General Manager, responded the ACE Subcommittees role and responsibility is to provide regular updates to the full Committees, noting a facilitator was hired to work with the ACE Task Force.

Ex-Officio Member Heatley stated the facilitator plays an important role within the ACE Task Force. Ex-Officio Member Heatley stressed the importance for the CTA ACE Subcommittee to work collaboratively with staff to process and streamline issues.

Ex-Officio Member Heatley stressed the importance for the Committee to reexamine their official name and consider changing Transit to Transportation.

Member Stahl requested the Committee’s official name be agendized at the April 8, 2009 CTA Meeting for discussion.

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the Committee received the report from the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee.

10. Committee Work Plan

James Unites, Operations Planning Program Manager and Staff Liaison, provided an update on additions to the Committee Workplan including proposed modification of Draft CTA Mission Statement.

Chairperson Morrow requested staff develop a report using key indicators on travel patterns with individuals with disabilities. Mr. Unites responded item #9 is listed on the Committee Work Plan as a future agenda item within the next three months.

Member Grant queried when the farebox tracking information would be presented to the Committee. Mr. Unites responded item #5 is listed on the Committee Work Plan as a future agenda item. Mr. Unites stated staff will confirm when the next report will be presented to the Committee.

Second Vice Chairperson Eljas referenced Member Shah’s request under Public Presentations regarding Line #s 25, 61, and 62 traveling to Valley Medical Center. Mr. Unites responded staff had previously provided the Committee with a report regarding the lines, noting it would not be feasible for Line #s 61 and 62 to travel to VMC.
Mr. Unites referenced Public Presentations, noting the speaker’s comments will be grouped together and staff will provide a status report back to the Committee.

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee Work Plan was received.

11. **Motion Tracking Report**

**On order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Motion Tracking report was received.

### REPORTS

12. **City of San Jose Disability Advisory Commission (DAC) Report**

**On Order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee deferred the City of San Jose Disability Advisory Commission (DAC) Report.

13. **Board of Directors Report**

There was no Board of Directors Report.

14. **Committee Staff Report**

James Unites, Operations Planning Program Manager and Staff Liaison, announced VTA will purchase 23 Toyota Prius for the Paratransit fleet with grant funding. Mr. Unites stated VTA is currently working on its Budget process for FY 2010 and FY 2011, noting the economical challenges facing VTA.

Mr. Unites reported the State budget has eliminated all operating assistance funding derived from the State Transit Assistance (STA) program allocated to transit agencies. VTA will lose approximately $6 million this fiscal year and $12 million for both FY 2010 and 2011.

Mr. Unites noted a 6 percent decrease in sales tax projections for FY 2009, a 5 percent decrease for FY 2010, and 3 percent decrease for FY 2011. VTA will have a deficit of $28 million in FY 2010 and $50 million in FY 2011.

Staff is currently working on its budget process and will provide an update at the April 16, 2009 Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee Meeting and April 24, 2009 Board of Directors Workshop Meeting. The recommended budget is scheduled for review in May 2009 at community meetings and VTA’s Advisory Committee Meetings then the final recommended budget will be forwarded for consideration at the June 4, 2009 Board of Directors Regular Meeting.

**On Order of Chairperson Morrow** and there being no objection, the Committee Staff Report was received.

15. **Chairperson’s Report**

There was no Chairperson’s Report.
16. **Announcements**

There were no Announcements.

17. **ADJOURNMENT**

On order of Chairperson Morrow and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle M. Garza, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

and

2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 11, 2009

MINUTES

Call to Order

The Regular Meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) was called to order at 4:38 p.m. by Chairperson Tebo in Conference Room B-104, VTA River Oaks Campus, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Blaylock</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Elias</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>4:46 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray Hashimoto</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberta Hughan</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Jacobvitz</td>
<td>CAC Vice Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaye Morando</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Powers</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally Probst</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Rogers</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Schulter</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Skinner</td>
<td>CAC Member</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noel Tebo</td>
<td>CAC Chair</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was not present and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.
3. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

There were no Public Presentations.

4. **Committee Staff Report**

Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, reported on VTA’s biennial budget for 2010 and 2011. Mr. Flynn stated: 1) VTA’s State Transit Assistance (STA) funds have been reduced by $6 Million in 2009 with a projected reduction of $12 Million in both 2010 and 2011; 2) sales tax revenues are expected to decline; 3) deficits of $28 Million in Fiscal Year 2010 and $50 Million in Fiscal Year 2011 are anticipated; 4) a 15 percent operating reserve will bridge a portion of these deficits, but is not sufficient to completely cover the projected shortfall; 5) departmental budgets are under review; 6) only critical staff vacancies will be filled; 7) the goal is to achieve labor savings through attrition rather than layoffs; 8) capital projects are being reevaluated and delayed where feasible; 9) travel requests are under review; and 10) project work will be performed by in-house staff whenever possible.

The recommended budget will be: 1) reviewed at the April 16, 2009, Administration & Finance (A&F) Committee meeting; 2) presented to the Board at a Workshop on April 24, 2009; 3) presented for review and comment at several community meetings; and 4) presented to the VTA Advisory Committees in early May.

Advisory Committee Members are encouraged to attend meetings and review the recommended budget prior to the May Advisory Committee meetings. The Board is scheduled to consider the budget at its June 4, 2009, meeting.

VTA Board Chairperson Dolly Sandoval was recently named by the Silicon Valley Business Journal as a “Woman of Influence.”

5. **Chairperson’s Report**

Chairperson Tebo reported on: 1) the BART discussion held at the February 27, 2009, Board Workshop; 2) coordination of the proposed Airport People Mover has been taken over by the City of San José; and 3) the Carbon-Free Mobility Conference he attended in Oakland on March 6, 2009.

Member Elias took his seat at 4:46 p.m. and a quorum was declared.

Members Okuzumi and Kline tendered their resignations from the Citizens Advisory Committee in February.

Member Schulter requested an additional two-month extension to his attendance waiver.

**BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/ GENERAL MANAGER**

**COMBINED CAC AND 2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE CONSENT AGENDAS**
6. **Minutes of February 11, 2009**

M/S/C (Probst/Rogers) to approve the Minutes of February 11, 2009.

7. **Monthly Legislative History Matrix**

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


Member Rogers questioned the reported decrease in Light Rail Shuttle ridership. Joonie Tolosa, Manager, Operations Analysis, Reporting & Systems, stated the decreased figure reflects the IBM Shuttle as the only remaining VTA funded Light Rail Shuttle.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received the Transit Operations Performance Report: 2009 Second Quarter (July 1, 2008-December 31, 2008).

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

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report.

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

Members Probst, Rogers and Powers noted their support for Bill Position AB 266 and recommended notifying the Board of the CAC’s support. Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, suggested Chairperson Tebo include CAC’s support of this bill position in his report to the Board at their April 2, 2009, meeting.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received the Bill Position: AB 266 (Carter).

**2000 MEASURE A CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA**

11. **Update on Efforts to Publicize Measure A Progress**

Bernice Alaniz, Deputy Director, Marketing & Public Affairs, reported on the methods staff uses to publicize and promote project status and milestones of Measure A Projects to the public, including: 1) hosting public meetings; 2) attending community events; 3) print ads in English, Spanish, and Vietnamese language newspapers; 4) distributing flyers; 5) mailing newsletters; and 6) issuing news releases.

Member Probst strongly encouraged staff to publicly tout VTA successes and community contributions.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Member Blaylock questioned feedback measurement. Ms. Alaniz stated comments during meetings are collected and compiled. She noted staff is considering the establishment of a Web Log (BLOG).

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received an Update on Efforts to Publicize Measure A Progress.

12. Compliance Auditor Status Report on FY08 Audit

David Bullock, CPA, Engagement Partner, and Craig Boyer, CPA, Engagement Manager, from the independent certified public accounting firm of Macias, Gini and O’Connell, LLP (MGO) provided a draft handout of the independent auditor’s reports and budgetary comparison schedule for the FY08 Audit.

Messrs. Bullock and Boyer: 1) discussed the scope of the current audit; 2) provided an update on the timetable; 3) discussed the content and presentation of the audit report; and 4) noted their focus is on the compliance aspect of the audit.

Member Elias questioned MGO’s familiarity with the California Bureau of State Audits (BSA) report on VTA issued on July 31, 2008. Mr. Bullock stated MGO would review the report to determine if information included was pertinent to the 2000 Measure A Program and the scope of MGO’s audit.

Mr. Flynn understood the BSA report did not have recommendations with regard to the 2000 Measure A Program. He stated, although some of the BSA recommendations dealt with advisory committees, the CWC is not an advisory committee. One result of the BSA report is the CAC Chairperson’s monthly report to the Board.

Mr. Bullock noted the sample format of MGO’s report provides more detail, a frame of reference, and a disclosure spelling out the acronyms will be included. He discussed potential changes to the report format with the CAC. The CAC members expressed their appreciation for the more detailed report.

Chairperson Tebo questioned the timeline for the report. Mr. Bullock provided an anticipated completion date of March 20, 2009.

Chairperson Tebo reminded the auditors the Citizens Watchdog Committee’s sole interest is to ensure Measure A funds are used appropriately and requested the Auditors provide any recommended actions as part of their presentation.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received the Compliance Auditor Status Report on FY08 Audit.

13. Background and Requirements for Citizens Watchdog Committee’s (CWC) Public Hearing

Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, discussed the annual CWC Public Hearing. Mr. Flynn noted at its April meeting the CWC will set the time and location for the hearing.

Mr. Flynn stated the purpose of this hearing is to: 1) provide the public with a forum for offering input to the CWC on the 2000 Measure A Program; and 2) allow the CWC to hear views, opinions, and any concerns from the community.
Mr. Flynn reminded the CWC, per their past decision, notification for this hearing will be publicly posted and published in local multi-language newspapers at least 21-days prior to the hearing. The public notice will also be posted on VTA’s website.

Members Powers and Probst recommended the use of public service announcements.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR AGENDA

14. Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Update: March

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, reported on the second ACE Task Force meeting held February 25, 2009. Excerpts from the Hay Group Report and the State Audit Report were reviewed to help define the scope of the Task Force.

A book entitled “Advisory Council” was distributed to the Task Force members. The book provides both framework and best practices for advisory committees.

The next ACE Task Force meeting will be March 25, 2009.

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee received the Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Update: March.

15. CAC Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Report

Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz reported on the evolving process of the ACE task force. He noted a facilitator, Carmen Clark, had recently been assigned to the task force. The facilitator began with a socialization process allowing the task force members an opportunity to develop an element of trust with one another, define their goal, and how to improve communication within and between the committees.

Member Blaylock questioned how Member Kline’s departure from the CAC will effect the CAC’s task force participation. Vice Chairperson Jacobvitz stated, as the ACE alternate for Members Kline and Powers, he had stepped into the task force role vacated by Member Kline. He noted that although both members and alternates participate in the process, alternate members do not vote unless they are replacing a voting member.

Member Blaylock volunteered to be the CAC’s ACE Task Force Alternate Member.

Members Rogers and Powers commended Chairperson Sandoval’s decision to appoint a professional facilitator to lead the Task Force as they review identified problems and the scope envisioned for the ACE process.

COMBINED CAC AND CITIZENS WATCHDOG COMMITTEE ITEMS

16. Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) and the Citizens Watchdog Committee (CWC) Work Plans

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the CAC and CWC Work Plans.
OTHER

17. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.

18. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Tebo and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Garcia, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Wednesday, March 11, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 6:02 p.m. by Chairperson Walton in Auditorium, Building A, VTA, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Bunnell</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>6:17 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Entin</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Fernandez</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Hagenmaier</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Ginzton</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William (Bill) Manry</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerri-Ann Meyer</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Muniz</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>6:04 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marian Sacco</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Simons</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Stallman, Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Sullivan</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Swent</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman Wadler</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Walton, Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Winter</td>
<td>SVBC</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

   There were no Orders of the Day.

3. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

   There was no Public Presentations.

   Member Muniz took his seat at 6:04 p.m.

4. **Committee Staff Report**

   Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, reported the following: 1) VTA completed installation of 61 e-bike lockers. VTA will receive eight more e-lockers in the coming weeks and with a budget for about 43 more e-lockers; and 2) There is an on-going internal coordination within VTA for site planning for future BART stations.

   - **Highway Program Update**
     
     Ms. DeRobertis referred to the Charcot Avenue Project and reported the City of San Jose’s decision to maintain a 14 foot wide shared lane at the off-ramp with a 4 foot wide shoulder to the left.

   - **Conditions of Approval Update**
     
     Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, reported the following conditions of approval: 1) City of Santa Clara’s San Tomas Business Park Campus Project required the developer to construct a sidewalk near the VTA Bus Stop along San Tomas Expressway; and 2) The Lawrence Station Road Residential Project in Sunnyvale included sidewalk improvements on Lawrence Expressway, lighted crosswalk to Vienna Light Rail Station, and bike parking.

   - **County Report**
     
     There was no County Report.

5. **Chairperson’s Report**

   Chairperson Walton congratulated Member Meyer and the City of Mountain View for receiving the Bronze Bicycle Friendly Community Award. Other award recipients include Stanford, Palo Alto, and Sunnyvale.

   Member Bunnell took her seat at 6:17 p.m.

   Chairperson Walton suggested inviting guest speakers to the BPAC Meeting like Dolly Sandoval, VTA Board Chairperson. Other members suggested inviting other VTA
Advisory Committees and/or other agencies/groups from other counties with similar roles to the BPAC.

CONSENT AGENDA

6. Minutes of February 11, 2009

M/S/C (Stallman/Wadler) to approve the Minutes of February 11, 2009.

7. Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report

M/S/C (Stallman/Wadler) to receive the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report.

REGULAR AGENDA

8. Advisory Committee Enhancement Update: March

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, noted the second Task Force meeting held on February 25, 2009, included review of the Hay Group and State Audit Reports and discussion of Best Practices for committee processes. On March 25, 2009, the Task Force Members are asked to come back with a priority list of six items the Task Force can pursue.

On order of Chairperson Walton and there being no objection, the Committee received a Brief Update on the Status and Progress of the Advisory Committee Enhancement Process - March 2009.

9. Receive BPAC Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Report

Vice Chairperson Stallman reported he and Member Wadler attended the last Task Force Meeting. He noted the Task Force Members’ responses will be summarized and the Task Force will make a determination which ideas to pursue.

On order of Chairperson Walton and there being no objection, the Committee received the BPAC Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee Report.

10. 2009 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager Fund

Bill Hough, Transportation Planner III, explained the source of the TFCA funds and VTA Board adopted policy on TFCA allocation. Mr. Hough noted staff prioritized the Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) Projects for 2009/10 TFCA to offset the amount owed by the competitive program to the BEP. Staff recommends six BEP and ongoing operating projects and four competitive funded projects as outlined in the staff report.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Committee Members expressed concern about the difficulty for BEP projects to qualify for the TFCA grants due to the cost-effectiveness criteria set by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Mr. Hough noted agencies can make formal comments to the criteria annually. Mr. Hough offered to send VTA’s own scoring criteria at Members’ request.

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

Member Stallman noted VTA should brainstorm how to attract project applications that are related to Safe Routes to School or to Junior Colleges for the BEP portion of the TFCA funds. He noted street infrastructure or subsidized Eco Pass can significantly reduce car trips to schools.

11. **Adopt 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program Project List**

Ms. DeRobertis reported this memo still needs some work and therefore will not be forwarded to the Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee this month. The project list will remain the same but the allocation amounts may change.

Member Meyer expressed concern about Project B48-Mountain view Permanente Creek Trail Undercrossing and Extension at Charleston and noted it has regional and countywide significance. Ms. DeRobertis responded the project is not in the BEP list and recommended the City of Mountain View to include the project into the Countywide Bicycle Plan (CBP) during the next CBP project list update.

Upon inquiry of Member Fernandez, Ms. DeRobertis noted the Page Mill/I-280 Interchange Improvement project was moved to either the highway or expressway project list.

M/S/C (Simons/Stallman) to recommend the Board to adopt the adjusted BEP allocations of completed and programmed projects as shown in Attachment A Tables 2 and 3 and the 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program project list as shown in Attachment B.

12. **Approval of Transportation Development Act Article 3 List - County Item**

Paul Pascoal, Santa Clara County Roads and Airport Department, provided a handout entitled, “Proposed 2009-2010 TDA Article 3 Project Priority List. Mr. Pascoal reviewed the TDA Project list including project rankings, project descriptions, grant fund requests and photos of project locations.

M/S/C (Stallman/Wadler) to approve the County's TDA Article 3 FY 09/10 Project Priority List as presented in Attachment A.

13. **County Roads Capital Projects Update**

Mr. Pascoal reported the following projects are shovel ready and could be advertised for construction in a few months pending Caltrans’ approval of funds release: Loyola Foothill Bridge; Foothill Expressway at Loyola shoulder widening; Montague
Expressway resurfacing; Capitol Expressway (Seven Trees) resurfacing and upgrades; and Oregon Page Mill resurfacing and pedestrian paths.

OTHER

14. **BPAC Work Plan**

Vice Chairperson Stallman requested an action item for April 2009 for Bike Access on Transit. He expressed interest in reviewing the Routine Accommodation features of the SR 237 Auxiliary Lane project included in Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035 when it becomes available.

Upon inquiry of Chairperson Walton regarding Bike to Work day efforts, Ms. DeRobertis responded VTA will contribute monies to the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC) and operate the Energizer Centers. Ms. DeRobertis noted the Bay Nature Magazine included in its new issue a map of trails near transit stations. At VTA’s request, the magazine will provide about 4,000 copies that could be distributed during Bike to Work Day.

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

15. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Paul Goldstein, SVBC and Interested Citizen, reported the community expressed concerns on the Oregon Expressway Improvements in Palo Alto during the Community Meeting and commended the Santa Clara County Roads and Airports staff for their responsiveness to the public during the meeting. He noted there are also discussions in Palo Alto on how the High Speed Rail can impact bike trails.

Member Wadler reported Campbell BPAC will meet this month and noted the construction along San Tomas Expressway.

Member Meyer reported the Mountain View BPAC presented the Bicycle Friendly Community Award to the City Council. She also reported the community expressed support for the Permanente Creek Overcrossing at a community meeting.

Member Simons announced the dedication of the Borregas will be held sometime in April 2009.

Member Sullivan announced the Santa Clara BAC meeting will be held in two weeks and will be focused on updating the City’s Bicycle Plan. Member Sullivan commended one of City of Santa Clara’s Senior Planner, Debbie Fernandez, for the consideration of Bicycle and Pedestrian access at the San Tomas Business Park.

Member Muniz announce the Gilroy Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Board will meet on March 23, 2009. Member Muniz reported there will be two Environmental Impact Report Scoping Meetings for High Speed Rail to be held in Gilroy and San Jose this month.
Chaiperson Walton announced the Mary Avenue Bridge ribbon cutting is scheduled for Thursday, April 30, 2009, at 3:00 p.m.

16. **ADJOURNMENT**

On order of Chairperson Walton and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine F. Baltao, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

March 12, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:36 p.m. by Chairperson Witthaus in Conference Room B-104, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greg Armendariz</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajeev Batra</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Capurso</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Chen, Alternate</td>
<td>Town of Los Altos Hills</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Cherbone</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Collen, Alternate</td>
<td>County of Santa Clara</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Connolly, Alt. Ex-Officio</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Dey</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1:38 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Goepfert</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan Jenkins</td>
<td>City of Mountain View</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Kass</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1:40 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayle Likens, Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>City of Palo Alto</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Lind</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Rowe</td>
<td>City of Morgan Hill</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Slintak</td>
<td>City of Monte Sereno</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Tripousis</td>
<td>City of San Jose</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A quorum was present.

2. **PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS**

There were no Public Presentations.

3. **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

There were no Orders of the Day.

4. **Committee Staff Report**

   Member Dey took his seat at 1:38 p.m.
   Member Kass took his seat at 1:40 p.m.

John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, provided a report, highlighting the following: 1) Reported on the two parallel paths the State of California is proceeding on to distribute the remaining $1.8 Billion received from the Federal Economic Stimulus package. One path follows the existing statutes and the other path requires legislation to review the programming processes. The Legislature is expected to consider the legislation the week of March 23, 2009; 2) In reference to jurisdictions working on trying to get the obligated funding that was distributed for each of the projects, there is an idea of possibly developing a process to provide a local assistance person to assist with the packaging of the projects; 3) Update on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); 4) 2009 Association of Bay Area of Governments (ABAG) Projections; and 5) California High Speed Rail Update.

In reference to the idea of possibly developing a process to provide a local assistance person to assist with the packaging of the projects, Member Dey expressed concern regarding Caltrans involvement and commented VTA needs to clearly understand the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Guidelines in order to determine when Caltrans is stepping beyond their boundaries.

Amin Surani, Principal Transportation Planner, distributed a document entitled, “American Recovery Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) and Highway Maintenance Project List,” for the Committee’s review.

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Committee Staff Report was received.

5. **Chairperson’s Report**

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

6. **Reports from TAC Working Groups**

   - **Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

     Celeste Fiore, Transportation Planner II, provided the following highlights from the February 2009 CIP meeting: 1) Discussed the Federal Economic Stimulus package; 2) Received scored projects for the FY 2009/10 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager (TFCA 40%) funds; and 3) Next scheduled CIP Working Group on March 24, 2009.

     Vice Chairperson Likens expressed concern regarding the April 10, 2009 application submittal deadline date for the Call for Projects for the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Program. She indicated the Member Agencies received notification the week of March 9, 2009, and queried if the deadline date could be extended. Amin Surani, Principal Transportation Planner, noted he would notify the CIP Working Group regarding the issue.

   - **Systems Operations & Management (SOM) Working Group**

     There was no Systems Operations & Management (SOM) Working Group Report.

     **On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Reports from the TAC Working Groups were received.

**BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

M/S/C (Batra/Dey) to approve the Consent Agenda, as amended.

**NOTE:** M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
7. **Minutes of February 12, 2009**

M/S/C (Batra/Dey) to approve the Minutes of February 12, 2009.

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

Receive the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report.


**REGULAR AGENDA**

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

Robert Swierk, Senior Transportation Planner, referenced Attachment A – Part 2, City/County Responses Quarterly Report – Projects Approved in October, November and December 2008, and provided a brief report on the following Projects: 1) City of Santa Clara San Tomas Business Park Campus Project and 2) City of Sunnyvale Luminaire/Lawrence Station Road Project.

Mr. Swierk noted staff is in the process of creating a more user friendly Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report.

In response to staff’s highlighting of two approved projects in Part 2 of the Proactive Quarterly Report, Alternate Member Collen stated he takes a little exception to the description of the bike and pedestrian operation on expressways as being contentious. The County has been proceeding on this for some time as a county initiative, and the expressway master plan update was based on very successful collaborative efforts from the cities and County working together, and there is now a consensus reflecting that. This was not just an outcome based on a VTA comment, but based on many years of hard work.

M/S/C (Tripousis/Batra) on a vote of 12 ayes, 1 no and 0 abstentions, the Committee received the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report. Alternate Member Collen opposed.

10. **Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Planning Grant Awards**

Celeste Fiore, Transportation Planner II, provided background information on the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program. She noted the Member Agencies’ eligibility to apply for planning grants in the following two categories: 1) Policy Planning Projects and 2) Capital Planning Projects.
Ms. Fiore reported on the Scoring Committee process. She referenced Table 1 – CDT Planning Grant Program Final Project List, and indicated VTA staff recommended grant funds be awarded to the four highest scoring projects as follows: 1) City of Sunnyvale – Lawrence Station Transit Village Study; 2) City of Campbell – Portals Project-Campbell Avenue Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements under State Route (SR) 17; 3) City of Sunnyvale – El Camino Real Multi-Modal Design Guidelines; and 4) Mountain View – Pedestrian Master Plan.

Ms. Fiore indicated the project descriptions of the four proposed projects recommended for grant funding were listed on Attachment A – CDT Planning Grants Program Cycle 2 Project Descriptions.

Member Batra recommended an asterisk be added to Table 1 identifying the Planning Projects versus Capital Projects.

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

**11. Adopt 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program Project List**

Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, provided an overview of the development of the 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) Project list. The steps involved to develop the list were as follows: 1) Call-for-projects – Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2035; 2) Identify the existing BEP projects that will roll-over to the 2009 update; 3) Determine how much funding is available for allocation to the 2009 BEP; and 4) Evaluate and score projects using the VTA Board of Directors adopted criteria.

Ms. DeRobertis provided an overview of the BEP Project List Evaluation and Scoring Process, noting the process for scoring and recommending projects for the BEP followed four basic steps. She referenced Attachment B which contained the recommended BEP Project list and allocations by project.

Member Cherbone queried about the City of Saratoga - PG&E De Anza Trail (Reach 3) Project being on the 2009 BEP Project List. The Project is partially funded by BEP and the remaining is Congestion Management and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds. Ms. DeRobertis indicated the Project will remain on the list until completion.

Member Kass referenced the City of Campbell – Campbell Avenue Improvements at State Route (SR) 17 and Los Gatos Creek Project, and expressed concern regarding the $950,000 BEP allocation. He indicated some of the money has already been allocated for BEP. Member Kass asked why the amount has not been reduced to the remaining BEP allocation balance at the top of the BEP Project List.

Member Dey recommended columns be added to the list indicating how much money has been programmed and how much remains to be allocated.

Member Cherbone recommended the list show the other funding sources that have already been allocated, noting the City of Campbell Project - Campbell Avenue Improvements at State Route (SR) 17 and Los Gatos Creek Project is totally funded.
Member Kass referenced the City of San Jose Projects – a) Los Gatos Creek Trail (Auzerais Avenue to Park Avenue) – San Carlos Street Segment and b) Los Gatos Creek Trail (Park to Santa Clara) and queried about the BEP allocation amounts listed. He expressed concern regarding the misrepresentation of the total amount of money needed to be programmed. Member Kass also recommended the funding sources be listed.

John Ristow, CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, noted the item will be forwarded to the Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee in April 2009. Staff will bring the item back to TAC at their April 9, 2009 meeting with the recommended modifications.

Alternate Member Collen expressed concern regarding the deletion of the Page Mill/I-280 Project from the 2009 BEP Project List, noting the Project has a very important bike element. He requested the Project be put back into qualifying status. Mr. Ristow asked Alternate Member Collen to send information to staff noting the issue.

Vice Chairperson Likens endorsed Alternate Member Collen’s concern regarding the Page Mill/I-280 Project, noting the importance of the Project.

Member Cherbone referenced Table 3 – Continuing BEP Projects Requiring an Adjustment in the Board Approved BEP Allocation, and noted the Adjusted BEP Allocation of $20,000 programmed for the Los Gatos Project should be programmed for the City of Saratoga Project.

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, the Committee deferred the adoption of the adjusted BEP allocations of completed and programmed projects as shown in Attachment A Tables 2 and 3 and the 2009 Bicycle Expenditure Program project list as shown in Attachment B to the April 9, 2009, TAC meeting.

12. 2009 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager Fund

Bill Hough, Transportation Planner III, reported the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) is generated by a $4.00 vehicle registration fee. The funds are forwarded to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and BAAQMD returns 40 percent of the funds to the county of origin. The fund is called the TFCA Program Manager Fund (TFCA 40%), and the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is the program manager for the County of Santa Clara.

Mr. Hough reported a previous Board of Directors action designated half of the annual TFCA allocation to bicycle projects in the Countywide Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) and the other half to a competitive program. Due to a limited amount of eligible BEP projects submitted, the money set aside for BEP projects has been loaned to the competitive program. Eventually, this resulted in the competitive program owing the BEP more than $2 million. As a result, staff gave priority in the 2009/10 TFCA program to BEP and ongoing operating projects.

Mr. Hough indicated VTA received 12 applications from project sponsors, noting six were for priority projects and six were in the competitive program. He directed attention to the chart entitled, “Attachment A – Santa Clara County FY 2009/10 TFCA 40% Program,” and provided a brief overview. TAC’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Working Group Scoring Subcommittee evaluated the competitive applications ranked on
the chart. The chart contained staff’s recommended FY 2009/10 TFCA 40% program and included the Scoring Subcommittee’s project funding recommendations for the competitive projects.

Upon query of Member Dey, John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer and Staff Liaison, clarified the comments made by the General Manager, Michael T. Burns, with regards to Traffic Signal Synchronization Projects. Mr. Burns recommended staff develop a process to ensure there is no degradation to transit services when doing Traffic Signal Synchronization Projects.

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

13. **Adopt 2009 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan**

Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a PowerPoint Presentation entitled, “Bus Rapid Transit Strategic Plan,” highlighting the following: 1) BRT Strategic Plan Goals and Objectives; 2) VTA Service Design Guidelines; 3) VTA BRT Branding; 4) Corridor Evaluation – Six Potential Corridors Studied (El Camino Real; King Road; Santa Clara-Alum Rock; Sunnyvale-Cupertino; Stevens Creek; and Monterey Highway; 5) Transit Sustainability Policy; 6) Most Promising Options (Objective: 30 percent travel time savings over local service); 7) Daily Ridership; 8) Total Operating Cost Estimate; 9) O&M Cost/Passenger (Operating cost per passenger measures system efficiency); 10) Capital Improvement Analysis: Major Findings; 11) Design Principles; 12) Photosimulations - Today and Future of: a) Alum Rock at King Road and b) Alum Rock at 28th Street; 13) Recommended placement of dedicated lanes on Corridors of Stevens Creek and El Camino Real, and 14) Santa Clara-Alum Rock Project Concept.

He provided a report on the next steps to be taken, highlighting: 1) Work cooperatively with partners; 2) Santa Clara-Alum Rock Preliminary Engineering; 3) El Camino BRT Conceptual Engineering; and 4) Stevens Creek BRT Conceptual Engineering.

Member Tripousis left the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

Vice Chairperson Likens queried about the level of analysis conducted on the impact of the BRT Strategic Plan on existing levels of service at signal light intersections. Vice Chairperson Likens expressed her opposition to support the BRT Strategic Plan. Mr. Connolly indicated staff did not look at the overall impact and reported on the outcome of the evaluations conducted on the Line 522 service, a year after introduction, in terms of level of impact it had on signal light intersections on El Camino Real.

Member Batra expressed his opposition to adopt the BRT Strategic Plan. He indicated the City of Santa Clara is in the process of updating their General Plan for 2035. He also expressed concern regarding the El Camino Real as a Grand Boulevard Concept and whether the concept works with the BRT Strategic Plan. He recommended the item be deferred for adoption. Mr. Connolly noted VTA staff presented the BRT Strategic Plan to the City of Santa Clara Planning staff and encouraged Member Batra to speak with the staff.
Vice Chairperson Likens requested the presentation on the BRT Strategic Plan be presented to the City of Palo Alto Council and VTA Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) member prior to recommending adoption of the BRT Strategic Plan. She also expressed an interest in hearing from the Grand Boulevard Initiative with regards to the BRT Strategic Plan.

Chairperson Witthaus also noted his reluctance to recommend adoption of the BRT Strategic Plan. He commented if the Plan is forwarded to the VTA Board of Directors and adopted, VTA is essentially setting in motion a project. He expressed concern about whether or not this stage has received adequate environmental review.

Vice Chairperson Likens requested the item be deferred for a month in order to receive information about the environmental review issue, to hear from the Grand Boulevard Initiative, and make sure all cities in the corridor have an opportunity to meet with their staff and Policy Advisory Committee member.

M/S/C (Likens/Jenkins) to defer the adoption of the 2009 VTA Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Strategic Plan to the April 9, 2009 TAC meeting. Further, requested information on the environmental review issue, to hear from the Grand Boulevard Initiative, and to make sure all cities within the corridor have had an opportunity to meet with their staff and PAC members.

John Ristow, Chief CMA and Staff Liaison, indicated the item is being presented at the March 19, 2009, Transit Planning and Operations (TP&O) Committee and the Committee would be informed of TAC’s action taken on the item.

Member Batra and Alternate Member Collen left the meeting at 3:12 p.m.

14. Advisory Committee Enhancement Update: March

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, provided a brief update on the Advisory Committee Enhancement process, highlighting: 1) Task Force meeting consisting of all Advisory Committee Subcommittee members held in February 2009; 2) Task Force reviewed excerpts from the Hay Group Report and California Bureau of State Audits report on VTA to help define the scope of the Advisory Committee Enhancement Process; 3) Task Force received a booklet titled “Advisory Councils” regarding Best Practices for Advisory Committees; and 4) Next Task Force meeting scheduled for March 25, 2009.

Member Dey extended an invitation to Chairperson Witthaus and Member Tripousis to attend the next meeting.

On order of Chairperson Witthaus and there being no objection, a brief update on the status and progress of the Advisory Committee Enhancement process to date was received.
15. **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee Report**

   Chairperson Witthaus provided a report on the March 12, 2009 TAC Subcommittee meeting, highlighting: 1) VTA’s Sustainability Program. Noted TAC Members will receive notification asking if their respective Member Agency would be interested in participating in a series of Sustainability Workshops; 2) Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager (TFCA 40%) funds; and 3) Implementation of Ramp Metering on both Highway 87 and U.S. 101.

   Member Dey noted the discussion held regarding the need for the VTA Ex-Officio position on TAC and whether a Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) representative should be appointed to TAC.

   **On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, an update from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee was received.

**OTHER**

16. **MTC Activities and Initiatives**

   There was no report on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives.

17. **Committee Work Plan**

   Upon query of Member Jenkins, Ying Smith, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a brief report on the “Bike Sharing Pilot Program” item agendized for the April 9, 2009 TAC meeting.

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

18. **Announcements**

   There were no Announcements.

19. **ADJOURNMENT**

   **On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Tracene Y. Crenshaw, Board Assistant
   VTA Board of Directors
Policy Advisory Committee
Thursday, March 12, 2009

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by Chairperson Abe-Koga in Conference Room B-104 Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

1. ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Moylan</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Whittum (Alternate)</td>
<td>City of Sunnyvale</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Page</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen King (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Saratoga</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cortese, Dave</td>
<td>SCC Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael F. Kotowski</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Baker (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Campbell</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Wang</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Wong (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Cupertino</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Woodward</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Tucker (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Gilroy</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Satterlee</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Carpenter (Alt)</td>
<td>City of Los Altos</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Pirzynski</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane McNutt (Alt)</td>
<td>Town of Los Gatos</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pete McHugh</td>
<td>City of Milpitas</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Jim Lawson, Senior Policy Advisor and Staff Liaison, requested Agenda Item # 7, Minutes of February 12, 2009; and Agenda Item # 9, Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

There were no Public Presentations.

4. Committee Staff Report

Jim Lawson, Senior Policy Advisor, reported 1) VTA celebrated Black History Month with a program featuring Tuskegee Airman Leslie Williams; 2) VTA received the Engineering Excellence Award for 2009 from the American Counsel of Engineering Companies for the 152/156 Interchange in South County; 3) VTA Chairperson Dolly Sandoval was recognized as “A Woman of Influence for 2009,” by the San Jose/Silicon Valley Business Journal; 4) At the March 5, 2009 Board Meeting the Board passed a resolution to apply for stimulus funding for the 237/880 express lane connector; 5) A High Speed Rail (HSR) presentation was provided by VTA staff; 6) Received the 2000 Measure A Semi-Annual Report; 7) Received the 1996 Measure B Progress Report; 8) Caltrain celebrated the completion of the Palo Alto and California Avenue Station.
improvements; 9) At the February Workshop the Board received a report regarding the near term budget outlook; 10) The Board received a report regarding the Federal American Recovery and Stimulus Act and discussed the status of the BART Project; and 11) Invited PAC members to the Board of Directors Workshop April 24, 2009.

Member Pirzynski referenced discussion at the February PAC meeting concerning the Association of the Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projections regarding the allocations of jobs to housing in the County. Member Pirzynski commented that after discussions with ABAG executive staff assumptions would be revised and recommendations made by San Jose staff would be considered. Member Pirzynski stated ABAG staff will present a detailed analysis of the new findings and third installment of projections at the May 2009 Cities Association meeting.

5. Chairperson’s Report

There was no Chairperson’s Report.

6. City Grouping Report

There was no City Grouping Report.

BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/ GENERAL MANAGER

CONSENT AGENDA

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

Approve the Minutes of February 12, 2009.


On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Transit Operations Performance Report: 2009 Second Quarter (July 1, 2008-December 31, 2008).

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

Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report.

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

7. Minutes of February 12, 2009

M/S/C (Wong/Lee) to approve the Minutes of February 12, 2009 as amended to reflect Member Cortese and Alternate Member Macias absent. Alternate Member Whittum abstained.

9. Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report

Robert Swiert, Senior Transportation Planner, and Ying Smith, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a brief overview of the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report.

On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Proactive CMP reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report.

10. Local Transportation Needs & Priorities: Gilroy

Don Dey, Gilroy City Transportation Engineer, provided a PowerPoint Presentation entitled, “City of Gilroy Transportation Network” highlighting: Overview of General Plan Land Use; The Gilroy Downtown Specific Plan; Roadway Network – South County Circulation Study; Bicycle Trails Network; Community Bus Network; and California High Speed Train.

Mr. Dey provided a brief overview of the Gilroy Downtown Specific Plan and stated the need for continued VTA support of the Streetscape projects in Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas, preparing studies and funding for new US 101 Overcrossing and Buena Vista Interchange, and bicycle and pedestrian trails in the Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP).

Mr. Dey reported the proposed High Speed Rail (HSR) alignment will run approximately 100 trains a day through Pacheco Pass with a regional station in Gilroy.

On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga and there being no objection, the Committee received the Local Transportation Needs & Priorities: Gilroy.

11. Revised Joint Development Policy

Bijal Patel, Deputy Director, Joint Development reported in January 2009, the Board adopted the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Plan 2035 (VTP2035). This is a strategic plan intended to position VTA, as the CMA of Santa Clara, County to effectively respond to changes in land use patterns, population growth, transportation costs, and environmental degradation and energy use over the next 25 years.

Member Saterlee requested clarification regarding the proposed goals. Ms. Patel clarified the objective is to meet the three policy goals of revenue, transit-oriented development, and transit operations.

Jim Lawson, Senior Policy Advisor and Staff Liaison, commented all decisions regarding land use must have Board approval.

The Committee requested staff provide the PAC a compilation of the VTA real estate inventory portfolio. Ms. Patel stated when the list is compiled it will be provided to the Committee. She further stated the objective is for VTA to have a long term source of stable revenue.

Member Pirzynski requested clarification of PAC’s role with the Revised Joint Development Policy. On general consensus, the Committee requested the Board recognize PAC’s interest to provide input regarding VTA’s real estate inventory asset compilation.

Ms. Patel clarified the ultimate goal of the policy is to create a portfolio with a priority schedule for adoption by the Board.

**On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga** and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Revised Joint Development Policy.

### 12. 2009 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager Fund (TFCA)

Bill Hough, Transportation Planner III, provided a report regarding the 2009 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program highlighting: 1) Background; 2) Priority Projects; and 3) The Competitive Program.

Mr. Hough stated the TFCA is generated by a $4.00 surcharge on vehicle registrations. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) returns 40 percent of these funds to the county where they were collected for allocation by a “program manager.” VTA is the program manager for this fund for Santa Clara County. Projects sponsors apply to VTA for funding. Projects are approved by the VTA Board who allocated the funds subject to the approval of BAAQMD.

Member Satterlee recommended removing the Light Rail Shuttle Program from the Priority Projects and placing it in the Funded Competitive Projects category.

Member Pirzynski commented the Light Rail Shuttle Service ridership has not increased. He recommended the program be removed from the Bicycle Expenditure Program.

**M/S/C (Wong/Page)** to approve the programming of FY 2009/10 Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager (TFCA 40%) Funds to Projects.

### 13. Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Update: March

Jennie Loft, Public Information Officer, introduced herself to the new committee members and provided a brief overview of the ACE process and its goals.
On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Advisory Committee Enhancement Update: March.

14. PAC Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Subcommittee report.

On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Advisory Committee Enhancement Subcommittee Report.

OTHER

15. Committee Work Plan

On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga and there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Work Plan.

16. Announcements

There were no Announcements

17. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Abe-Koga and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline F. Golzio, Board Assistant

VTA Board of Directors
Downtown East Valley Policy Advisory Board

Thursday, March 5, 2009

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The Regular Meeting of the Downtown East Valley Policy Advisory Board (PAB) was called to order at 3:08 p.m. by Chairperson Campos in the East Wing, Lower Level Conference Room, Santa Clara County Government Center, 70 West Hedding Street, San Jose, California.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Cortese</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Herrera</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Shirakawa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>3:31 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Liccardo</td>
<td>Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nora Campos</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A quorum was present.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

3. Minutes of December 4, 2008

M/S/C (Cortese/Liccardo) to approve Minutes of December 4, 2008.

4. Status of the Santa Clara-Alum Rock Project

Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager and Staff Liaison, provided a report highlighting the following: 1) Project schedule; 2) State Route 130 (Alum Rock Avenue) Relinquishment; 3) Bus Rapid Transit Vehicle Procurement; 4) Alum Rock Business District - Form Based Zoning Plan; 5) Project Agreement between the City of San Jose and VTA; and 6) Eastridge Transit Center Improvement and Access Plan.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED AND, UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.
Member Cortese inquired on the eligibility of the State Route 130 (Alum Rock Avenue) Relinquishment for Federal stimulus funds. John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer, responded the State Route 130 Relinquishment is not included in the City of San Jose’s list of projects eligible for Federal funds. He noted staff is waiting on the State’s decision regarding the distribution of the remaining Federal stimulus funds where the State Route 130 Relinquishment may be eligible. He noted the State Route 130 Relinquishment may also acquire Federal funding for roadway rehabilitation on the next re-authorization of the Federal Transit Bill.

Member Cortese expressed concern on the impact of the relinquishment to the Santa Clara-Alum Rock project schedule. Mr. Connolly responded a Memorandum of Understanding would be developed between the City of San Jose and Caltrans to proceed with construction and eliminate impacts to the project schedule.

Chairperson Campos questioned what improvements the Santa Clara-Alum Rock project would deliver. Mr. Connolly responded the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) would bring portions of the project under a state of good repair. He noted the project assessment would be conducted to determine the cost to improve elements outside the project.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo inquired about the project assessment’s timeline. Mr. Connolly responded the assessment would take four to five months, and it would include a lot of field work.

Ray Salvano, Department of Transportation, City of San Jose, described the scope of the relinquishment and the assessment process. He noted a general assessment of Alum Rock’s condition with and without the BRT would be conducted to determine the cost of improvements.

Chairperson Campos inquired on the timeline of the Alum Rock Business District-Form Based Zoning Plan. Mr. Connolly responded staff has until the end of March 2009 to provide input on the plan.

Member Shirakawa took his seat at 3:31 p.m.

Member Cortese expressed the following concerns regarding the BRT project: 1) Compatibility of the project to different modes of transportation; and 2) Pedestrian and landscaping improvements attuned with the Capitol Expressway Corridor.

Ken Ronsse, Deputy Director, responded the project is encountering compatibility issues but assured the project would be compatible with different modes of transportation. He noted staff has not explored advancing the pedestrian and landscaping elements for the BRT.

Member Cortese requested staff provide the Policy Advisory Board with the following information: 1) Status and updates of the Santa Clara-Alum Rock project; and 2) Information on pedestrian and landscaping improvements ready to move forward.
Member Herrera inquired if the community outreach on the Eastridge Center would include pedestrian and landscaping improvements for the BRT. Mr. Connolly responded they would be part of the discussion.

**On Order of Chairperson Campos** and there being no objection, the Committee received a status report for the Santa Clara-Alum Rock Project.

5. **Bus Rapid Transit Strategic Plan**

Kevin Connolly, Transportation Planning Manager and Staff Liaison, provided a presentation highlighting the following: 1) BRT Strategic Plan; 2) VTA Service Design Guidelines; 3) VTA BRT Branding; 4) Branding; 5) Corridor Evaluation; 6) Transit Sustainability Policy; 7) Most Promising Options; 8) Daily Ridership; 9) Total Operating Cost Estimate; 10) Operating and Maintenance Cost/Passenger; 11) Capital Improvement Analysis: Major Fundings; 12) Design Principles; 13) Corridors; and 14) Next Steps.

Member Cortese suggested replacing the name Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).

Member Herrera inquired on the analysis for having BRT to Eastridge Center and its impacts to economic development. Mr. Connolly explained staff has a great relationship with the management of Eastridge. They understand the importance of public transportation in improving economic condition of the area. He added staff would explore ways to effectively operate the Light Rail and BRT to Eastridge.

Vice Chairperson Liccardo inquired if electric vehicles could be procured for the BRT. Mr. Connolly responded hybrid vehicles would be procured for the BRT. He explained at this time electric vehicles are unable to provide the level of service brought by BRT.

**On Order of Chairperson Campos** and there being no objection, the Committee received a status report on Bus Rapid Transit Strategic Plan.

6. **Capitol Expressway Light Rail Project**

Kenneth Ronsse, Deputy Director, provided a report highlighting the following: 1) Project overview; 2) Multi-modal Boulevard; 3) Impacts of the project; and 4) Project status (Right-of-way acquisition and Federal documents).

Member Cortese inquired on the need of projects for Federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer, explained all Federal requirements and clearance need to be met on projects receiving Federal stimulus funds.

Member Cortese inquired on other potential funding sources. Mr. Ristow responded a criteria for selecting projects eligible for Federal Stimulus Bill, amounting to $1.5 billion, are yet to be determined.

Member Cortese inquired if the Board of Directors adopted an expenditure plan. Mr. Ristow responded the Board of Directors has not adopted a new expenditure plan. He stated staff recommends a short term expenditure plan, two to ten years, geared to move projects and investments forward.
Vice Chairperson Liccardo inquired on the role of ridership in prioritizing the project to receive funding. Mr. Ristow explained ridership figures are considered at the New Starts process. He noted land use and ridership would be incorporated in the study staff is conducting to determine ways to move projects forward. He stated it is the Board of Directors decision to move Capitol Expressway Light Rail project forward.

Member Liccardo requested findings from the studies and information gathered from community outreach to serve as a guide for the City of San Jose’s General Plan update. Mr. Ristow responded staff participated on the General Plan exercise and noted an update would be presented to the Policy Advisory Board at a future meeting.

Member Cortese requested the year 2000 Preferred Investment Strategy for the DTEV.

**On Order of Chairperson Campos** and there being no objection, the Committee received a status report for the Capitol Expressway Light Rail Project.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

**On order of Chairperson Campos** and there being no objection, the Committee adjourned the meeting at 4:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Diresco, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors