VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension

Santa Clara Community Working Group

September 15, 2016

Agenda

• Follow-up Items and Work Plan
• City Related Project Update: City Place
• 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>Angela Sipp</td>
<td>Primary Outreach Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leyla Hedayat</td>
<td>Phase II Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Roecks</td>
<td>Technical Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Davidson</td>
<td>City of Santa Clara – Planning 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

Public meetings on specific technical topics - TBD
Follow-up Items

• None

Schedule Update

Leyla Hedayat, VTA
Schedule Update

- Circulate Draft SEIS/SEIR Document – December 2016*
- VTA Board Defines 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

Eileen Goodwin, Facilitator
City Related Project Update: City Place

John Davidson, City of Santa Clara

City Place

*land uses*
City Place TDM program
Transportation Demand Management

• Mitigation Measure includes:
  – A 10% peak hour office trip reduction target
  – A 5% peak hour residential trip reduction target
  – A palette of TDM options, including shuttles to transit
  – Annual monitoring
FTA Funding Process

Kevin Kurimoto, VTA

FTA Funding Process
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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

Individual Criteria Ratings
- Mobility improvements (16.66%)
- Environmental benefits (16.66%)
- Congestion relief (16.66%)
- Cost-effectiveness (16.66%)
- Economic development (16.66%)
- Land use (NS or SS) or capacity needs (CC) (16.66%)
- Current condition (25%)
- Commitment of funds (25%)
- Reliability/Capacity (25%)

Summary Ratings
- Project justification† (50% of Overall Rating)
  Must be at least "Medium" for project to get "Medium" or better Overall Rating
- Local financial commitment† (50% of Overall Rating)
  Must be at least "Medium" for project to get "Medium" or better Overall Rating

Overall Rating
- Overall Project 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
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

Agenda

Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

• Regional Accessibility

• Property Values

• TOD Project Examples

• Lessons Learned
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)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BART</th>
<th>Driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other considerations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BART SAVES COMMUTERS TIME**

- **Oakland**: Commuters save 7 miles per trip by using BART instead of driving
- **San Francisco**: Commuters save 30 min. per trip by using BART instead of driving

**Taking BART vs. Driving**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BART</th>
<th>Driving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BART Fare</strong></td>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gas, maintenance, oil changes, and depreciation</strong></td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BART Park and Ride Fee</strong></td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking and bridge tolls</strong></td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Cost</strong></td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>$9,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions**

- Commuter distance of 10 miles and 720 workdays per year (BART, parking $3/day, bridge $4/day round trip)
- 24 miles daily commute 5 days a week
- 5-year project
- 5% return on investment

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/
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BART @ 20 Studies (1995): Office Space

East Bay (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/

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 ecosystem

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Distance to Nearest BART Station</th>
<th>BART Proximity Premium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/4 mile</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/4 to 1/2 mile</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$65 million/year in added revenue
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Property Value Premiums - Condos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Distance to Nearest BART Station</th>
<th>BART Proximity Premium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within 1/2 mile</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 to 1 mile</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 miles</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 miles</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Transit-Oriented Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Castro Valley</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant Hill Ph I</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35,590</td>
<td>35,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashby</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin/Pleasant I</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL COMPLETED</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>107,000</td>
<td>81,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>MacArthur</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>42,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hayward Ph I</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>1,178</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLETED AND UNDER CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>117,000</td>
<td>125,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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
Fruitvale BART Paseo - After

Richmond BART
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

A Case Study of Holding a Longer Term Vision

Impact of Transit on Station Area Communities

Richmond BART

BART Planning, Development & Construction
Pleasant Hill / Contra Costa Centre BART Station

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
### 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:
  - Community vision
  - Local initiatives
  - 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.

---

**SVRT Community Working Groups**


Strengthening the connections between people, places, and services enhances BART’s value as a regional resource.
Lessons Learned from Phase I

Leyla Hedayat, VTA

Lessons Learned from Phase I
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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

Angela Sipp, VTA

**Community Engagement CWG Polling Results**

**MOST VALUED FUNCTION OF COMMUNITY OUTREACH**

- **Regular updates on projects**
  - 57%
  - DT San Jose: 56% - Somewhat effective; 22% - Very effective
  - Alum Rock: 73% - Somewhat effective; 27% - Very effective
  - Santa Clara: 27% - Somewhat effective; 73% - Very effective

- **Direct contact with representatives**
  - 53%
  - DT San Jose: 56% - Somewhat effective; 22% - Very effective
  - Alum Rock: 73% - Somewhat effective; 27% - Very effective
  - Santa Clara: 27% - Somewhat effective; 73% - Very effective
Community Engagement
CWG Polling Results

PREFERRED SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS FOR OUTREACH

- For DT San Jose
  - Nextdoor: 57%
  - Facebook: 14%

- For Alum Rock
  - Facebook: 53%
  - Nextdoor: 13%

- For Santa Clara
  - Facebook: 53%

PREFERRED ONLINE OUTREACH FOR CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

- For DT San Jose
  - Google Maps: 15%
  - Nextdoor: 31%

- For Alum Rock
  - Google Maps: 46%

- For Santa Clara
  - Google Maps: 31%

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: Thursday, November 17, 2016 ~ 4:00-6:00 PM,
  South Bay Historic Railroad Society ~ BYOB
  – Environmental process (how to comment)
  – Technology Integration in BART Phase I Design
  – VTA Contracting (SBE/DBE outreach and local business outreach and goals)
  – CWG Next Steps, Recap of Election
• Action Items