VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension

Downtown-Diridon Community Working Group

September 13, 2016

Agenda

• Follow-up Items and Work Plan
• SPUR and the BART Corridor
• FTA Process: New Starts Funding
• Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities
• Lessons Learned from Phase I
• Project Updates
• Next Steps
Role of the CWG

- Be project liaisons
- Receive briefings on technical areas
- Receive project updates
- Build an understanding of the project
- Collaborate with VTA
- Contribute to the successful delivery of the project

Your Role as a CWG Member

- Attend CWG meetings
  - Bring your own binder (BYOB)
- Be honest
- Provide feedback
- Get informed
- Disseminate accurate information
- Act as conduits for information to community at large
Role of the CWG Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CWG Team Member</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Goodwin</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent Pearse</td>
<td>Primary Outreach Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyla Hedayat</td>
<td>Phase II Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Kurimoto</td>
<td>Technical Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Brilliot</td>
<td>City of San Jose – Planning Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosalynn Hughey</td>
<td>City of San Jose – Planning Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Zenk</td>
<td>City of San Jose – DOT Liaison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upcoming Meetings

Public Hearings for Draft Environment Document
- Winter 2017

VTA Board of Directors
- September 23, 2016 (Workshop Meeting) at 9:00AM
- October 6, 2016 at 5:30PM
- November 3, 2016 at 5:30PM

BART Silicon Valley Program Working Committee
- October 3, 2016 at 10:00AM

Diridon Joint Policy Advisory Board
- September 16, 2016 at 3:00PM

Public meetings on specific technical topics - TBD
Follow-up Items (1 of 2)

- CSJ Station Access Report
  - On the Phase II CWG website under “Phase II CWG Links”
- Add Diridon Station staff recommendation discussion to November agenda
  - Added to November CWG workplan and agenda
- Provide link to Diridon Intermodal Study RFP in meeting summary
  - See June meeting notes, under “Follow-Up Items”
- Conduct Construction community outreach poll with CWG members allowing for more detailed feedback
  - Will be revisited after sales tax measure ballot language is determined

Follow-up Items (2 of 2)

- Consider publicly available online poll to ask community members about preferred construction communication tools
  - Noted, on today’s agenda
- Add Diridon Station Options discussion to September CWG agenda and provide graphics to explain the options
  - Added to November CWG workplan and agenda when more detailed graphics will be available as part the Diridon Station – North Option technical study
Schedule Update

Leyla Hedayat, VTA

- Circulate Draft SEIS/SEIR Document – December 2016*
- VTA BoardDefines Final SEIS/SEIR Project – May 2017*
- Circulate Final SEIS/SEIR Document – October 2017*
- FTA Record of Decision – December 2017*

*Contingent on FTA review
Work Plan Shifts

Facilitator

SPUR and the BART Corridor

Teresa Alvarado, SPUR
Presentation to the BART Silicon Valley Phase II Community Working Groups
Teresa Alvarado | San Jose Director
September 2016

I. SPUR’s History and Mission
II. SPUR’s Work on BART

SPUR | Ideas + Action for a Better City
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SPUR’s History and Mission
I. SPUR's History and Mission

II. SPUR's Work on BART

Q&A
1. Concentrate growth inside existing cities
2. Build great neighborhoods
3. Make it affordable to live here
4. Give people better ways to get where they need to go
5. Lay the foundations of economic prosperity—for everyone
6. Reduce our ecological footprint and prepare for climate change
7. Support local government
WIN: Funding for Second Transbay Rail Crossing Study in November BART Bond

1973 SPUR authors San Francisco's Transit First Policy
1997 SPUR authors A Comprehensive Approach to Fixing Muni
2000 SPUR authors What’s Next for Muni
2001 SPUR authors The Next Step for Muni Reform
2005 SPUR authors Muni’s Billion Dollar Problem
2007 Muni launches “transit effectiveness project”
2014 SPUR Supports Prop.A (Passed)
2015 MUNI FORWARD launched

WIN: Major changes for Muni
IMPROVING REGIONAL PLANNING IN THE BAY AREA
Recommendations for integrating ABAG and MTC

Rethinking Regional Planning: A Window of Opportunity in 2016
By Egon Terplan, Regional Planning Director

Egon Terplan: Bay area needs a single regional agency for planning and funding
By Egon Terplan | Special to the Mercury News

WIN: Merger of MTC and ABAG
Will denser land use patterns actually translate into livable, walkable, places?

How can San Jose become the largest, most lively, and most significant hub of the south bay?
How can people get where they want to go, when they want to go—on reliable and sustainable modes?
The Future of the Berryessa BART Station

BART Phase II Station Area Profiles
Designing the Second Transbay Rail Crossing

High-Speed Rail: Funding, Station Area Development, and more
Caltrain: Long-Range Plan to Grow Ridership to 260,000 people/day
I. SPUR’s History and Mission

II. Our Work in San Jose

II. SPUR’s Work on BART

I. Q&A

Upcoming Programs

Rail~Volution California Day*
Oct. 12 @ 2-5pm

High-Speed Rail on the Horizon
Oct. 25 @ 12:30

What’s Next for Diridon?
Nov. 2 @ 12:30

Lessons from Great Urban Train Stations
Nov. 16 @ 12:30

*Tickets for purchase. Held in San Francisco.

Image credit: Alan Hart, VIA Architects
FTA Funding Process

Kevin Kurimoto, VTA

FTA Funding Process

Community Working Groups
September 2016
Phase II Funding Strategy

Phase II Project Cost: $4.69 Billion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Status</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Target Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expended</td>
<td>Measure A Sales Tax &amp; TCRP</td>
<td>$160 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Existing Measure A Sales Tax</td>
<td>$1 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>FTA New Starts</td>
<td>$1.5 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>New Sales Tax Measure B</td>
<td>$1.5 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected</td>
<td>Cap &amp; Trade Program</td>
<td>$750 Million³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4.91 Billion²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ As part of the Federal New Starts review process, FTA will conduct a risk evaluation and establish with VTA the contingency levels for the project.

² The amount included in the funding strategy assumes a level of additional contingency resulting from the future risk assessment results.

³ VTA is targeting the maximum State Cap & Trade amount of $750 million. The current program is competitive and any allocation awarded to VTA could be less than the target amount.

FTA Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Program

- Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST), discretionary & highly competitive Federal grant program
- Legislatively directed multi-year, multi-step process, with FTA project evaluation and rating required at specific points
- Roughly $2 billion appropriated each year
- Demand for funds exceeds supply
- Phase II accepted into Project Development phase March 2016
Program Process

Project Development
- Board determines project description
- Project adopted into long-range plan
- Complete environmental review process
- Complete activities for project evaluation and rating
- Two-year period to complete

Engineering
- Complete sufficient engineering and design
- Gain commitments of all non-New Starts funding
- Anticipate entry in Summer 2018

Full Funding Grant Agreement
- Construction
- Anticipate 2019

Project Evaluation and Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Criteria Ratings</th>
<th>Summary Ratings</th>
<th>Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility Improvements (84.6%)</td>
<td>Project Justification* (50% of Overall Rating)</td>
<td>Overall Project Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Benefits (16.6%)</td>
<td>*Must be at least &quot;Medium&quot; for project to get &quot;Medium&quot; or better Overall Rating.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Relief (16.6%)</td>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness (16.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-Effectiveness (16.6%)</td>
<td>Economic Development (16.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development (16.6%)</td>
<td>Land Use (NS or SS) or Capacity Needs (CC) (16.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use (NS or SS) or Capacity Needs (CC) (16.6%)</td>
<td>Current Condition (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Condition (25%)</td>
<td>Commitment of Funds (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of Funds (25%)</td>
<td>Reliability/Capacity (25%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability/Capacity (25%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Financial Commitment* (50% of Overall Rating)
*Must be at least "Medium" for project to get "Medium" or better Overall Rating.
Program Funding

- FAST authorizes the CIG Program at $2.3 billion each year through FY2020 (no growth)
- Historically appropriations have been between $1.8 and $2.1 billion per year for the program

Questions
Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

Val Menotti, BART

Strengthening the connections between people, places, and services enhances BART’s value as a regional resource.

SVRT Community Working Groups
Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

System Facts

• Elected Board of Directors
  – nine districts

• 3 Counties:
  - Alameda, Contra Costa & San Francisco
  - Serves San Mateo, and soon Santa Clara

• 104 total miles

• 5 lines + Oakland Airport Connector

• 45 stations

• 46,000 parking spaces

• Farebox recovery: 74%
Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

Regional Accessibility

- Travel time
- Cost
- Other considerations (i.e. comfort, productivity)

Taking BART vs. Driving
Oninda to Downtown
San Francisco (Montgomery)
Annual Cost (2014 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BART</th>
<th>Driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BART fare</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas, maintenance, oil changes, and depreciation</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART Park and Ride fee</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumptions:
- Commute distance of 10 miles and 728 workdays per year.
- BART fare: $1.00, BART Pass $41/day round trip.
- Gas price: $2.50 per gallon.
- Maintenance and other costs: $100 per year.

Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

Effects: BART + Other Factors

BART affects property values when other factors present:

- Community support
- Local zoning / incentives / redevelopment
- Strong real estate market

BART @ 20 Series: Land Use and Development Impacts, University of California Transportation Center (UCTC)

San Francisco (1963 – 1992)

BART @ 20 Series: Land Use and Development Impacts, University of California Transportation Center (UCTC)
http://www.accessmagazine.org/articles/spring-1999/middle-age-sprawl-bart-urban-development/
Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

BART @ 20 Studies (1995): Office Space

East Bay (1963 – 1992)

BART @ 20 Series: Land Use and Development Impacts, University of California Transportation Center (UCTC) Working Paper #308, Cervero, et. al, Sept. 1995

http://www.accessmagazine.org/articles/spring-1999/middle-age-sprawl-bart-urban-development/

BART @ 20 Series: Land Use and Development Impacts, University of California Transportation Center (UCTC) Working Paper #308, Cervero, et. al, Sept. 1995

2/3rds of BART trips begin or end on Market Street

BART Supports Job Growth in Downtown SF (2015)
- Increases access to labor pool
- Facilitates capacity to recruit and retain employees
- Reduces commute costs
- Enables higher density office space, walkable, vibrant, urban eco-system

Source: Strategic Economics, CoStar, 2015
Property Value Impacts (2015): Office Space East Bay/North San Mateo

Property Value Premiums – Office in East Bay and N. San Mateo County, vs. outside ½ Mile

- Within ¼ mile: 13.7%
- ¼ to ½ mile: 7.6%

$65 million/year in added revenue

Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

Property Value Impacts (2015): East Bay Multi-Family Residential

Property Value Premiums - Condos

- Within ¼ mile: 15.0%
- ¼ to 1 mile: 10.4%
- 1 to 2 miles: 7.4%
- 2 to 5 miles: 1.3%

# Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

## Transit-Oriented Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>% Affordable</th>
<th>Office (SF)</th>
<th>Retail (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Castro Valley</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fruitvale</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasant Hill Ph I</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35,590</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dublin/Pleasanton I</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COMPLETED</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,176</strong></td>
<td><strong>256</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
<td><strong>107,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>81,590</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Under Construction | MacArthur | 624 | 106 | 17% | 5,000 | 42,500 |
|                    | San Leandro| 200 | 200 | 100%| 5,000 | 1,000  |
|                    | South Hayward Ph I | 354 | 152 | 43% | -     | -      |
| TOTAL UNDER CONSTRUCTION |         | **1,178** | **458** | **39%** | **10,000** | **43,500** |

**TOTAL COMPLETED AND UNDER CONSTRUCTION**  
**2,354** | **714** | **30%** | **117,000** | **125,090**

---

# Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

## Fruitvale BART

![Fruitvale BART Station Map]
Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities
Fruitvale Transit Village - Before

Fruitvale Transit Village Site Plan

Neighborhood Retail
Fruitvale Transit Village - After

Phase 1
- 27,000 SF Office
- 37,000 SF Retail
- 71,000 SF Public
- 47 Residential units
- Public plaza
- Mixed-use
  - Community clinic
  - Child care facility
  - Public library
  - Charter high school

Fruitvale BART Paseo - Before
Richmond BART - Before

- City Redevelopment effort
- Lower density, larger district-wide plan
- Capitalize on Intercity Rail / BART connection
- Improved intermodal access and sense of safety at station
- Streetscape on Nevin & MacDonald
- Transformative:
  - Kaiser Hospital was going to close, expanded instead in 2006
Transit Village Site Plan

- Semi-rural / suburban site in 1972
- Specific Plan adopted 1983 and Redevelopment Plan 1984
- Contra Costa Centre has emerged as mixed-use, suburban center of 140 acres
- 2.2 M SF Class A office space
- 423 hotel rooms
- 2,300 multi-family residential units
Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities
Pleasant Hill / Contra Costa Centre BART
Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

Lessons Learned

• BART is an important investment to improve regional accessibility and sustainability.
• Transit alone does not change a station area
• Important to also have:
  o Community vision
  o Local initiatives
  o Market forces to amplify accessibility benefits
• Change is market driven and thus incremental
• Redevelopment has played a huge role historically
• Station Areas can become focal points for communities
• Consider equity from the beginning

Strengthening the connections between people, places, and services enhances BART’s value as a regional resource.

SVRT Community Working Groups
Lessons Learned from Phase I

Leyla Hedayat, VTA

Lessons Learned from Phase I

Community Working Groups
September 2016
Lessons Learned: Design and Planning

- Include “joint development” in environmental clearance (redevelopment of excess property; retail uses within station sites)
- Rigorous planning of utility relocations
- Avoid showing detailed architecture on project graphics until design is advanced
- Advance station designs ahead of community planning or specific plans by cities

Lessons Learned: Design and Planning

- Detailed agreements with cities or agencies in advance, defining non-transit improvements to be constructed by project and cost sharing terms
- Prepare a “road map” of the federal funding process tracking all deliverables required by FTA
- Attention to operating costs in advance, not just capital costs; ensure funding sources are adequate
- Property and right-of-way acquisitions must follow federal Uniform Relocation Act
Lessons Learned: Project Delivery
Design-Build

• Provides potential cost and time savings, but also involves challenges

• Bid documents need considerable detail for construction items to be owned by others (e.g., cities). Cannot simply require construction “to city standard” because this may be variable or unclear

• Third party plan reviews may result in change orders. Address this with careful contract language and/or advance agreements with the third parties

• Ensure RFP documents fully describe all project elements that really matter to the project. Design-Build contractor not obligated to provide more or better than what is stated in the documents.

Lessons Learned: Real Estate

• Assess appraisal resources early in process, considering need for consistency based on location, type of property, highest and best use, etc.

• Particularly if a design build project, communicate early and often with engineers to ensure acquiring actual need—not more and not less—and to ensure no changes in design affecting acquisition

• Work closely with environmental team to ensure language does not needlessly create issues for environmental clearance and real estate negotiations

• Consider time needed for FTA concurrences as part of schedule. Give FTA a “heads up.” They will work with you!
Lessons Learned: Outreach

• Involve Outreach early in project planning, design and engineering, become project knowledgeable

• Research and establish relationships with key stakeholders in advance of construction

• Consistently assign project outreach staff to work in specific communities

• Provide comprehensive requirements in construction documents for outreach support

Questions
Recap of June CWG Construction Outreach Poll Results

Brent Pearse, VTA
Community Engagement
CWG Polling Results

PREFERRED SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS FOR OUTREACH
- 14% (Nextdoor) DT San Jose
- 13% (Facebook) Alum Rock
- 13% (Facebook) Santa Clara

PREFERRED ONLINE OUTREACH FOR CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS
- 20% DT San Jose
- 31% Alum Rock
- 15% Santa Clara

Upcoming Community Outreach Efforts

► Environmental Draft Public Meetings – Winter 2017
► Access Planning Workshops – Winter 2017
► Construction Methodology Workshop – Spring 2017
► Board Approval – Spring 2017
Discussion

Eileen Goodwin, Facilitator

Next Steps

• Next meeting: Tuesday, November 15, 2016 ~ 4:00-6:00 PM,
  San Jose/SV Chamber of Commerce ~ BYOB
  – Diridon Station Options Update
  – Environmental Process (how to comment)
  – Diridon Area Planning & Associated Projects (City to present)
  – Design and aesthetics of the BART structures such as vents, exits, etc.
  – VTA Contracting (SBE/DBE outreach and local business outreach and goals)
  – CWG Next Steps, Recap of Election

• Parking Validation
• Action Items