

From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2020 2:22 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary

Subject: VTA Information: Updated Sept. 18, 2020 Board of Directors' Workshop agenda packet

Board of Directors:

The Updated Sept. 18, 2020, Board of Director's Workshop agenda packet has been posted on our agenda [portal](#) that includes the following:

- Agenda Item #3.1.d. 2021 Transit Service Plan (ppt)
- Agenda Item #3.2.a. VTA Block Design Development Framework Update (ppt)

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**



From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2020 4:46 PM

To: VTA Board of Directors

Subject: From VTA: Correspondence re: Healthy Transit Plan follow up letter to R. Marcantonio

VTA Board of Directors:

For your information only.

Attached is correspondence from Nuria I. Fernandez, VTA's General Manager/CEO, responding to Mr. Richard Marcantonio's letter dated 09/04/20 - VTA Board Resolution to Endorse & Implement MTC's "Healthy Transit Plan". Please note the initial letter was emailed to you previously.

Thank you.

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building C
San Jose, CA 95134-1927





September 17, 2020

By Email: Mr. Richard Marcantonio: rmarcantonio@publicadvocates.org

Dear Mr. Marcantonio:

Thank you for the follow up letter and observations; they are appreciated.

As I mentioned in my previous response, VTA's 10-Point Plan predates the "Riding Together: Bay Area Healthy Transit Plan" and is what we have implemented in Santa Clara County. VTA is guided by the directives of the Santa Clara County Public Health Department which have historically been the stricter of the nine Bay Area counties; therefore, our actions will be directed by these local mandates.

On-going efforts to execute VTA's 10-Point Plan are sufficient in meeting the Bay Area Healthy Transit Plan recommendations with the exception of the [Metrics Dashboard \("coming soon"\)](#) in which VTA, and the other Bay Area transit operators, will be collecting and reporting requested data monthly. VTA's COVID-19 Information Center at www.vta.org has been updated to reflect this commitment.

Lastly, the June 2 presentation sent to you was meant to provide a snapshot of the efforts we were undertaking to develop our 10-Point Plan. As you point out correctly, we are no longer restricting front door boarding and have updated our website to reflect that. We have also indicated that we are in the process of installing hand sanitizer and mask dispensers on our transit vehicles.

Thank you again for your comments and commitment in keeping transit workers and customers safe and in good health!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'Nuria I. Fernandez'.

Nuria I. Fernandez
General Manager/CEO

From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2020 5:12 PM

To: VTA Board of Directors

Subject: VTA Information: 2nd Update - Sept. 18, 2020 Board of Directors' Workshop agenda packet

Board of Directors:

The updated Sept. 18, 2020 Board of Directors' Workshop agenda packet is now posted on our agenda [portal](#) that includes the following:

Item 3.1. Public Comment from Mr. Alex Shoor

Item 3.2. Public Comment from Mr. Roland Lebrun

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](tel:408-321-5680)



From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Friday, September 18, 2020 2:42 PM

To: VTA Board of Directors

Subject: VTA Information: 3rd Update: Sept. 18, 2020 Board of Directors' Workshop agenda packet

Board of Directors:

You may access the Updated Sept. 16, 2020 Board of Directors' Workshop agenda packet on the agenda [portal](#) that includes the following:

Item #2 Public Comment from Mr. Beekman

Item #3.1. Public Comments from Charlotte Quinn and Robin Roemer

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](tel:408-321-5680)



From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Friday, September 18, 2020 5:11 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary

Cc: Golem, Ron

Subject: From VTA: Response to Republic Urban Properties re: Developer Selection for Exclusive Negotiations for Curtner Station TOD

VTA Board of Directors:

Attached is VTA staff's response to Republic Urban Properties (ltr. attached) re: Developer Selection for Exclusive Negotiations for Curtner Station Transit-Oriented Development.

If you have any questions, please reply to this email or contact Ron Golem, Director of Real Estate & Transit Oriented Development at 408-321-5791 or ron.golem@vta.org.

Thank you.

VTA Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building B-1
San Jose, CA 95134-1927
Phone: 408-321-5680



Republic

September 2, 2020

VTA President Chavez and VTA Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
333 North First Street, Building B-1
San Jose, CA 95134

Re: September 3, 2020 Meeting Item 7.4

Dear VTA President Chavez and Honorable VTA Board Members,

Republic Urban Properties (“Republic”) urges you to reject the staff recommendation and select our development program for the following reasons:

1. BDG/CBNA’s proposal is inconsistent with the Request for Proposal (“RFP”) and, if selected, would pose serious issues of fairness and transparency;
2. The evaluation of BDG/CBNA’s proposal fails to take into account risk and, as such, overvalues the expected economic benefits to VTA; and,
3. A mixed-use, mixed-income development that favors housing production best matches with what was solicited in the RFP and with what the community wants and needs.

First, the recommended development program is inconsistent with the RFP.

VTA’s stated vision is to create a “mixed-use and mixed-income equitable Transit-Oriented Development.” (RFP at Appendix 7, p. 1.) To this end, its Curtner RFP called for development programs to create a “vibrant, high-quality mixed-use development” (RFP at p. 5 [emphasis added]) that would be evaluated in part based on “VTA “desire[] a mix of both market rate and affordable housing at the Project” (RFP at p. 22.)¹ Accordingly, proposals were directed to comply with the City of San Jose’s “Signature Review Urban Plan Village context” (RFP at p. 6) and VTA specifically informed applicants that “the City [has] directed that the Project will require a minimum of 305 housing units, and approximately 17,000 (0.07 FAR) commercial sq. ft.” (RFP at p.10 [emphasis added].)

¹ Residential density for a Signature Project should be at 55 dwelling units/acre or more. See <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments-offices/planning-building-code-enforcement/planning-division/citywide-planning/urban-villages/signature-projects>.

Consistent with these directives, the RFP directed applicants to make the largest parcel in the development, Parcel A, “available for mixed-use transit-oriented development.” (RFP at p. 4.) Not surprisingly, all three of VTA’s concepts focused on housing with neighborhood-serving commercial as an important – but distinctly secondary aspect of the development.

BDG/CBNA has proposed to build a 200,000 SF medical office building with no market rate housing and affordable housing that will not be provided until the second phase of development. The proposed residential density of 11.8 DUs/Ac (or 31.8 DUs/Ac if the assisted living units are included) is also inconsistent with the Signature Project policies.

While BDG/CBNA’s proposal complies with the existing NCC General Plan, this designation is simply a placeholder for future Urban Village design. It does not serve VTA’s TOD goals to eliminate a large, ideal Signature Project site where housing could be located and to put, in its place, a large office development where there is limited commercial interest, great concern over the potential traffic impacts from a high-density commercial development, and much neighborhood need for residential and neighborhood-serving uses.

More basically, the selection of a proposal that does not meet the thrust of the RFP creates a serious question of transparency and fairness. If the submissions were supposed to be centered on commercial/employment uses and did not need to meet the minimum number of housing units for a Signature Project, provide any market rate housing or follow any of VTA’s proposed concepts, the RFP should have so stated.

Second, the economic analysis of BDG/CBNA’s proposal does not appropriately discount it for risk, and, as such, it overvalues the expected economic benefits to VTA.

On paper, BDG/CBNA’s projected returns may be appealing but, as a public steward, VTA cannot afford to speculate. The recommended development program is risky, unsupported by historical demand, and should not be VTA’s top choice for this site.

While we all wish that San Jose was a place that could easily attract large-scale employers to lease 200,000 SF office buildings, the reality is that there is no proven demand for office developments of this scale outside of Downtown. If private investors are not willing to take the risk, it bears asking why a public agency would voluntarily undertake what the private sector will not?²

The fact that BDG/CBNA’s proposal is focused on medical office only adds to the risk. No office or medical lease of 20,000 SF or greater has been signed in the area between SR-17 and 101 South of I-280 in nearly 3 years. While Kaiser was rumored to be looking for a large-scale office building several years ago, their search was limited to the Evergreen/Eastside areas of San Jose – not Central San Jose.

² There is no other development in San Jose for office buildings that approach this magnitude outside of Downtown other than a 345,000 SF office project at 3610 Olsen Drive (Santana West) that has been under construction since 2019 and remains 100% unleased. Tellingly, the next largest new office developments are a 16,700 SF building at 1799 Hamilton Ave and 15,900 SF building at 1133 Minnesota Avenue.

The high cost of construction for a net-zero water, net-zero medical office building further compounds the danger of insufficient lease-up to return the expected benefits to VTA. These costs, which Republic estimates to be between \$1,000 and \$1,200/SF, would require rents in excess of \$4/SF in order to be feasible.

Any expectation that an office building in the Curtner neighborhood could command these rents when there are other commercial options in more attractive areas³ coming available each day as COVID decimates office occupancy rates is speculative, at best.

Third, a mixed-use, mixed-income development that favors housing production best meets the expectations set in the RFP and fulfills the community's needs.

Republic has proposed a flexible development program that will build at least 305 family-oriented market-rate and affordable units⁴ as well as 17,000 SF of neighborhood-serving commercial, including a daycare for which a Letter of Intent to Lease has already been secured. Republic has also committed to ground lease payments of \$110,000 per year that can be used for VTA station improvements, such as Public Art, Access Improvements, Safety and Lighting Improvements, Transit Benefits.

The surface parking lot in Republic's development program provides VTA with the flexibility for a second phase of development which could add even more housing units (up to 500+ units total) and more leasable commercial space.⁵ This second phase offers VTA approximately 30% more net revenue than what VTA has calculated for Republic's development proposal.⁶

If VTA chooses Republic's proposal and opts for a second phase of development as it has with BDG/CBNA, Republic's proposal also yields more affordable units. Under Republic's proposal, at

³ Even if one were to The Downtown San Jose Area, which has better access to Caltrain and other amenities, is scheduled to deliver over 4.5 million SF of Class A office space between 2022 and 2023. These projects will compete with the Curtner TOD and reduce demand.

⁴ Republic chose Kin Families as its operator because of its expertise in designing and managing urban-living environments and to give a wider variety of rental housing options for families and multi-generational living. Republic's proposal features larger floor plans, babyproof apartment finishes, family-friendly amenities (playgrounds, libraries, sand boxes, etc.), stroller parking and additional storage opportunities, daycare and afterschool services, and a regular family event programming. This type of unit and amenity programming is directly correlated with VTA's eTOD goals of "[m]eet[ing] local and regional affordable and workforce housing goals, with the evaluation of opportunities for more units...and a greater share of family-sized units.." (RFP, Appendix 7 at p. 4.)

⁵ The opportunity to redevelop the remaining parking lot are with additional housing units (both market-rate and affordable) and ground floor commercial uses was communicated to VTA staff in the interview and in a written follow-up communication but it does not appear to have been included in the staff summary or in the economic analysis of the project.

⁶ Republic Urban and Charities Housing will also work with VTA to provide an up-front capitalized ground lease payment to the extent that such monetary contribution toward land will not render the affordable housing project financially infeasible. Currently, for just Phase 1, this is estimated at \$27,500 per BMR unit or \$1,677,500 total.

least 20% of the units provided will be reserved for lower-income households. A total of 61 affordable units will be provided in the first phase and the second phase would bring this up to approximately 100 units. These units are not only desperately needed by the community, they are also needed by the City of San Jose, which is falling woefully short of allocating enough feasible, vacant or developable land to meet its RHNA allocation and certify its Housing Element by December of 2022.

In short, Republic's development proposal is strongly grounded in a proven concept with historically-verifiable metrics; both Republic and Charities Housing have a strong local presence and a good working relationship with labor; and Republic has successfully navigated projects of this scale and scope, including the December 2019 closing of the \$488 million Gateway at BART Millbrae Station project located in the City of Millbrae.

Our proposal is not only the safest option with the best developer sponsorship, it is also the one that is most likely to lead to a successful, fully-leased up project that will catalyze ridership and provide VTA with strong, reliable long-term lease payments.

Sincerely,



Michael R. Van Every
President/CEO

CC: Dev Davis, District 6 San Jose Councilmember
Mark Mikl, Charities Housing



September 15, 2020

Mr. Michael Van Every
Republic Urban Properties
84 W Santa Clara Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95113

RE: Developer Selection for Exclusive Negotiations for Curtner Station Transit-Oriented Development

Dear Michael,

This letter is sent in follow up to the Republic letter dated September 2, 2020 addressed to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board of Directors regarding the VTA staff recommendation to authorize the General Manager to enter into an Exclusive Negotiations Agreement (ENA) with Bayview Development Group (BDG) and Civil & Building North America (CBNA) for the Curtner Station Transit-Oriented Development project. The staff recommendation also includes a provision that if negotiations are not successfully concluded with the BDG/CBNA team, the General Manager would be authorized to enter into an ENA with your firm.

VTA's Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Program strives to ensure transparency and fairness in the solicitation and evaluation of developer proposals. Staff regrets that the September 2nd letter may contain incomplete or incorrect information, and we want to set the record straight. The second page of this letter contains a table that includes the assertions from the September 2nd letter along with VTA's explanations and clarifications. Following the table are the relevant pages from the RFP document to provide the complete context for the Curtner TOD offering.

When VTA staff works on a Request for Proposals (RFP), the starting point is always the local jurisdiction's General Plan and Zoning designations for land use; meetings we conduct with the community and local stakeholders prior to RFP release; and the goals of VTA's Board-adopted TOD Policy. With this framework, staff obtains approval from the Board of Directors for release of the RFP. These steps lead to the content in a RFP. VTA intentionally seeks proposals for the broadest possible range of development programs and uses that are consistent with existing local plans, our community and stakeholder engagement, and direction from the VTA Board of Directors. RFPs also invite developers, in addition to submitting a proposal based on RFP requirements, to provide creative alternative approaches that could better advance VTA's goals even if they are not specifically described in the RFP. The goal for VTA is to have the broadest possible competition to get the best TOD proposals for the benefit of VTA, the community, and our region.

As described in the RFP, the VTA TOD Policy provides developers who believe improprieties an opportunity to submit a written protest. Protests are considered in line with the VTA procurement protest procedure and are evaluated by the VTA's Deputy General Manager/CFO.

VTA greatly appreciates the two high-quality projects it is pursuing with Republic at the Tamien and Blossom Hill light rail stations. The work we're jointly doing is creating a new model for public-private partnership TOD projects in Santa Clara County. VTA staff appreciates the strong proposal the Republic team submitted for Curtner Station, and we remain ready to recommend negotiations with Republic if an agreement cannot be reached with BDG/CBNA.

We trust that the above information provides more insight into the RFP requirements and evaluation of the submittals. Please feel free to reach out to me for additional information.

Sincerely,

Ron Golem
 Director, Real Estate & Transit-Oriented Development

cc: VTA Board Secretary

Republic Letter	VTA Explanation / Clarification
<p>BDG/CBNA's proposal is inconsistent with the Request for Proposal ("RFP") and, if selected, would pose serious issues of fairness and transparency</p>	<p>VTA Staff and selection panel reviewed all proposals (including BDG/CBNA) and deemed them all to be consistent with the RFP and City land use guidance below:</p> <p>Per Section 1(B) of RFP – Page 5 & 6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>VTA encourages Respondents to think creatively about how to best meet VTA's objectives for the Project as described in this Section 1B. <u>VTA is willing to consider any approach that would accomplish its objectives in a superior manner.</u></i> <i>Compliance with land uses permitted under the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan ("General Plan") and Signature Review Urban Plan Village Plan context (Appendix 9).</i> <p>City's feedback on minimum requirements for Signature Review Project: Section 3(B) of RFP – Page 10:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The City has provided VTA with preliminary acceptable residential densities and minimum commercial square footage for the Project to meet Signature Project eligibility requirements. At 5.55 acres, the City has directed that the Project will require a minimum of 305 housing units, and approximately 17,000 (0.07 FAR) commercial sq. ft. Calculations are based on gross acreage for the site. These calculations are provided as general guidance, actual densities and commercial requirements will need to be reviewed and approved by the City of San Jose. VTA strongly encourages proposals that maximize mixed-use densities.</i> <p><i>...Respondents are advised to reach out to Jared Hart at the City of San Jose's Planning Department for further information, which VTA expressly permits during proposal preparation.</i></p>

Republic Letter	VTA Explanation / Clarification
	<p>BDG/CBNA’s proposal would not require a Signature Review Process as it is currently consistent with the General Plan.</p> <p>RFP Q&A published 3/13/20: <i>“VTA’s responses are provided below each question. To the extent any of these answers alter or supplement the RFP, they should be considered an amendment or addendum thereto”</i></p> <p>Q&A #9: <u><i>Is VTA interested in a full commercial project with no residential?</i></u> <u><i>A: VTA is open to any allowable land uses under the City of San Jose general plan and zoning codes which will meet its project objectives including increased ridership and long-term stable revenue.</i></u></p>
<p>The evaluation of BDG/CBNA’s proposal fails to take into account risk and, as such, overvalues the expected economic benefits to VTA;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At present there is tremendous uncertainty and risk in real estate and capital markets – this applies to all projects and all uses. Based on the current market situation, any assessment of risk would be speculative. We believe that in the context of recovery after the COVID-19 crisis, all projects proposed in response to the RFP are feasible. Economic benefits to VTA are evaluated on a long-term basis with respect to the ground lease and VTA’s goal of maximizing long term revenue to support transit operations. <p>Regarding net-zero costs as stated in Republic letter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> BDG/CBNA’s ambitions to include net-zero reach goals are in their proposal and will likely require further analysis .
<p>A mixed-use, mixed-income development that favors housing production best matches with what was solicited in the RFP and with what the community wants and needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RFP allowed flexibility for uses as noted above. BDG/CBNA Mixed-Use Proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 200,000 sq. ft. office 118 senior living units 65 affordable units (4 more than Republic’s proposal) 8,000 sq. ft. retail 9,000 sq. ft. daycare BDG proposal includes station area enhancements such as pedestrian walkways and paseos, a new intersection at Curtner & Canoas, and a new bus stop on Curtner Republic notes in their letter significant future development potential with an additional phase which was not included in their proposal. VTA asked about a potential Phase 2. Republic did not commit to a revised proposal at the time. The evaluation panel analyzed the offer as proposed.

Republic Letter	VTA Explanation / Clarification
	<p>Below is Republic’s written response to VTA’s follow up questions:</p> <p>10. Will it be possible to develop the surface parking in the future for structured parking, open space and/or additional housing? Talk to us about future development opportunities on the lower-density site, and how those might be incorporated over time.</p> <p>Through the City of San Jose's preliminary review process, we will vet a possibility of increasing residential density across all 3 parcels, which may result in a much small area dedicated to surface parking uses (yet we will ensure to preserve at least 100 spaces for transit riders).</p>

The Agenda Packet for the September 3, 2020 VTA Board Meeting contains a full analysis of the Curtner Station proposals and sets forth the basis for the staff recommendation to award an Exclusive Negotiations Agreement to BDG/CBNA based on it being the superior overall proposal based on the RFP criteria and the developer’s proposed development program, architectural vision, and economic return.

The following pages consist of Curtner Station RFP pages 5, 6, 10, and the response to Questions and Answer #9, to provide the full context of what the RFP stated with regards to the items discussed in this letter.

so long as transit services do not experience long-term disruption and the Respondent demonstrates how changes better serve the Project and VTA.

B. Objectives

VTA is seeking proposals that will:

- Increase transit ridership and provide access improvements such that the final development, net of any changes to transit parking, results in a net increase in transit ridership.
- Advance overall objectives of VTA's TOD policy (**Appendix 7**).
- Meet or exceed the affordable housing requirements of VTA's Affordable Housing Policy (**Appendix 16**). VTA's Affordable Housing Policy mandates that residential developments contain a minimum of 20 percent of residential units that are affordable to low-income households (earning 60 percent or less of Area Median Income ("AMI")), with half of those units affordable to very low-or extremely low-income households (earning 50 percent of AMI or lower).
- VTA prefers a mixed-income approach where Proposals integrate market rate and affordable units in the same building(s), although separate leaseholds for market rate and affordable will be considered.
- Incorporate creative and innovative approaches to development and serve as a catalyst to establish a transit-oriented community in the station area.
- Generate revenue to support VTA transit operations and investment by maximizing long term ground lease revenue.
- Engage with the community in the development of the Project, to ensure an equitable development project that aims to provide benefits to the local community.
- Create a vibrant, high-quality mixed-use development. This includes outstanding urban design to provide high-quality, active, and safe public civic spaces. Utilize green and sustainable design to minimize vehicle and building-related greenhouse gas emissions.
- Enhance station access and mobility through creation of a transit plaza, improved pedestrian and bike safety, and wayfinding to the station area.
- Provide community workforce opportunities during construction of the Project including workforce apprenticeship opportunities that create access to construction careers.

VTA encourages Respondents to think creatively about how to best meet VTA's objectives for the Project as described in this Section 1B. VTA is willing to consider any approach that would accomplish its objectives in a superior manner.

The City of San Jose has established the following requirements and objectives for this Project that will need to be met in order for the selected Developer to obtain necessary development approvals from the City:

- Compliance with land uses permitted under the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan (“**General Plan**”) and Signature Review Urban Plan Village Plan context (**Appendix 9**).
- Inclusion of community amenities in the development that can serve to: (i) activate the development; (ii) provide community gathering space; (iii) provide infrastructure for services; and/or (iv) create a sense of place. These amenities should enhance the quality of life for the residents of the property, while also benefitting the adjacent neighborhoods and communities.
- Support and enhancement of the local trail system and connectivity for pedestrian and bike safety as well as wayfinding to the station.

3. The commercial/office component of the Signature Project must be constructed before or concurrently with the residential component.
4. Be located at a visible, prominent location within the Urban Village so that it can be an example for, but not impose obstacles to, subsequent other development within the Urban Village area.

Additionally, Signature Projects will be reviewed for conformance with the following objectives:

1. Inclusion of public parklands and/or privately maintained, publicly-accessible plazas or open space areas.
2. Achievement of the pedestrian friendly design guideline objectives identified within the General Plan.
3. Provision of a substantive opportunity for input by interested community members in the planning and design process.
4. Demonstration of high-quality architectural, landscape and site design features.
5. Consistency with the recommendations of the City's Urban Design Review process or equivalent recommending process if the Project is subject to review by such a process.

The City has provided VTA with preliminary acceptable residential densities and minimum commercial square footage for the Project to meet Signature Project eligibility requirements. At 5.55 acres, the City has directed that the Project will require a minimum of 305 housing units, and approximately 17,000 (0.07 FAR) commercial sq. ft. Calculations are based on gross acreage for the site. These calculations are provided as general guidance, actual densities and commercial requirements will need to be reviewed and approved by the City of San Jose. VTA strongly encourages proposals that maximize mixed-use densities.

The City of San Jose is reviewing potential streamlining for housing entitlements through California Assembly Bill No. 3194 (AB 3194). See **Appendix 22**. Such streamlining may be applicable to this project. Respondents are advised to reach out to Jared Hart at the City of San Jose's Planning Department for further information, which VTA expressly permits during proposal preparation.

B. Community Outreach and Entitlement Process

VTA seeks to select a Developer prior to submittal of a development application, in order to allow VTA, the Developer, the community, and the City to work together to finalize the application. The selected Developer will be responsible for entitlement costs and will work with VTA to prepare and submit an application for any necessary land use changes.

In cooperation with VTA, the Developer, at its own cost and expense, will work with the City and VTA to develop the design, site plan, and financing structure for development of a mutually

4) Q. Is VTA open to shared parking?

A: Yes. VTA is open to flexible and creative parking solutions, including shared parking programs for the 100 required transit stalls. Overall, VTA aims to minimize parking and leverage the availability of transit at this location.

5) Q. What are examples of TDM measure that VTA would like to see?

A: Transit passes for residents, bike and car share programs. See additional details on VTA's Smart Pass program here: <https://www.vta.org/go/fares/smartpass>

6) Q. Will VTA be improving the frequency of the Light Rail or Bus lines that serve the Curtner Station?

A: At this time, there are no proposed changes to the light rail or bus services at Curtner. The station is served by the Blue light rail line as well as the 26 bus line, which was just upgraded to frequent service.

7) Q. Is VTA interested in senior living programs?

A: VTA supports both affordable and market rate senior housing programs. Proposals must meet VTA's Affordable Housing Policy which requires that at least 20% of units are affordable at 60% AMI or lower. Half of those units must be at 50% AMI or below.

8) Q. Is VTA interested in higher AMI levels ranging from 80%-120%?

A: Yes. Such units would need to be in addition to VTA's Affordable Housing Policy which requires that at least 20% of units are affordable at 60% AMI or lower. Half of those units must be at 50% AMI or below. A proposal that is out of conformance with the policy would require VTA Board of Directors approval. There can be no guaranty that an exception is available.

9) Q. Is VTA interested in a full commercial project with no residential?

A: VTA is open to any allowable land uses under the City of San Jose general plan and zoning codes which will meet its project objectives including increased ridership and long-term stable revenue.