VTA Board of Directors:

The VTA Board of Directors Agenda Packet for November 7, 2019 has been revised to include additional items under the General Managers Report.

You may access the revised VTA Board of Directors Agenda Packet for the November 7, 2019, Regular Meeting on our agenda portal.

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building B
San Jose, CA 95134-1927
Phone 408-321-5680
VTA Daily News Coverage for Wednesday, November 6, 2019

1. New express lanes on Highway 237 to open Nov. 15: Roadshow (Mercury News)
2. Pothole improvements promised in SB 1 are a slow road to better (Business Journal)
3. BART blows deadline for new San Jose station (Curbed San Francisco)
4. San Jose Council Candidates Square Off Over Fair Elections, Transportation at SVLG Forum (San Jose Metro/San Jose Inside)

New express lanes on Highway 237 to open Nov. 15: Roadshow (Mercury News)

The new express lane signage is not clear as to who can use it. Signs say if you’re in a carpool, you don’t have to pay. However, nowhere, including on the FasTrak website, is it clear that one needs a flex sticker and an account to use the express lanes as a carpooler. I found out by getting a ticket.

Matthew Young, San Jose

A: Be on the alert on Nov. 15 when express lanes on Highway 237 will be extended west from Mathilda. My suggestion is to get a flex sticker or tag. It has three numbers on it, and if you are driving solo and willing to pay the toll to do so, just show the “1” on your transponder and that’s all you need. If you’re a carpool, use the “2” or “3” to indicate how many people are in your car.

Carpool vehicles with two or more occupants, motorcycles, transit buses and eligible clean-air vehicles with a transponder will be able to continue to use the express lanes free of charge.

A big change is that carpool/express lane hours will start at 5 a.m. and run until 8 p.m.

Q: For the past year or so I have driven by the intersection of Saratoga Avenue and Interstate 280 and am amazed at the garbage accumulation by one female. She has been allowed to stack and line up grocery carts, a bed, chairs, and even hang clothes to dry all on the sidewalk in front of Harry’s Hofbrau. Why is this allowed month after month? Our city is becoming a garbage disgrace.

Kathi Castro, Santa Clara

A: Disgrace it is. More efforts will be made to clean up this area.

Q: Fun fact. Yes, a Tesla on autopilot will ride the center of the lane but if a motorcycle approaches from the rear slowly (instead of screaming past like many do) the car will sense the object and shift to the left. Just an FYI.

James Alger

A: Thanks for the tip.

Q: I see that someone else agrees that we need a road over the hill from San Martin. After my last note to you about this, I wrote the county board of supervisors. I received a note back from Ms. (Cindy) Chavez that the new realignment will take care of the problem. The new problem is that a new interchange at Highway 101 and Highway 25, plus a new interchange at 25 and Highway 156 will add about nine more miles to the trip and use up more good farmland. Most truckers will use it, but I’ll bet dollars to donuts that the cars will still use Highway 152, mainly because the truckers will be gone! The road over the hill should be a toll road. Thanks, Gary. You do a good job!

Bill Bartz

A: A toll road continues to get support, so stay tuned.
**Pothole improvements promised in SB 1 are a slow road to better** *(Business Journal)*

After the first full year of funding from SB 1, the state gas tax increase championed in the California Legislature by Sen. Jim Beall, the potholes in city streets that were pitched to voters as the driving force for the legislation are beginning to disappear.

Slowly.

“Every driver in San Jose knows we have a long way to go to reach a pothole-free future,” a press release from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission quoted Mayor Sam Liccardo as saying in its annual assessment of pavement conditions in the nine-county Bay Area.

The release gives pavement assessment scores on a rolling three-year basis and says San Jose’s grade has climbed three points to 65 on a 100-point scale from the 62 it scored in 2016. That’s right in the middle of the “fair” range.

Only one city in Santa Clara County — Monte Sereno — had a lower score at 63, and Palo Alto came out on top at 84, like San Jose also up three points. That’s in the “very good” category.

San Francisco graded out at 72, “good,” and Oakland got a 54, “at-risk.”

The Bay Area’s best pavement was Dublin’s 86 followed by Palo Alto and Clayton, which were tied, and then Daly City and El Cerrito at 83, Brentwood at 82, Cupertino, Foster City and unincorporated Solano County at 81, and Colma, San Ramon and Union City at 80.

The MTC has a “vital signs” website at [www.vitalsigns.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.vitalsigns.mtc.ca.gov) on which you can get block-by-block analysis of pavement conditions and every city’s pavement score dating back to 2003.

It shows that San Jose’s pavement conditions have barely changed over that period. They were at 64 in 2003 and have always been a point or two below the Santa Clara County average over those 15 years.

“The majority of Bay Area cities and towns have seen minimal shifts in their pavement conditions over the past 10 years,” the website says.

---

**BART blows deadline for new San Jose station** *(Curbed San Francisco)*

But VTA holds out hope for trains to roll by the end of the year

While BART and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) still hope to have the $2.3 billion Berryessa Station in San Jose ferrying passengers by the end of 2019, the project has missed a critical final deadline.

Last week, VTA announced that the new station, which would provide a 10-mile extension into Silicon Valley, has begun “pre-revenue operations”—i.e., the final phase of testing before allowing riders onboard—at Berryessa, which includes training BART staff on the ins and outs of the new stop, as well as simulated service to help iron out scheduling kinks.

[Correction: The $2.3 billion budget and 10-mile extension includes Milpitas Station as well as Berryessa Station.]

It’s a big milestone for the long-planned BART foray into the South Bay, but it comes late.

Earlier in the year, BART spokesperson Alicia Trost told the [San Jose Mercury-News](https://www.sanjosemercury.com), “Service will not start on December 28, 2019 if VTA does not resolve the discrepancies necessary for BART to start Pre-Revenue Testing by October 21.”

It looks like the transit agency blew that target by a week. But VTA spokesperson Bernice Alaniz says they can still make the end-of-2019 goal, writing that the new station is “on track to begin prior to the year’s end.”
Trost now tells Curbed SF that the October 21 deadline “was prior to BART and VTA coming to an agreement to start pre-revenue testing with a condensed testing schedule” and that “the goal remains to open for service by the end of the year.”

BART previously shrunk its usual 90-day testing period for a station to just two months in an effort to finish by year’s end. Trost says the new agreement “allows time each day for both testing and time for VTA to resolve remaining discrepancies.”

Earlier this year, BART said it hoped to start carrying passengers to the new station by November 1, but VTA pledged service “no later than December 31, 2019.” As months went by, both agencies aligned their goals around a December-or-bust plan.

Plans for San Jose BART service stretch back to the 1950s and the earliest days of BART planning. VTA broke ground on Berryessa Station in 2012. Once upon a time, service was planned for as far back as 2015.

When finally complete, the trip from downtown San Francisco to San Jose will finish take roughly 60 minutes. VTA estimates that by 2030 some 25,000 passengers will enter and exit the station daily.

The planned downtown San Jose BART station, approximately six miles from Berryessa, was not projected to go into service until 2026, but now may take as long as 2030.

Back to Top

San Jose Council Candidates Square Off Over Fair Elections, Transportation at SVLG Forum (San Jose Metro/San Jose Inside)

Eight candidates running for three San Jose City Council districts faced off over the Fair Elections Initiative and a regional transportation measure Friday at the Silicon Valley Leadership Group’s latest candidate forum.

The debate, which was held at Blach Construction in Milpitas, featured contenders for council seats in districts 4, 8 and 10.

Berryessa Union School District Trustee David Cohen and employment rights attorney Huy Tran are challenging District 4 Councilman Lan Diep. In District 8, incumbent Councilwoman Sylvia Arenas faces Evergreen School District Trustee Jim Zito. And in District 10, four candidates are vying for the open seat of soon-to-term-out Councilman Johnny Khamis: Bay Area Women’s March President Jenny Higgins Bradanini, ex-Brigade CEO Matt Mahan, businesswoman Helen Wang and financial advisor Vinh Do. Do, who filed his paperwork with the City Clerk last week, was not in attendance.

Fair Elections Initiative

More than two months ago, a coalition of union groups proposed a ballot measure that would align the mayoral election with presidential election years and bar certain developers and their lobbyists from donating to council campaigns.

Advocates of the measure say it would increase voter turnout and eliminate the “pay to play” environment of local politics. But critics contend that holding mayoral elections in conjunction with the presidential election would draw attention away from local issues. They also claim the measure is hypocritical by exempting one special interest, business, while allowing another, labor.

Silicon Valley Leadership Group President and CEO Carl Guardino asked candidates whether they support the two aspects of the measure.

District 4

Diep has made his position clear in the past that holding the mayoral election during a presidential year would distract voters from local issues. On Friday morning, he voiced his concerns about the campaign contribution portion of the measure.
“Really it’s just getting special interest money out of it, except for [their] special interest money,” he argued. “I think that also in San Jose we have a $600 campaign contribution limit ... and I don’t believe that anyone on this stage can be bought for $600.”

Tran, on the other hand, has previously come out in support of the initiative. He drew attention to what he saw as inequalities between business and labor interests and its ability to support campaigns.

“I’m a true believer of the labor movement,” he said. “I do believe that there is a qualitative difference between a labor organization, which connects people who have to rely on each other to build their power, versus folks who have endless resources to get their point across.”

Cohen agreed with Tran’s views, but wasn’t sure if the measure fully addresses the issue of big money in politics.

“My problem with this piece is I don’t think this really does something about the true problem with money in politics, which is the independent expenditures,” Cohen told the audience.

**District 8**

When San Jose considered shifting the mayoral election earlier this year, Arenas was one of the five council members who voted in favor of it.

“It’s not an unknown truth, we all know this that typically women and people of color show up on presidential years,” she said. “I think that these groups need an opportunity to also run for office and have a mayor choice and a fair opportunity.”

She added that she has been conflicted from the beginning about limiting people’s ability to donate to campaign, but figures that the benefits outweigh the risks.

Zito said he strongly opposes the measure, and that he believes it is unconstitutional to exempt certain people from donating to political campaigns. He also questioned the legitimacy of the claim that it would increase voter turnout, especially in light of absentee ballots becoming increasingly common. “I believe [the mayoral race] deserves the limelight,” he said. “I believe that with voter choice we have really mitigated a significant number of impediments for anybody to vote.”

**District 10**

While Mahan said he didn’t feel strongly about changing the mayoral election cycle, he called the campaign contribution limits against business interests “deceptive.”

“If we want to curb the influence of concentrated special-interest power, that’s fine, but let’s do it equally and evenly across the board,” he said.

Higgins Bradanini said she supports the measure because residents deserve “clean elections.” She acknowledged, however, that the campaign contribution aspect was going to be the most “divisive” part. In her Silicon Valley Leadership Group candidate questionnaire she called the “attacks” against labor “shortsighted.”

“We say that money can’t buy votes, so I think it’s appropriate and important to put a policy in place that assures that for our voters,” she said.

Wang agreed with Diep that changing the mayoral election year would create too much noise. In her SVLG questionnaire she called the measure “expensive” and “unnecessary.”

“If we change the election cycle, nobody pays attention to the local issues,” she said.

**Transportation**

Silicon Valley Leadership Group has helped lead the push for FASTER Bay Area: a potential November 2020 ballot measure that would raise an estimated $100 million over the next 40 years through a region-wide one-cent-per-dollar sales tax increase.

On Friday, the candidates were asked if they would support a tax measure to build a “world-class, seamless integrated transit system” in the Bay Area.

**District 4**

Tran said that while he loves the idea of transforming the region’s transportation system, he was uneasy about the one-cent sales tax increase.
“I’m getting really concerned about whether we’re making it harder for the families in our city to stay here,” he said. “I want to see how we fund this that doesn’t hurt the families that are already struggling.”

Cohen said that the Bay Area is “long overdue” for a “regional transit approach,” and was excited to work alongside neighboring counties in solving the issue.

“This includes getting high speed rail, connecting the state so we can move people faster,” he said. “This will mean more transportation by electrification, which means less carbon emissions and all kind of things we can benefit from.”

Diep was concerned about the number of tax measures over the last few elections, but said that this one was was “worthwhile” as San Jose becomes more dense.

“We can’t stay being a car-oriented community any longer, especially as the North San Jose representative, I believe we need this source of money to eventually get BART to come to North San Jose,” he said.

**District 8**

Zito, who hails from New York, said he understands the need for sustainable transit and would support the one-cent sales tax increase. But like Tran, he expressed concern about how the tax “affects our most vulnerable residents.”

“As long as there’s good oversight and good accountability, I believe that that can be used for providing connectivity as a regional wide solution,” he said.

Arenas drew upon her experience as a member of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) board and her vote to expand the light rail.

“I want to make sure I focus on connectivity,” she said. “One of those things is making sure that project is on board. ... As a council member I want to make sure that our residents have options in order to get to work, to play and to go back home.”

**District 10**

Wang—who grew up in Taiwan and has lived in a number of cities around the world with good transit systems—said she would support the tax hike if it was “economically feasible,” according to her candidate questionnaire. She has also gone on record as being against the California High Speed Rail project.

“The High Speed Rail focus appears to be wasteful, poorly conceived, opposed by many in the Central Valley, and will detract from the more desirable Bay Area connectivity,” she wrote in her SVLG questionnaire.

Higgins Bradanini said she would support the measure and that it would bring “other opportunities for providing better options for our communities.”

“I’m not usually supportive of regressive taxes because it does affect our most vulnerable, but [I will] if it’s developed in a fair and equitable way and takes into account all the diverse needs of our communities,” she said.

Mahan called himself a “big believer of getting people out of their cars,” but said he wants to make sure that the tax wouldn’t put a burden on the working class.

“We need some mitigation strategies to reduce the impact on low income residents,” he said, “whether that’s subsidies for fares, vouchers for public transit tickets [or] working with employers to reduce the impact on their employees.”
VTA Board of Directors:

The November 7, 2019, Board of Directors Agenda Packet has now been updated to include presentations and/or materials for the following items:

- **Agenda Item #5.5** - Ad Hoc Board Enhancement Committee Chairperson’s Report
- **Agenda Item #7.3** - Operations & Maintenance Agreement with BART
- **Agenda Item #8.1** - General Manager’s Report – Security Stats
- **Agenda Item #8.1.A** - New Transit Service Plan Implementation, Operations Workforce Development, and Customer Communications during a Service Interruption Updates
- **Agenda Item #8.1.C** - Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Program Update

You may access the updated agenda packet on [our portal](http://portal.vta.org).

**Copies will be provided for you in your Reading Folders.**

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building B
San Jose, CA 95134-1927
Phone 408-321-5680
VTA Board of Directors:

The November 7, 2019, Board of Directors Agenda Packet has now been updated to include public comment for Agenda Item #7.3 - Operations & Maintenance Agreement with BART.

You may access the updated agenda packet on our portal.

Copies will be provided for you in your Reading Folders.

Thank you.
VTA Board of Directors:

The November 7, 2019, Board of Directors Agenda Packet has now been updated to include materials for the following items:

- **Agenda Item #3** - Public Comment
- **Agenda Item # 5.2** - Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Chairperson’s Report
- **Agenda Item #8.1.B** - Government Affairs Report
- **Agenda Item #8.3** - Items of Concern and Referral to Administration

You may access the updated agenda packet on our portal.

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
3331 North First Street, Building B  
San Jose, CA 95134-1927  
Phone 408-321-5680
VTA Daily News Coverage for Friday, November 8, 2019

1. As BART’s Opening Draws Near, Its Law Enforcement Contract is Still in Limbo (Milpitas Beat)
2. Startups invited to create real-time transit mapping platform for emergency response (Traffic Technology Today)

As BART’s Opening Draws Near, Its Law Enforcement Contract is Still in Limbo (Milpitas Beat)

The Milpitas Transit Center, which contains the city’s BART station, is going to open — eventually. When it does, BART Police will have jurisdiction around the immediate station area. As for the rest of the surrounding area? It’s complicated...

The Santa Clara County Sheriff’s Office already provides law enforcement services for VTA properties, which include the Milpitas and Berryessa BART stations.

But the sheriff and the VTA’s BART station contract expired on June 30. VTA has yet to award a new contract to a law enforcement agency, and instead negotiated a six-month extension with the sheriff. But whatever happens after the six months is anyone’s guess.

Earlier this year, the VTA solicited bids for a new contract and multiple law enforcement agencies responded, according to Deputy Jessica Gabaldon, the sheriff’s public information officer.

Milpitas Police Chief Armando Corpuz saw VTA’s proposal request as an opportunity for the Milpitas Police Department (MPD) to step in and negotiate to win the contract, a move that received the city council’s blessing back in April.

A recommendation will be considered by the VTA’s Board of Directors sometime in November, after the body considers all the submitted proposals — including that of Milpitas, according to MPD Assistant Police Chief Kevin Moscuzza.

“There’s a benefit if we’re providing police services and working in that area,” said Moscuzza. “It would be easier for us to make adjustments.”

MPD has already made extensive plans in anticipation of the new transit center. The department has hired 93 additional personnel, including dozens of community service officers, to help with parking and other less hazardous functions.

That will free up more full-time officers to help with the large influx of people coming in and out of the city daily on BART.

The last few years have been challenging ones for BART. According to a grand jury report released in June, violent crime on the transit system, including robberies and aggravated assaults, has increased by 115 percent since 2014.

Perhaps uncoincidentally, BART ridership has gone down 8 percent during that period, and rider satisfaction plummeted from 86 percent in 2012 to 56 percent in 2018, according to the report. All the more reason, Moscuzza believes, to see Milpitas as best equipped in terms of dealing with potential crime in its transit center.

Said Moscuzza, “We can carve our deployment of officers to create an efficient and effective plan.”

Back to Top
Startups invited to create real-time transit mapping platform for emergency response (Traffic Technology Today)  
Startups, innovators and entrepreneurs are invited to apply to become a ‘Startup in Residence’ (STIR) with California’s Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to develop a Bay Area transit visual information system for use by emergency managers in times of crisis. 
The STIR program connects businesses and technology talent with public agencies such as the MTC in an effort to collaborate on innovative solutions to public sector problems. In its role as the regional transportation planning, financing and coordinating agency for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area, this year the MTC has one challenge: a regional mapping platform that will assist with emergency response. The Commission is seeking a robust but easy-to-use solution to improve emergency managers’ ability to graphically visualize, in real-time, such critical information as the transit vehicles and other assets available, and the conditions in which they must operate. 
Bay Area emergency operations managers currently must visit a variety of complex online platforms to gather critical information. But when time is of the essence, it would take an unnecessary amount of time to visit all of these sites in order to implement an Incident Action Plan to prepare for the emergency response. Many of these critical information data points, such as transit assets (bus and rail locations) have publicly available API’s made available by the respective transit agencies, however, currently there is no regional mapping platform that will let an emergency manager visualize all of the assets at one time at the regional level. 
Applications for MTC’s project are due November 20, and if selected by Commission, the organization will complete a pro bono residency over 16 weeks starting in February 2020. Through this work, the selected participant will get an inside look at one of the USA’s premier metropolitan planning organizations. At the conclusion of the residency, if the participating organization’s solution is approved by MTC, STIR’s expedited procurement process will streamline the path to contracting for the product. 
The STIR program is offered by City Innovate, a San Francisco-based Public Benefit Corporation dedicated to helping emerging technology companies solve challenges in government. STIR offers a framework for governments to solve challenges in collaboration with startups through a structured process that drives rapid innovation. MTC joins nearly 30 government partners participating in the Startup in Residence program this year. Since 2014, startups from around the world have provided technology solutions to cities including San Francisco, Oakland, Miami and Houston.
Back to Top