

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 10:40 AM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: VTA Correspondence: Support Letter for AB 2034 (Kalra)

VTA Board of Directors:

We are forwarding you the following:

From	Topic
VTA	Letter of Support for AB 2034 (Kalra)

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95134
408.321.5680
board.secretary@vta.org



Conserve paper. Think before you print.



March 14, 2018

The Honorable Mark Stone
Chairperson Assembly Judiciary Committee
State Capitol, Room 3146
Sacramento, CA 94249

Dear Chairperson Stone:

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) respectfully requests your support for AB 2034 (Kalra) when this bill comes before the Assembly Judiciary Committee for a vote. AB 2034 requires the Department of Justice to develop guidelines to assist employers providing mass transportation services in California in the development of training programs on how to recognize signs of human trafficking and how to report those signs to the appropriate law enforcement agencies. Training programs would be required to be in place by January 1, 2020 for all new and existing front-line employees and employees that may receive reports of suspected human trafficking.

In 2015, VTA was approached by the Santa Clara County Human Trafficking Commission about participating in an employer training effort geared toward creating employee awareness of human trafficking and providing workers with the skills to help them identify suspicious activity. Recognizing the important role that our front-line employees could play in preventing human trafficking, VTA agreed to partner with the County of Santa Clara's Office of Women's Policy to develop a training program and materials that would be appropriate for public transit workers. The resulting training was provided to more than 700 bus and light rail operators, maintenance workers, and other field personnel who would be most likely to observe suspicious human trafficking activity. The extensive roll out of the program included multiple training sessions per day at each of VTA's Operating Divisions. The sessions included an overview by the South Bay Coalition to End Human Trafficking and an educational video about human trafficking.

VTA has since incorporated the training and video into the orientation process for new employees and, to date more than 1,200 VTA front-line and new employees have received the training and the video has been made available to the entire workforce. In addition, VTA worked with the Santa Clara County Sheriff's Office to develop a protocol for our front-line employees to follow when they observe and report suspected human trafficking activity. VTA bus operator Tim Watson credited the training and protocol after he helped to prevent an attempted abduction in 2015.

AB 2034 is intended to develop guidelines for the implementation of training programs similar to ours that would equip employees with the definition of human trafficking, physical and mental

The Honorable Mark Stone
Support for AB 2034 (Kalra)
March 14, 2018
Page Two

signs that may indicate human trafficking, and guidance on how to report these signs. The Department of Justice would be required to consult with community-based anti-human trafficking organizations in the development of the guidelines, and the training programs may be provided by the same organizations.

It is estimated that human trafficking affects more than 20.9 million people worldwide. California is considered to be one of the top four destinations in the United States for human trafficking. In California, 72 percent of human trafficking victims, who are overwhelmingly women and children, are United States citizens. Often, the signs of human trafficking are in plain sight. Front-line employees of mass transportation providers, given the nature of their work, may come in contact with suspicious activity. With awareness training, they could be instrumental in recognizing, reporting and, thus, helping to combat incidents of human trafficking. For this reason, we respectfully seek your support for AB 2034.

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sam Liccardo". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "S" and a long, sweeping underline.

Sam Liccardo, Chairperson
Board of Directors
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 11:33 AM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: March 19, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Monday, March 19, 2018

1. [Highway 87 Survey \(NBC Bay Area\)](#)
2. [BART Billboard ads \(ABC 7 News\)](#)
3. [Anti-Immigrant Ads Aimed At Tech Workers Are Running On Public Transit \(Buzzfeed.com\)](#)
4. [San Jose Earthquakes hire charter service to replace VTA buses \(Silicon Valley Business Journal\)](#)
5. [High-speed rail denies it will opt for slow route between San Jose and Gilroy \(Silicon Valley Business Journal\)](#)
6. [Editorial: To ease traffic, the Bay Area should vote yes on Measure 3 \(San Francisco Chronicle\)](#)
7. [If Rail Passenger Service Is Such A Boondoggle, Why Are So Many Of California's Passenger Trains So Crowded? \(ntbraymer.com\)](#)
8. [A Bold, Divisive Plan to Wean Californians From Cars \(New York Times\)](#)

[Highway 87 Survey \(NBC Bay Area\)](#)

(link to video)

[BART Billboard ads \(ABC 7 News\)](#)

(link to video)

[Anti-Immigrant Ads Aimed At Tech Workers Are Running On Public Transit \(Buzzfeed.com\)](#)

A DC-based group called "Progressives For Immigration Reform" has posted ads across San Francisco that say a foreign-born tech workforce has made US workers seem "expensive, undeserving, and expendable."

An ad campaign against tech companies hiring foreign workers rolled out across San Francisco's public transit system Thursday.

The campaign was paid for by Progressives for Immigration Reform, a DC-based group [designated as "anti-immigrant"](#) by the Southern Poverty Law Center (a civil rights nonprofit) in [2010](#).

The ads say cheap foreign labor has made US tech workers seem "expensive, undeserving, and expendable." They advocate for laws requiring tech companies to hire US workers instead.

Kevin Lynn, executive director at Progressives for Immigration Reform, said the campaign is about protecting US jobs. "The idea is to make immigration work for the citizens as a whole," said Lynn, whose mother immigrated to the US from Ireland in 1952. "That's what we've done for a long time, but it's not doing that now."

The campaign cost \$80,000, according to a spokesperson for the Bay Area Rapid Transit system (BART) where the ads were posted. The ads will run in stations and on trains for about one month, from March to April. Lynn declined to disclose the source of PFIR's funding, but said it "comes from foundations that support our views on immigration."

The campaign is part of a larger US Tech Workers campaign by the group, which, according to its [website](#), is trying to unite US-born tech workers against the [three-quarters](#) of tech workers in Silicon Valley who were born outside the country.

"Americans now fill only 29% of the tech jobs in San Jose, the cradle of Silicon Valley. Despite the demand for science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) workers, wages have been flat for years," the website reads. "We believe for this generation entering the workforce, and for future generations to prosper, U.S. tech companies must seek and hire U.S. tech workers first."

Because of the First Amendment, BART can't remove the ads.

"It is important for our riders to know the ads contradict our values," a transit spokesperson wrote via email. "As a transit system we can't deny the ads. They comply with guidelines allowing advertisers to express a point of view without regard to the viewpoint expressed, consistent with First Amendment freedom of speech court rulings."

The issue of how to regulate H-1B visas, which allow skilled workers from other countries to come to the US to work in tech jobs that can't be filled by Americans, is the subject of much debate.

On the one side, there are large tech companies which require a steady stream of coders and programmers to fill seats, and believe more immigration drives more innovation. [Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg's Fwd.us](#), a lobbying group focused on immigration reform, has been pushing its pro-immigration stance on the H-1B issue for five years.

On the other side are those who believe the influx of foreign-born workers is taking high-paying, skilled jobs away from Americans, and that the H-1B visa system enriches foreign companies that behave like labor farms.

"I don't see where innovation necessarily comes from diversity," Lynn said. "What it comes from is having an environment where you can hire your college graduates, put them into a good paying job, and allow them to innovate."

While [visa fraud does exist](#), concern about opportunities for US workers has tipped over into [xenophobia](#) in the past.

During his campaign, Donald Trump said he would [do away with the skilled worker visa program](#) entirely. He later scaled back those claims, but [tweaks](#) to the program under Trump's [Buy American, Hire American](#) policy have made it [harder to attain](#) the visas.

Tech companies have widely opposed the president's other attempts at immigration reform, with [Facebook, Apple, Google, and others supporting DACA](#), and [Apple, Google, Uber, and Tesla opposing the temporary ban on the US refugee program](#).

Multiple proposals for [reforming the H-1B visa program](#) are currently before Congress. Lynn said regulation should get rid of the lower two tiers of H-1B visas, or "almost 95% of the program."

In response to new ["anti-immigration policies,"](#) San Francisco's BART took a strong stance on immigration issues. Its board of directors passed a [safe transit policy](#) in June 2017, which [banned federal agents](#) from questioning riders, and stated its "commitment to stand together with the people of the Bay Area in opposing hate, violence, and acts of intolerance committed against our riding community and employees."

"We're in the Bay Area to stay," said Lynn. "We'll work in other tech centers across the United States. Our goal is to inform workers of what they need to do to bring pressure to their electeds to change this system that I think has run amok."

[Back to Top](#)

[San Jose Earthquakes hire charter service to replace VTA buses](#) (Silicon Valley Business Journal)

The San Jose Earthquakes have replaced the free bus service once provided to their stadium by the Valley Transportation Authority with a private charter service.

Lux Bus America, which is based in San Jose and Anaheim, will run two buses in a loop before and after games from the corner of St. John and Market streets downtown near San Pedro Square to Avaya Stadium on Coleman Avenue, the team announced.

The team's next home match is March 31 against New York City FC.

VTA provided a special service for the Quakes along Coleman from downtown, for which fans paid a fare. [As a result of a policy change enacted by VTA last summer](#), the transportation agency said it would begin charging for that line plus special services also offered to San Jose Sharks and San Francisco 49ers games.

For the Earthquakes the service this season would have cost the team about \$233,000.

The Quakes and San Jose Sharks opted out and their VTA service, beyond what is offered on regular bus and light rail runs, has been dropped.

Fans using Lux Bus Team can ride free, said team spokesman Jake Pisani. He declined to give cost figures for Lux Bus but said, "It is cheaper."

[Back to Top](#)

[High-speed rail denies it will opt for slow route between San Jose and Gilroy](#) (Silicon Valley Business Journal)

California high-speed rail's chief of rail operations on Friday denied a [report in the Los Angeles Times](#) that the California project has chosen a slower, cheaper alternative for its San Jose-Gilroy alignment.

"That is not an accurate statement," said [Frank Vacca](#), who was also quoted by the newspaper. "It's misleading in that (it says) that's the only alternative or that it's been selected. This alignment has been added as an alternative. It's been looked at and studied."

In describing the cost range for building the 40 miles railroad between the two cities, one of the 2018 draft business plan's supporting documents called "[Capital Cost Basis of Estimate Report](#)" describes a mostly at-grade alignment alongside the Union Pacific track used by Caltrain and requiring 32 grade crossings.

High-speed rail spokeswoman [Annie Parker](#) acknowledged that people might infer that alignment was the chosen or preferred alignment. But she said it was used as an example as part of the high-speed rail authority's new practice, announced in the business plan, of giving a range of cost estimates for every construction segment instead of one figure.

“For each of the project sections, we picked a representative alignment, then evaluated a series of risks and alternatives that produced a range of construction costs,” she said. The cost of the San Jose-Gilroy alignment in the supporting document “is on the lower end, but it was not the lowest and not the highest. It was used for the purpose of the cost estimate basis only.”

Vacca said the slower speed alignment was added to the environmental review process in recent months because “it certainly provides significant cost reduction in construction. Two, it has environmental benefits in that we will have minimal private property acquisition, we will have minimal impact to the adjoining towns and that it’s still on an existing rail corridor.”

[Dan Richard](#), board chair of the project, has said several times that he wants to get some part of the project up and running as quickly as possible in the belief it would sway public opinion on the project's value. High-speed rail's [new CEO, Brian Kelly, said last week](#) that he hopes high-speed trains could run between San Francisco and Gilroy even before service is connected to the San Joaquin Valley.

Asked if the at-grade option between San Jose and Gilroy was highlighted in the documents to achieve that, Vacca said, "Our goal has been, and will continue to be, to get high-speed rail operating as quickly as we can, as economically as we can so that Californians can benefit from this program. Absolutely."

But the other alternatives including an at-grade option that would eliminate grade crossings — either by closing some or providing grade separation with an overpass for the railroad or road — or with significant viaduct sections are still alignment possibilities, he said.

“There aren’t any alignments that have been eliminated,” he said. “We’re going to carry forward several options between Gilroy and San Jose. The alternatives will go through the comment period and go through the environmental process. And when they’re ready they’ll go to our board for them to select the preferred alternative.”

In public meetings on alignment possibilities covered by the Silicon Valley Business Journal, every alignment has received considerable negative comment.

The objections to an at-grade option adjacent to the Union Pacific right-of-way have been focused on how such a routing could divide small downtowns in Morgan Hill and San Martin.

The addition of grade crossings would require a significant speed reduction under Federal Railroad Administration rules.

Vacca said the option referred to by the L.A. Times would limit top speeds to 110 miles per hour. With additional grade crossing safety protection, the FRA allows up to 125-mile-per-hour operation through grade crossings. Speeds above that requires grade separation.

Despite showing alignment options with design speeds up to 220 miles per hour at public meetings for some places between San Jose and Gilroy, Vacca said that doesn’t mean trains necessarily would operate that fast on elevated segments.

The highest speed, even on a dedicated elevated structure, "would be in the 150-180 mph band" between San Jose and Gilroy, he said. "If a small section is designed for 200 mph, when you actually operate the train, they may not be able to reach that speed because of acceleration or deceleration. A separate section may be designed for 200 mph but because of the operating characteristics of the train, it may only reach 155 or 180 before you have to put the brakes on for the next curve. We take that all into account when we talk about trip time. We take that all into account when we talk about trip time."

[Back to Top](#)

[Editorial: To ease traffic, the Bay Area should vote yes on Measure 3 \(San Francisco Chronicle\)](#)

The Bay Bridge Toll Plaza. Under Regional Measure 3, tolls will increase on the Bay Area's bridges by a total of \$3 over the next seven years. The funds will go to a wide variety of regional road and transit projects, including ferries, the BART extension, and improvements to 680. Photo: Santiago Mejia, The Chronicle

Photo: Santiago Mejia, The Chronicle

The Bay Bridge Toll Plaza. Under Regional Measure 3, tolls will increase on the Bay Area's bridges by a total of \$3 over the next seven years. The funds will go to a wide variety of regional road and transit projects, including ferries, the BART extension, and improvements to 680.

The Bay Area has outgrown its regional transportation options.

Everyone who commutes in the Bay Area — whether it's by car, by rail or by bus — can agree on this point. Aside from housing, the Bay Area's deteriorating transportation infrastructure is our top regional challenge, and it's affecting everything from our quality of life to our economic growth.

That's why a long list of elected officials, business groups and regional transportation organizations have come together to push Regional Measure 3. The measure, which will be on the June ballot in nine Bay Area counties, will authorize toll increases on the region's seven state-owned bridges. (The Golden Gate Bridge, with its separate authority, is excluded.)

Current tolls will increase by \$1 on Jan. 1, 2019, then by another \$1 in 2022 and 2025. That will bring tolls to \$8 on every bridge except the Bay Bridge, where the toll will be \$9 during peak commute times.

Toll increases are never easy to swallow. But it's impossible to argue with the needs the measure has specifically identified for the resulting \$4.45 billion in funding.

The North Bay will benefit from improvements to the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge, to state Highways 29 and 37, to U.S. Highway 101 and to Sonoma-Marín Area Rail Transit (SMART) service.

San Francisco can look forward to a downtown extension for Caltrain, upgrades to the Clipper card system and a badly needed expansion of the Muni fleet.

Weary East Bay commuters will see relief from improvements to Interstates 80, 680 and 880, as well as some of the region's more notorious snarls, where I-680 meets Highways 4 and 84.

On the Peninsula and in the South Bay, this money will go toward the second phase of the necessary BART extension to San Jose. It'll also help connect the east side of San Jose to BART via a regional connector. Road improvements include the Dumbarton corridor and the Highway 101/92 interchange.

"Over the past two generations, we've barely added any capacity to regional transit," said Gabriel Metcalf, president of SPUR, an urban planning think tank. "This is a very practical next step when it comes to our regional transit needs."

The project list, which was developed by staff members at regional transit organizations, leans heavily toward improving the region's mass transit options.

There are excellent reasons for this — the Bay Area can't drive its way out of traffic congestion, and mass transit remains the most efficient way to move the most people.

Mass transit is also very expensive to build and to operate. Passing this regional measure could make the Bay Area more competitive in battles for state and federal matching funds.

Most bridge commuters can afford these toll increases. (The Bay Area's toll payers tend to have higher incomes than the overall population.) For those who have lower incomes, they'll continue to receive price reductions for carpooling, and the measure includes a discount for anyone who regularly commutes over two toll bridges.

Low-income transit commuters could actually benefit from the measure. The Clipper card upgrades will allow the Bay Area's transit authorities to coordinate income-based fare discounts.

The measure doesn't currently face any organized opposition. It also enjoys the approval of a solid majority of voters in the nine counties.

Those impressive feats are testament to how deeply the Bay Area is affected by traffic congestion, and how necessary many of these projects are.

Regional Measure 3 can't and won't fix all of the Bay Area's traffic and infrastructure problems. For that, we'll need state and federal support.

But that's been too long in coming, and it's past time for the Bay Area to make the improvements we can make on our own.

Measure 3 will result in real, measurable improvements to regional commutes, and that's more than enough reason for the voters to say yes.

[Back to Top](#)

[If Rail Passenger Service Is Such A Boondoggle, Why Are So Many Of California's Passenger Trains So Crowded? \(ntbraymer.com\)](#)

A good example of this is around the Bay Area. Ridership growth on BART took off shortly after the Loma Prieta earthquake on October 17, 1989. With the earthquake came the collapse of a part of the Bay Bridge and of a viaduct for the I-880 freeway in Oakland. BART wasn't running on the night of October 17th because electrical power needed to run its trains was shut off for most of the Bay Area because of the earthquake. By the morning of the 18th, the BART system was checked and no major damage was found. As soon as power was restored, BART was running again. But for months the Bay Bridge was out of service. Soon ridership on BART jumped because of the shut down of the Bay Bridge. But even after the Bay Bridge was reopened ridership continued to grow on BART.

With Caltrain, it was one of the few forms of transportation working the night of October 17, 1989. One problem was the safes that held ticket stock for Caltrain had electric locks. Without power the safes couldn't be opened so there were no tickets that could be sold. But the decision was made to forgo charging passengers that night and many people rode Caltrain that night with no other options available. Between BART and Caltrain, ridership has continued to grow and with that the problems of overcrowding on its trains. Of course the freeways in the Bay Area are also often jammed. The Bay Area also has a problem most regions would love to have. The economic engine of the Silicon Valley centered around the city of Palo Alto has created so many jobs, that it is difficult for its employees to find decent, affordable housing and makes commuting challenging. Not only are Caltrain and BART often jammed in the Bay Area. Ridership is often heavy on the Altamont Corridor Express, a commuter rail service between San Jose and Stockton. As for San Francisco's Muni, crowding is common on its Muni Metro trains and city buses.

But crowded trains are to be found elsewhere in California. The Capitol Corridor trains between San Jose and Sacramento often have full trains. So does the San Joaquin and Pacific Surfliner Amtrak trains. These trains are usually crowded on weekends and during major holidays. More equipment is needed for these services to meet demand and bring in more revenue. Holding back these improvements is lack of funding for track improvements and more equipment. In Southern California rail transit is generally doing well. The extension of the Purple Line in Los Angeles 9 miles to Westwood will cost \$7.9 billion dollars. Finished by 2028 for the busiest transportation corridor in Los Angeles this extension is expected to increase Red/Purple Lines

daily ridership to over 300,000 passengers a day. The Light Rail Lines are doing well with ridership much higher now on the recently expanded Expo and Gold Lines. With some Los Angeles County sales tax revenue dedicated to transportation spending, several other projects are also under construction or will be in the near future. Where ridership is declining is on the local bus lines. But traffic is getting so bad, the buses are often late and with it its passenger arriving late for work. This doesn't have to be. In downtown Seattle the number of jobs has grown recently. But fewer people are driving to work. Instead more people are using improved public transportation.

So who are these people who love to call rail passenger service a boondoggle? The same people who's solution to every problem is cutting taxes. So how has that worked? Federal Income Taxes hit their lowest rates in the late 1920's as did Federal spending. At the same time there was a major speculative bubble at the New York Stock Exchange. With lending institutions willing to finance people to buy stocks, many people who knew nothing about the stock market bought stock on credit as prices rose and they dreamed of their seemingly growing wealth. Speculative bubbles are nothing new and even smart people can get caught up in them. Most people who know who Sir Issac Newton was would agree that he was a very smart scientist. In 1720 there was a financial bubble based on the stock of the South Sea Company of England. Newton bought its stock when it was cheap and watched its price rise. Finally when he thought the stock had peaked, he sold it making a fortune. But seeing the stock price of the South Sea Company continue to rise he put his money back into that stock. Soon there after the price of the stock crashed and Newton lost a fortune.

Well much the same thing happened in 1929 after the market crashed which set off the Great Depression, not just for the United States but also for much of the world. With the coming of World War 2, taxes and government spending in the United States reached record highs. Even after the war, the post War economy set record levels of economic growth up to the early 1970's even with these high taxes. And generally they stayed that way until the 1980 election of Ronald Reagan. Based on the work of Economist Arthur Laffer, the assumption was that lowering taxes would cause companies and wealthy people to invest in expanding old and starting new businesses which would stimulate the economy and create more revenue for the Government than with higher taxes. One of the first acts of President Reagan was to push through a major tax cut. In 1981 and 82 the country went into the worst post World War 2 recession only being surpassed later in 2007 which was also preceded by Federal Tax cuts which did little to stimulate the economy during the George W. Bush administration. The Reagan administration was forced to raise some taxes. There was steady economic growth after 1983 along with record breaking Federal deficits. In the 1992 elections a major issue was the recession of 1991 during the administration of George H. W. Bush which was a factor in the election that year of Bill Clinton. Clinton raise income taxes, created a budget surplus and paid down some of the National debt and left office with one of the lowest national unemployment rates since the 1960's

California's Governor Brown gets a great deal of criticism from outside of California for raising taxes. But he has turned the State's massive budget deficit into a major surplus which he guards for use during the next recession which is likely not a question of if but when. Over the last 6 years California has enjoyed record economic growth with higher taxes. California's biggest problems are transportation and the high cost of housing. Californians in urban areas have voted several times to increase local taxes for things that they want like improved transportation including rail service. Since the National elections of 2016 many campaign promises have been broken. What most voters want from any party is job security, social security for old age or disability, affordable housing, affordable health care and good transportation. Since 2016 most of the special elections to date have been lost by the party which passed the recent major tax cut, but have not addressed the other more pressing concerns of the voters.

[Back to Top](#)

[A Bold, Divisive Plan to Wean Californians From Cars](#) (New York Times)

Legislation would allow more home building along transit routes to reduce gas-guzzling commutes. Some who support the goal have denounced the method.

It's an audacious proposal to get Californians out of their cars: [a bill](#) in the State Legislature that would allow eight-story buildings near major transit stops, even if local communities object.

The idea is to foster taller, more compact residential neighborhoods that wean people from long, gas-guzzling commutes, reducing greenhouse-gas emissions.

So it was surprising to see the Sierra Club among the bill's opponents, since its [policy proposals](#) call for communities to be "revitalized or retrofitted" to achieve precisely those environmental goals. The California chapter [described the bill](#) as "heavy-handed," saying it could cause a backlash against public transit and lead to the displacement of low-income residents from existing housing.

State Senator Scott Wiener, the bill's sponsor, responded by accusing the group of "advocating for low-density sprawl."

Orinda is half an hour east of San Francisco by rail. A patchwork of local zoning regulations makes it difficult to change housing policy on a wide scale. Credit Jim Wilson/The New York Times

In a state where debates often involve shades of blue, it's not uncommon for the like-minded to find themselves at odds. But the tensions over Mr. Wiener's proposal point to a wider divide in the fight against climate change, specifically how far the law should go to reshape urban lifestyles.

Although many cities and states are embracing cleaner sources of electricity and encouraging people to buy electric vehicles, they are having a harder time getting Americans to drive less, something that may be just as important.

Transportation [accounts for one-third of the nation's carbon-dioxide emissions](#) and recently surpassed power plants as its largest contributor to global warming. Even as stricter federal standards push cars to become more fuel efficient, the gains have been steadily offset as Americans drive more.

“We can have all the electric vehicles and solar panels in the world, but we won’t meet our climate goals without making it easier for people to live near where they work, and live near transit and drive less,” Mr. Wiener said.

Downtown Orinda, within blocks of a transit station. A study found that denser residential building around transit hubs or in central cities could help cut vehicle travel 20 to 40 percent. Credit: Jim Wilson/The New York Times

[Study](#) after [study](#) has found that people living in compact cities have a smaller carbon footprint than those in sprawling cities or suburban areas. This is partly because they often live in apartments that require less energy to heat and cool than large single-family homes, but also because they commute shorter distances and are more likely to walk or take public transit.

Residents of dense, transit-friendly San Francisco emit an average of just 6.7 tons of carbon dioxide per year, according to [a 2015 report](#) from the University of California, Los Angeles. By contrast, the average in the broader Bay Area is 14.6 tons, in part because people drive farther to work.

This is true nationwide, too: The [Urban Land Institute concluded](#) that policies to promote compact growth — such as building taller apartments around transit centers or adding more housing downtown — could help cut vehicle travel 20 to 40 percent.

Most environmental groups see such policies as an important tool, but they are often deeply contentious, even in liberal California. Unlike measures to add wind and solar power to the electric grid, land-use provisions involve wholesale transformations of neighborhoods where people have lived for decades, making the politics of change much more difficult and toxic.

Bay Area Rapid Transit passengers in Oakland. “We won’t meet our climate goals without making it easier for people to live near where they work, and live near transit and drive less,” State Senator Scott Wiener said. Credit: Jim Wilson/The New York Times

What’s more, zoning codes are governed by tens of thousands of municipalities nationwide, making the levers of change more diffuse than they are for regulating cars or electric utilities.

“Land use gets very complicated very quickly — you need to tailor different strategies to each individual community,” said Koben Calhoun, a manager at the Rocky Mountain Institute, a

nonprofit group that is helping cities track their progress on climate change. “It’s harder to distill into a simple message.”

In the past, researchers studying public opinion have found that, [as one survey from 2000](#) put it, Americans will support action on climate change “as long as these initiatives do not demand a significant alteration of lifestyle,” such as driving less.

But Mr. Wiener and others are betting that this attitude is shifting, particularly among young people. His recent bill would pre-empt local zoning rules and allow developers to build apartment buildings up to 85 feet tall within a half-mile of train stations and a quarter-mile of high-frequency bus stops.

The MacArthur Commons development, adjacent to an Oakland transit station, will create almost 400 units of housing. CreditJim Wilson/The New York Times

The law applies only to parcels already zoned for residential use, and city rules like historic-building protections and affordable-housing requirements would still apply. But localities would be prevented from restricting such areas to single-family homes.

In Mr. Wiener’s view, local activists and homeowners [too often use zoning codes to prevent apartments from being built](#) in California’s cities, a dynamic that has worsened the state’s housing shortage.

Michael Brune, the executive director of the Sierra Club’s national organization, said Mr. Wiener’s bill went too far in overriding residents’ say over neighborhood development.

“We are hopeful that this legislation could be designed in such a way that is successful at increasing urban infill but does it in a way that doesn’t eliminate local voices,” Mr. Brune said. “It can be challenging to get this right.”

A neighborhood of small homes near the Rockridge station in Oakland is within an area where taller construction would be permitted under Senator Wiener’s bill. CreditJim Wilson/The New York Times

In California, the fight over denser development has been complicated by the state’s housing crisis. About a third of the state’s six million renters pay more than half of their monthly income on rent, according to census figures. Homelessness is rising throughout the state, and about one in five residents in the state lives in poverty once housing costs are factored in — the highest poverty rate in the nation.

Mr. Wiener, who has pushed for various housing bills in both the State Senate and in his previous job on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, said his bill would help reduce housing costs by speeding up construction and alleviating a housing shortage that has plagued the state for decades. High housing costs are also a culprit behind the state’s [longer commutes](#). In the Bay Area, about 5 percent of commuters spend more than 90 minutes traveling to work,

compared with 3 percent nationwide, [according to an analysis](#) of census data by the Brookings Institution.

But lower- and even middle-income residents fear being evicted or priced out of their neighborhoods, making them resist development. Some of Mr. Wiener's most vocal opposition has come from anti-gentrification and tenants' rights groups that see his plan as a socioeconomic makeover backed by the real estate industry. Mr. Wiener said late last month that he was [amending the bill](#) to add provisions to restrict demolition and tenant displacement. Hearings are expected in the coming weeks.

In part because of the vexed politics, states have often taken a lighter approach to promoting density, using carrots rather than sticks. In the Northeast, at least six states — Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Maine, New Jersey and New York — [have adopted goals](#) of sharply slowing the growth in vehicle miles traveled in the coming decades. Their plans typically envision financial incentives for revitalizing downtown areas and encouraging greater density.

California tried an incentive approach to density with [the Sustainable Communities Act](#), a sweeping bill passed in 2008. But some experts say it did not go nearly far enough to change the state's urban sprawl or car culture.

California has made impressive strides in solar and wind power and its push for electric vehicles. But the combination of high housing costs and rising commute times threatens to keep the state from achieving its ambitious target [of cutting emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030](#).

Last year, the California Air Resources Board [estimated that meeting those goals](#) would require a 7 percent cut in vehicle miles traveled by 2030, compared with levels that the agency projects would otherwise be reached under current policy. That would be 1.5 fewer miles per day for the average person.

"Land use is so fundamental to everything," said Ethan Elkind, director of the climate program at the Center for Law, Energy and the Environment at the University of California, Berkeley. "And it's one of the areas where California is lagging."

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Tuesday, March 20, 2018 2:06 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: March 20, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Tuesday, March 20, 2018

1. [Earthquakes Shuttle Buses \(KTVU CH. 2\)](#)
2. [Roadshow: This Highway 85 interchange is a merging mess \(Mercury News\)](#)
3. [Mercury News editorial: Regional Measure 3 will ease Bay Area commutes \(Mercury News\)](#)
4. [Supervisors approve placing measure to raise bridge tolls on ballot \(The AlmanacNews.com\)](#)
5. [Pedestrian's death in Arizona casts pall on testing of self-driving cars \(Silicon Valley Business Journal\)](#)

[Earthquakes Shuttle Buses \(KTVU CH. 2\)](#)

(Link to video)

[Back to Top](#)

[Roadshow: This Highway 85 interchange is a merging mess \(Mercury News\)](#)

Are there plans to update the Highway 85 interchanges at El Camino Real and Highway 237? This area can come to a complete stop as 85 drivers merge right to get onto 237 while within 100 feet or so El Camino drivers merge onto 85.

I would think this would be hugely expensive; there may be no easy fix. They'd have to do something like they did for 17-85; put in a tunnel before the bridge to divert around that interchange. This would probably put the price tag in the \$50-100 million range.

Mark Dawson
Campbell

Like Mr. Roadshow's [Facebook page](#) for more questions and answers about Bay Area roads, freeways and commuting.

A: Oh, that might be about right. Rebuilding these interchanges is on the list of projects to be funded by the Measure B sales tax approved in 2016. However that tax is tied up in court and a decision on its validity may not come until the end of the year.

Q: Is there any plan to upgrade the connection from Highway 237 to Highway 101? It is narrow with poor visibility.

Vladimir Ivan

Mountain View

A: No major upgrade is planned. The VTA looked at changes, but said there were too many expensive challenges related to the Moffett Field flight path.

Q: Mr. Road Guy. Help me win a bet. With all this talk about allowing traffic to drive on freeway shoulders, my friend claims that one time cars were allowed to drive on the shoulders on 237. I say he must have been smoking some funny stuff. We have a pizza riding on this.

Bill Ramirez

Santa Clara

A: You lose. When 237 was a four-lane city street with traffic lights, drivers were permitted to use the shoulder during commute times. That ended when the traffic lights were removed and 237 was converted into a six-lane freeway in the early 1990s.

Q: I was troubled to read about a driver in a new Honda zipping down Interstate 880 with her headlights off. My not-at-all-new 2005 Corolla has a little electric "eye" that looks out of the windshield and turns the lights on automatically in low light if the driver does not. I'm amazed all modern cars don't have this safety feature.

Lisa Hatt

Sunnyvale

A: Me, too. More auto companies should offer this feature.

Q: One of my colleagues mused: "Before the time change, the meter from Interstate 280 to 85 was always on when I was driving to work. Last week it wasn't on, even though I'm driving at the same time. Do the meters not understand daylight savings time?"

Kevin Vermilion

San Jose

A: The ramp meter controller changes the time automatically. Most likely there were other issues, like loss of power. Caltrans will take care of it.

[Back to Top](#)

[Mercury News editorial: Regional Measure 3 will ease Bay Area commutes](#)

(Mercury News)

It's imperative that voters OK BART, Caltrain and highway projects for the benefit of all

Bay Area congestion is unbearable. Opportunities to make improvements for the entire region are rare. It's imperative that voters in the nine Bay Area counties support [Regional Measure 3](#) on June 5 to build transportation infrastructure for the benefit of all.

RM3 authorizes toll increases on seven state-owned Bay Area bridges, raising an estimated \$4.45 billion over 25 years for transit projects, highway improvements and better bicycle and pedestrian access. No better option exists to make this level of impact on what is the Bay Area's highest priority. A simple majority vote is needed for RM3 to pass.

The ballot measure isn't perfect. Increasing bridge tolls by \$1 in 2019 and again in 2022 and 2025 will create hardships for drivers using them on a regular basis. Those commuters benefited directly in past regional transportation measures. All commuters — including those who pay tolls regularly — will gain if more people take transit, unclogging bridges and highways.

The South Bay has much to gain by passing RM3. It raises \$375 million to bring BART to downtown San Jose, which is absolutely essential for keeping the region's economy strong. Twenty-five years ago, no one would have believed that what was once a quaint little station would be capable of accommodating 600 trains a day by 2026. The project will make it possible for San Francisco and East Bay residents to commute to San Jose in roughly an hour, or less. And — here's the important part — without getting in their cars and clogging freeways. Or paying a parking fee upon arrival.

RM3's transit projects also include \$130 million to extend the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority's light rail from the Alum Rock station to the Eastridge Transit Station, \$500 million for badly needed new BART cars, and \$325 million to extend Caltrain from its current terminus at Fourth Street and King Street to the Transbay Transit Center in San Francisco.

The South Bay will benefit from \$280 million worth of highway improvements, including the Dumbarton corridor (\$130 million), Highway 92/Highway 101 interchange (\$50 million), Interstate 680/State Route 84 interchange reconstruction (\$85 million) and an Interstate 680/Interstate 880/State Route 262 freeway connector (\$15 million).

All told, \$985 million in funding will go specifically toward South Bay projects.

The ballot measure contains significant weaknesses. RM3 has no sunset provision, although it's hard to believe there won't be funding needs 25 years from now. RM3 creates an 18-member

oversight committee, but it would permit BART's board to nominate the person who would be the required inspector general. That's less than ideal, given that BART's board has a history of broken promises. But consider the benefits from Regional Measure 1 in 1989 and Regional Measure 2 in 2004. Those ballot measures helped fund the new Benicia Bridge, the Carquinez Bridge replacement, BART to Warm Springs, the widening of the San Mateo Bridge and more than a dozen other worthwhile projects.

Over the long haul, RM3 will carry equal or greater benefits. Vote yes on June 5.

[Back to Top](#)

[Supervisors approve placing measure to raise bridge tolls on ballot](#) (The AlmanacNews.com)

The San Mateo County Board of Supervisors on Feb. 27 authorized placing a measure on the June 5 ballot asking voters countywide to weigh in on Regional Measure 3.

The measure will be before voters in all nine Bay Area counties, asking them to approve toll increases on major Bay Area bridges to fund improvements for regional traffic problems.

To pass, the measure requires a simple majority of the total vote from all nine counties, Metropolitan Transportation Commission spokesman John Goodwin said.

The vote on the San Mateo County board to authorize the ballot measure was 4-0, with Supervisor Dave Pine absent, county spokeswoman Michelle Durand said.

If Bay Area voters approve the measure, tolls would rise by \$1 in January 2019, another \$1 in January 2022 and another in January 2025 for the seven bridges owned and operated by the Bay Area Toll Authority, including the Dumbarton and San Mateo-Hayward bridges. Each \$1 increase would add about \$125 million to the MTC's coffers per year, assuming current traffic volume, commission documents say.

Tolls for the Golden Gate Bridge would not be affected, as that bridge is not overseen by the Bay Area Toll Authority.

The funding, the commission says, would pay for "urgently needed transportation improvements" including new rail cars for the Bay Area Rapid Transit system; extending BART to Silicon Valley; extending Caltrain into downtown San Francisco; increasing ferry service; and improving North Bay freeways and interchanges.

Drivers in carpools would continue to receive discounts of 50 percent during peak weekday commute hours. FasTrak users who cross two bridges during commute hours would receive a 50 percent discount on the dollar added to the toll by this measure, but only for the second bridge crossed in one day.

"Transportation is an issue of enormous concern and a very high priority for folks all around the Bay Area," Mr. Goodwin said. "That's true today, that was true a generation ago and I reckon it will be true a generation from now.

"There is no question that the last five, six or seven years of economic growth in the Bay Area, and the expansion of jobs, has really crystallized how urgent our transportation needs are," he said.

Another tax

San Mateo County voters are likely to see another transportation tax measure on the November ballot: a bid to raise the sales tax by a half-cent.

This 30-year tax, the third half-cent sales tax for transportation in the county, would fund improvements in public transit, local streets and roads, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and high-tech transportation systems.

In the other direction, a statewide initiative in a signature-gathering phase for the November election aims to repeal Senate Bill 1 of 2017 meant to fund repairs and improvements to local roads, state highways, and public transportation.

Supervisor Warren Slocum, who represents the county at the transportation commission, said in a statement: "This year is a once-in-a-generation opportunity to define our transportation future for decades to come. Passage of the first two measures and rejection of the SB1 repeal would allow us to move forward with a significant local and regional plan" to reduce congestion on U.S. 101, increase ridership on Caltrain and connect major rail networks serving the Bay Area and beyond.

[Back to Top](#)

[Pedestrian's death in Arizona casts pall on testing of self-driving cars](#) (Silicon Valley Business Journal)

This story is available as a result of a content partnership with The New York Times. Subscribers will see stories like this every day on our website (and in our daily emails) as an added value to your subscription.

SAN FRANCISCO — Arizona officials saw opportunity when Uber and other companies began testing driverless cars a few years ago. Promising to keep oversight light, they invited the companies to test their robotic vehicles on the state's roads.

Then on Sunday night, an autonomous car operated by Uber — and with an emergency backup driver behind the wheel — struck and killed a woman on a street in Tempe, Arizona. It was believed to be the first pedestrian death associated with self-driving technology. The company quickly suspended testing in Tempe as well as in Pittsburgh, San Francisco and Toronto.

The accident was a reminder that self-driving technology is still in the experimental stage, and governments are still trying to figure out how to regulate it.

Uber, Waymo and a long list of tech companies and automakers have begun to expand testing of their self-driving vehicles in cities around the country. The companies say the cars will be safer than regular cars simply because they take easily distracted humans out of the driving equation. But the technology is still only about a decade old, and just now starting to experience the unpredictable situations that drivers can face.

It was not yet clear if the crash in Arizona will lead other companies or state regulators to slow the rollout of self-driving vehicles on public roads.

Much of the testing of autonomous cars has taken place in a piecemeal regulatory environment. Some states, like Arizona, have taken a lenient approach to regulation. Arizona officials wanted to lure companies working on self-driving technology out of neighboring California, where regulators had been less receptive.

But regulators in California and elsewhere have become more accommodating lately. In April, California is expected to follow Arizona's lead and allow companies to test cars without a person in the driver's seat.

Federal policymakers have also considered a lighter touch. A Senate bill, if passed, would free autonomous-car makers from some existing safety standards and pre-empt states from creating their own vehicle safety laws. Similar legislation has been passed in the House. The Senate version has passed a committee vote but has not reached a full floor vote.

"This tragic incident makes clear that autonomous vehicle technology has a long way to go before it is truly safe for the passengers, pedestrians, and drivers who share America's roads," said Sen. Richard Blumenthal, D-Conn.

The Uber car, a Volvo XC90 SUV outfitted with the company's sensing system, was in autonomous mode with a human safety driver at the wheel but carrying no passengers when it struck Elaine Herzberg, a 49-year-old woman, around 10 p.m. Sunday.

Sgt. Ronald Elcock, a Tempe police spokesman, said during a news conference that a preliminary investigation showed that the vehicle was moving around 40 mph when it struck Herzberg, who was walking with her bicycle on the street. He said it did not appear as if the car had slowed down before impact and that the Uber safety driver had shown no signs of impairment. The weather was clear and dry.

Uber said it would work with police.

"Our hearts go out to the victim's family," an Uber spokeswoman, Sarah Abboud, said in a statement. "We are fully cooperating with local authorities in their investigation of this incident."

Tempe, with its dry weather and wide roads, was considered an ideal place to test autonomous vehicles. In 2015, Arizona officials declared the state a regulation-free zone in order to attract testing operations from companies like Uber, Waymo and Lyft.

“We needed our message to Uber, Lyft and other entrepreneurs in Silicon Valley to be that Arizona was open to new ideas,” Doug Ducey, Arizona’s governor, said in an interview in June 2017.

Using an executive order, Ducey opened the state to testing of autonomous vehicles that had safety drivers at the wheel, ready to take over in an emergency. He updated that mandate earlier this month to allow testing of unmanned self-driving cars, noting that a “business-friendly and low regulatory environment” had helped the state’s economy.

Even when an Uber self-driving car and another vehicle collided in Tempe in March 2017, city police and Ducey said that extra safety regulations were not necessary; the other driver was at fault, not the self-driving vehicle.

But on Monday, Mark Mitchell, Tempe’s mayor, called Uber’s decision to suspend autonomous vehicle testing a “responsible step” and cautioned people from drawing conclusions prematurely. Daniel Scarpinato, a spokesman for Ducey, said the updated order from the governor “provides enhanced enforcement measures and clarity on responsibility in these accidents.”

In California, where testing without a backup driver was just weeks away from being permitted, Jessica Gonzalez, a spokeswoman for the state Department of Motor Vehicles, said officials were in the process of gathering more information about the Tempe crash. Waymo, Lyft and Cruise, an autonomous vehicle company owned by General Motors, did not respond to requests for comment.

In a news release, the National Transportation Safety Board said it was sending a team of four investigators to examine “the vehicle’s interaction with the environment, other vehicles and vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and bicyclists.”

Since late last year, Waymo, the self-driving car unit of Google’s parent company Alphabet, has been using cars without a human in the driver’s seat to pick up and drop off passengers in Arizona.

Most testing of driverless cars occurs with a safety driver in the front seat who is available to take over if something goes wrong. It can be challenging, however, to take control of a fast-moving vehicle.

California requires companies to report the number of instances when human drivers are forced to take over for the autonomous vehicle, called “disengagements.”

Between December 2016 and November 2017, Waymo’s self-driving cars drove about 350,000 miles and human drivers retook the wheel 63 times — an average of about 5,600 miles

between every disengagement. Uber has not been testing its self-driving cars long enough in California to be required to release its disengagement numbers.

Researchers working on autonomous technology have struggled with how to teach the systems to adjust for unpredictable human driving or behavior. Still, most researchers believe self-driving cars will ultimately be more safe than their human counterparts.

In 2016, 37,461 people died in traffic-related accidents in the United States, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. That amounts to 1.18 fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled in 2016.

Waymo, which has been testing autonomous vehicles on public roads since 2009 when it was Google's self-driving car project, has said its cars have driven more than 5 million miles while Uber's cars have covered 3 million miles.

In 2016, a man driving his Tesla using Autopilot, the car company's self-driving feature, died on a state highway in Florida when his car crashed into a tractor-trailer that was crossing the road. Federal regulators later ruled there were no defects in the system to cause the accident.

But the crash in Tempe will draw attention among the general public to self-driving cars, said Michael Bennett, an associate research professor at Arizona State University who has been looking into how people respond to driverless cars and artificial intelligence.

"We've imagined an event like this as a huge inflection point for the technology and the companies advocating for it," he said. "They're going to have to do a lot to prove that the technology is safe."

[© The New York Times \[2018\]. All Rights Reserved](#)

NYT and New York Times are trademarks of The New York Times.

Not to be redistributed, copied or modified in any way.

[Back to Top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 1:23 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors; VTA Advisory Committee Members
Subject: SR 87 Corridor study survey is now live

VTA Board of Directors and Advisory Committee Members:

Earlier this month staff informed you that the SR 87 survey is forthcoming. The survey is now available; please share the survey link with your constituents and network.

If you have any questions, please reply to this email.

Thank you.

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), in partnership with the City of San Jose, has initiated a study of State Route (SR) 87. Nine miles in length and serving as a connector between US-101 and SR 85, SR 87 is an important multi-modal corridor that experiences some of the worst congestion in Santa Clara County.

This study seeks to address existing concerns for SR 87 in advance of anticipated growth and land-use in the area. VTA will identify technology-based improvements and innovative solutions that will maximize use of existing infrastructure, focus on less capital-intensive operational applications, and rely on real time information to find “hidden” capacities along SR 87.

As part of this study, VTA is soliciting feedback from community members who travel along the SR 87 corridor. Please take our short survey and share with us your travel habits, thoughts, and opinions as they pertain to SR 87.

The survey should take no more than five minutes. Your input will help us better understand how this corridor is used now and the steps that can be taken to meet the needs of travelers moving forward.

To access the survey, please click: <https://form.jotform.com/jorge87/vta-sr-87-get-to-know-you>

For more information about the study, including fact sheet, please visit: <http://www.vta.org/projects-and-programs/highway/sr-87-corridor-study>.

Board Secretary's Office
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building B
San Jose, CA 95134-1927

Phone **408-321-5680**
board.secretary@vta.org



Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 4:12 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: March 22, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Thursday, March 22, 2018

1. [BART Tunnel Board Votes \(KCBS radio\)](#)
2. [California high-speed rail moves to 'road show' mode to shore up public support](#)

BART Tunnel Board Votes (KCBS radio)

(Link to audio)

California high-speed rail moves to 'road show' mode to shore up public support

(Silicon Valley Business Journal)

With its [new higher-cost, delayed-completion business plan](#) now 11 days old, the California High-Speed Rail Authority launched what resembles a private company's investor road show Tuesday to rebuild public and legislative confidence in the project.

The road show began at its board meeting in Sacramento with nearly 90 minutes of presentation by new project CEO [Brian Kelly](#), public comments and board questions on an agenda item originally slated for less than a third that time.

It will continue next month through at least two hearings by the California Legislature and a board meeting on the road in Los Angeles. The scheduled wind-up is May 15 in San Jose, when the board hopes to adopt a final version of the business plan.

All this will proceed against the backdrop of a state audit, approved last month by the legislature, prompted by January's announcement of costs of Central Valley construction running more than a third above estimates.

While the project has faced numerous criticisms since voters approved it a decade ago, many of them are encompassed by the statement of one public speaker at the hearing who said [Proposition 1A](#) "established an agreement between the voters and high-speed rail, an

agreement which the high-speed rail authority has broken. ... Those yes voters deserve transparency. They need to weigh-in on an outcome for which they did not vote yes.”

That was the starting point for Kelly’s presentation in which he maintained that the system proposed in the business plan — despite changes in estimates — is the same as what voters authorized.

“Voters did approve Proposition 1A in 2008,” Kelly said, “and with that came an expectation to build the statewide Phase 1 system (San Francisco to Los Angeles) outlined in that bond measure. Our commitment is reiterated in this plan and that is our objective.”

But as the construction strategy for doing that has evolved into building ever-smaller segments — because of the failure to find much additional funding — the segments in this plan are the smallest yet.

Kelly outlined a longer valley-to-valley segment than in the previous 2016 business plan — San Francisco to Bakersfield rather than San Jose to a point north of Bakersfield — but that is now broken into a San Francisco-Gilroy leg and a Madera-Bakersfield leg with the expensive link under the mountains between Gilroy and Madera “isolated,” meaning not built, until more money is found.

“Defining valley-to-valley in this way also ties to the highest revenue and the highest revenue for valley-to-valley service,” Kelly said.

But initially it would yield two separate pieces of “high-speed rail-ready infrastructure that may be able to see passenger service as early as 2027.” For San Jose, that means high-speed trains would arrive, at the earliest, two years later than the previous business plan called for and the trains would run no farther than San Francisco or Gilroy.

Kelly also said that operational changes in the project have been instituted to guard against the kind of cost increases seen in the Central Valley.

Sixty-three percent of the cost increase there was due to launching construction on segments before all the property needed was in hand, he said. It was done partly because federal funding for construction there had to be spent by last September under grant requirements.

“The important point here is that future construction contracts the authority moves forward on will not repeat this mistake.”

[Back to Top](#)

From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 4:35 PM

To: VTA Board of Directors

Subject: VTA Correspondence: Support for Affordable Housing at Tamien; VTA Countywide Bicycle Plan; Story on Two of VTA's Longtime Employees

VTA Board of Directors:

We are forwarding you the following:

From	Topic
Members of the Public	Support for more affordable housing at Tamien Transit-Oriented Development
VTA	Staff response regarding VTA Countywide Bicycle Plan
VTA	Feature story on two of VTA's longtime employees: https://newswheel.vta.org/30-years-of-recognition-and-memories/

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 N. First Street
San Jose, CA 95134
408.321.5680
board.secretary@vta.org



Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: Kevin Wang

Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 12:12 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; District2@sanjoseca.gov; District3@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; District5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District7@sanjoseca.gov; District8@sanjoseca.gov; District9@sanjoseca.gov; District10@sanjoseca.gov; John.McAlister@mountainview.gov; svaidthyanathan@cupertino.org; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; mayor@sunnyvale.ca.gov; daniel.harney@cityofgilroy.org; teresa.oneill; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org; pring@thecorecompanies.com

Subject: Make more affordable housing at Tamien

Dear VTA Board Members,

We need more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development! The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. I want to **STRONGLY ENCOURAGE TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!**

The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. We'd like to see 150 units of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Kind regards,

Kevin Wang

From: Quetzalli Hernandez

Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 12:45 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary

Subject: Affordable housing at Tamien

Dear VTA Board Members,

We need more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development! The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. I want to **STRONGLY ENCOURAGE TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!**

The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. We'd like to see 150 units of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Kind regards,

Quetzalli

-----Original Message-----

From: Frank Kim

Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 2:27 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; District2@sanjoseca.gov; District3@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; District5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District7@sanjoseca.gov; District8@sanjoseca.gov; District9@sanjoseca.gov; District10@sanjoseca.gov; John.McAlister@mountainview.gov; svaidthyanathan@cupertino.org; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; mayor@sunnyvale.ca.gov; daniel.harney@cityofgilroy.org; teresa.oneill; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.yeager@bos.sccgov.org; pring@thecorecompanies.com

Subject: more affordable housing at Tamien Transit Oriented Development

Dear VTA Board Members,

We need more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development! The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. I want to **STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!**

The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. We'd like to see 150 units or more of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Kind regards,
Frank Kim

From: Nehemiah Bymaster

Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 2:31 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; District2@sanjoseca.gov; District3@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; District5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District7@sanjoseca.gov; District8@sanjoseca.gov; District9@sanjoseca.gov; District10@sanjoseca.gov; John.McAlister@mountainview.gov; svaidhyanathan@cupertino.org; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; mayor@sunnyvale.ca.gov; daniel.harney@cityofgilroy.org; teresa.oneill; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.yeager@bos.sccgov.org; pring@thecorecompanies.com

Subject: affordable housing

Dear VTA Board Members,

We need more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development! The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. I want to **STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!**

The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. We'd like to see 150 units of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Kind regards,

Nehemiah Gabriel Bymaster

From: Sarah Chan

Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 8:53 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; District2@sanjoseca.gov; District3@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; District5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District7@sanjoseca.gov; District8@sanjoseca.gov; District9@sanjoseca.gov; District10@sanjoseca.gov; John.McAlister@mountainview.gov; svaidhyanathan@cupertino.org; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; mayor@sunnyvale.ca.gov; daniel.harney@cityofgilroy.org; teresa.oneillSC; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.yeager@bos.sccgov.org; pring@thecorecompanies.com

Subject: Efforts to Increase Affordable Housing at Tamien

Dear VTA Board Members,

I am writing to advocate for more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development. The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. In the 95110 zip code, there are 1,659 extremely low income households (\$0-\$31,900) that have ZERO affordable housing units. We'd like to see **150 units or more** of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area

Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families. The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. Again, I want to strongly encourage you to support efforts for more affordable housing at Tamien.

Kind regards,

Sarah Chan

From: Baker Cleveland III
Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 11:31 PM
To: Baker Cleveland III
Subject: Help families live with dignantly

Dear VTA Board Members,

I was born and raised in San Jose. I make over just \$100,000 and I can't afford to buy a new home. I love to live here but I will be forever a renter. I can't imagine what it's like to have to share a home with 3 other families just to make one monthly rent payment. It's encouraging to hear you are creating more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development! The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units.

I want to STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!

The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. We'd like to see 150 units or more of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Respectfully,

Baker Cleveland

From: EddyShahin
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 5:05 AM
To: EddyShahin
Subject: Making an impact on Affordable Housing in San Jose

Dear VTA Board Members,

We need more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development! The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. I want to **STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!**

The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. We'd like to see 150 units or more of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Kind regards,

Eddy Shahin
San Jose Resident since 1973

From: Kelly Schertle
Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 8:02 PM
To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; District2@sanjoseca.gov; District3@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; District5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District7@sanjoseca.gov; District8@sanjoseca.gov; District9@sanjoseca.gov; District10@sanjoseca.gov; John.McAlister@mountainview.gov; svaidhyanathan@cupertino.org; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; mayor@sunnyvale.ca.gov; daniel.harney@cityofgilroy.org; teresa.oneillSC@gmail.com; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.yeager@bos.sccgov.org; pring@thecorecompanies.com
Subject: We Need Affordable Housing

Dear VTA Board Members,

We need more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development! The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. I want to **STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!**

The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. We'd like to see

150 units or more of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

I personally know many people that are struggling to live in San Jose. This city isn't just for high-income tech workers! My coworkers at a coffee shop work full time and have to live out of their car, they've been searching for housing for years and nothing is affordable. This city is a place for everyone, and furthermore couldn't survive without the food service workers, the janitors and cleaners, the artists, students, teachers, mechanics, and more that barely make enough to stay above water living in the Bay Area. Please keep these people in mind as you work on this housing development.

Kind regards,
Kelly Schertle

From: agooshibah **On Behalf Of** Nina Lord

Sent: Monday, March 19, 2018 9:40 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; District2@sanjoseca.gov; District3@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; District5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District7@sanjoseca.gov; District8@sanjoseca.gov; District9@sanjoseca.gov; District10 San Jose; John.McAlister@mountainview.gov; svaidhyanathan@cupertino.org; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; mayor@sunnyvale.ca.gov; daniel.harney@cityofgilroy.org; teresa.oneill; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.yeager@bos.sccgov.org; pring@thecorecompanies.com

Subject: affordable housing at Tamien Station Urban Transit Center

Dear VTA Board Members,

I am in a mid-to-high income household and currently rent in 95126 because it's too financially strenuous to buy a home or to even rent closer to our jobs in Campbell and Santa Clara.

I feel that the South Bay is quite economically segregated. With Google coming to San Jose, more gentrification is going to occur and lower income residents are going to get pushed out. I feel we should be able to providing housing for people who work here, even if they don't make a lot of money. We have many important services here that don't pay as much as high-tech positions.

I think we need this diversity for social reasons too. Otherwise we become less empathetic and humble. We all have things to learn from and teach one another.

I recently learned of the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development. The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. I want to **STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!**

I've lived in the Washington community for two years. It is a low income community that desperately needs more affordable housing, and this is great opportunity. We'd like to see 150 units or more of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Thank you for your time,
Nina Lord

From: cammie dunaway

Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 10:21 AM

To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; District2@sanjoseca.gov; District3@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; District5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District7@sanjoseca.gov; District8@sanjoseca.gov; District9@sanjoseca.gov; District10@sanjoseca.gov; John.McAlister@mountainview.gov; svaidhyanathan@cupertino.org; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; mayor@sunnyvale.ca.gov; daniel.harney@cityofgilroy.org; teresa.oneill; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.yeager@bos.sccgov.org; pring@thecorecompanies.com; Lendy Dunaway

Subject: Please Support More Affordable Housing for Tamien Station

Dear VTA Board Members,

I am writing to ask for your consideration and support to increase the number of affordable housing units at Tamien Station VTA from 80 to at least 150 units. I understand that the VTA staff and the developer are currently working to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units and I hope you will support this effort. Additionally, I'd like to ask that the affordable housing units be accessible for undocumented families.

I have been a resident of San Jose living in Willow Glen since 2003. I am so proud to be a part of this vibrant community and I want the entire nation to look at us as an example of a community coming together to take care of each other. I and I imagine most of you, are blessed with such abundance. Lets share those blessings with our most vulnerable neighbors. Affordable housing will enable people from all walks of life to contribute to San Jose's bright future.

Thank you,

Cammie Dunaway

From: Birdie Cheng

Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 3:01 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov; District1@sanjoseca.gov; District2@sanjoseca.gov; District3@sanjoseca.gov; District4@sanjoseca.gov; District5@sanjoseca.gov; District6@sanjoseca.gov; District7@sanjoseca.gov; District8@sanjoseca.gov; District9@sanjoseca.gov; District10@sanjoseca.gov; John.McAlister@mountainview.gov; svaidthyanathan@cupertino.org; larry.carr@morganhill.ca.gov; mayor@sunnyvale.ca.gov; daniel.harney@cityofgilroy.org; teresa.oneill; bnunez@ci.milpitas.ca.gov; dave.cortese@bos.sccgov.org; Cindy.Chavez@bos.sccgov.org; supervisor.yeager@bos.sccgov.org; pring@thecorecompanies.com

Subject: Increase affordable housing!

Dear VTA Board Members,

We need more affordable housing at the VTA's Tamien Transit Oriented Development!

The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units. I want to **STRONGLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO SUPPORT EFFORTS FOR MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING AT TAMIEN!**

The Washington community is a low income community and desperately needs more affordable housing. We'd like to see 150 units or more of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority (or all) of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Kind regards,

Roberta Cheng

From: Kassi Wilson

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 12:47 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary; rrennie@losgatosca.gov; mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov

Subject: Commitment & Action - Our Tamien Neighbors

Dear VTA Board Members,

We need affordable housing for our Tamien neighbors (VTA's Transit Oriented Development). The VTA staff and developer are collaborating to reduce parking and increase the number of affordable housing units.

I want to encourage you to support their efforts for more affordable housing.

You are probably already aware that the Washington community is a low income area and they desperately need affordable housing for their families.

We'd like to see at least 150 units of affordable housing at Tamien, with the majority of the affordable housing for residents at less than 50% of the Area Median Income. Additionally, we'd like to ensure that the affordable housing units are accessible for undocumented families.

Thank you for reading this email and doing your best!

Sincerely,

Kassi J. Wilson

From: Ledbetter, Lauren **On Behalf Of** Bikes
Sent: Wednesday, March 21, 2018 9:08 AM
To: 'Stacy Bruzek Banerjee'; Bikes; VTA Board Secretary
Cc: Council@sunnyvale.ca.gov; BPAC@sunnyvale.ca.gov; council@losaltosca.gov; cjordan@losaltosca.gov; AGalea@losaltosca.gov; citycouncil@cupertino.org; board@cusdk8.org; bill_wilson@fuhdsd.org; hung_wei@fuhdsd.org; jeff_moe@fuhdsd.org; barbara_nunes@fuhdsd.org; roy_rocklin@fuhdsd.org
Subject: RE: Feedback on VTA Countywide Bicycle Plan

Stacy and Sandeepan,

Thank you for your comments on the Countywide Bicycle Plan. I have received similar comments from other community members regarding Homestead Road. We are currently reviewing all comments, and will be releasing a revised final plan in May.

In response to your points, below:

VTA agrees it is important to provide safe routes to school and low-stress bicycling infrastructure that even young children can use safely. I will connect with city staff to understand the status of improvements for Homestead Road at 85 and see if there are ways VTA can help.

Countywide Bicycle Plan focuses on cross-jurisdictional bicycle connections, and identifies a subset of roads and bike paths as Cross County Bicycle Corridors. Many of these, including Homestead Road, provide important access to schools. For the update, we added more roads and bike paths as Cross County Bicycle Corridors. We also prioritized some corridors, using factors such as collision history and predicted use by students.

Prioritizing Homestead as a CCBC makes it more likely that this stretch will receive attention and funding, compared to other similar CCBCs that are not prioritized. Specific designs for a given CCBC will typically be led by local jurisdictions. VTA provides input into plans/designs for selected projects, and now that the Countywide Bicycle Plan has identified priorities, we can focus our resources where they can be most effective. Given your involvement in the schools, I expect you know that Sunnyvale is going to be updating their bicycle plan in the near future and developing a Safe Routes to School plan. This plan is a good opportunity to give more attention to this section of roadway.

Regarding the Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Plan, I am on the Technical Advisory Group for this planning effort. Among other things, I provided to Caltrans a list of projects drawn from the Countywide Bicycle Plan update and requests sent in by city staff. I too noted that some Santa Clara County projects were not included in the project comments tool published in December 2017. That problem has been addressed: improvements to Homestead Road through the Highway 85 interchange are included on the most recent draft list of projects I saw from Caltrans in February 2018.

Thank you both for your commitment to making our community a better place to walk and bike,

Lauren

Lauren Ledbetter

Senior Transportation Planner
Bicycle and Pedestrian Program

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

3331 North First Street, Building B
San Jose, CA 95134-1927
Phone **408-321-5716**



From: Stacy Bruzek Banerjee
Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 6:25 PM
To: Bikes <Bikes.Bikes@vta.org>; VTA Board Secretary <Board.Secretary@vta.org>
Cc: Council@sunnyvale.ca.gov; BPAC@sunnyvale.ca.gov; council@losaltosca.gov; cjordan@losaltosca.gov; AGalea@losaltosca.gov; citycouncil@cupertino.org; board@cusdk8.org; bill_wilson@fuhdsd.org; hung_wei@fuhdsd.org; jeff_moe@fuhdsd.org; barbara_nunes@fuhdsd.org; roy_rocklin@fuhdsd.org
Subject: Feedback on VTA Countywide Bicycle Plan

VTA board, staff, and BPAC,

I have reviewed the entire [Countywide Bicycle Plan Update - draft](#). I have three important feedback points and a request for the VTA to actively engage in providing a complete Safe Routes to School solution for Homestead Road between Foothill Expressway/Grant Road and 85/Bernardo Ave.

1. While school routes are mentioned in this plan, they have not been given enough dedicated attention. Young children are our most vulnerable population on the roadway and they (through various programs) are encouraged to ride bikes to/from school, yet most have not had drivers education and do not know the full rules of the road, are inexperienced cyclists, have developing brains and bodies, have received insufficient bicycle safety education - and don't have airbags or tons of steel, as hurried distracted drivers do, to protect themselves. In addition, school routes that span jurisdictional borders should be given extra examination and scrutiny - especially when a school route requires the use of high-stress arterial roads spanning multiple cities, and the crossing of expressways, freeway interchanges and creeks. The VTA/county should actively engage to provide safe routes where local agencies have not coordinated and implemented end-to-end safe routes plans to date.

2. The plans' [interactive map](#) categorizes the stretch of Homestead Road from Foothill Expressway/Grant Road (frontage) to 85/Bernardo Ave as a priority corridor in the Cross County Bicycle Corridors designation, however there are no known committed plans by any of the agencies to make short-term or long-term improvements on this route. This is indeed a high priority corridor. It is also the only school route available for several 100's of students from Los Altos, Cupertino, and Sunnyvale to reach the following schools:

- West Valley Elementary;
- Cupertino Middle School; and
- Homestead High School.

Yet, it is unsafe. This approximate 1/2 mile stretch of road has at least 5 jurisdictions including 3 cities, the county expressway, and the state (Caltrans 85 off-ramps, Homestead bridge) - as well as a bridge over Stevens Creek/Santa Clara Valley Water District. While student cyclists should feel safe from vehicles and bicycle infrastructure should be connected/seamless across jurisdictions, it is not in this area today. In fact, green paint is barely used in the bike lane at conflict zones, there is no easy access to the multi-user pathway at either end, the pathway abruptly ends at the creek (Los Altos/Sunnyvale border), the pathway does not continue on the bridge over 85 and the current bike facility (bike lane) over the bridge is not wide enough to be safe for young children, and the 85 off-ramps and interchange must be crossed.

In short, on this stretch of Homestead Road, bicycle facilities and the bicycle experience are NOT consistent across jurisdictional boundaries, through intersections, and interchanges - although several 100's of children at all levels of age/experience bike through here alone to reach or return from school. It's not acceptable that collisions and near-misses have been happening at an alarming rate, including of students being severely injured en route to/from school without any improvements or solutions being put in place. We need the safest, lowest stress bicycle facility to meet the community needs - one which is suitable for and provides very young children learning to ride to/from school an end-to-end safe route, and one that addresses the needs of multi-flows of different students/schools providing all students an end-to-end safe route to/from school. We would like the right bicycle infrastructure to be complemented by regular, sufficient and site-specific education for students and frequent enforcement of motor vehicle drivers especially during school route hours.

We understand it will take some time to implement the right long-term infrastructure solution, and in the interim we would like short-term solutions to be put in place such as safety-focused quick-build bicycle infrastructure, crossing guard placement in all warranted locations, for-fee busing options for students, site-specific guidelines and education on how students should bike through this stretch of road safely, school route maps for CMS and West Valley, etc.

3. Caltrans circulated their District 4 Bicycle Plan draft (project comments tool) in December 2017 for feedback, and the VTA priority Cross County Bicycle Corridor (CCBC) on Homestead Road (the area mentioned in #2 above) was NOT mentioned at all for any prioritization or planned improvements in the Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Plan draft although that VTA priority CCBC on Homestead Road includes Caltrans 85 offramp, interchange and bridge over 85. How does the VTA work with Caltrans on planning, prioritizing, funding, and implementing safe connected bicycle infrastructure, and how does the VTA Countywide Bicycle Plan Update align with Caltrans Bicycle plans? As a member of the public looking at both of these plans, they seem to be stand-alone and disjointed especially with respect to this stretch of Homestead Road. If Caltrans is not identifying this area of Homestead Road a priority, what is the VTAs timely execution plan to create an end-to-end "bicycle network that is **safe**, convenient, and **connected**, enabling people of all ages and abilities to **easily bike to [from]** work, **school**, shopping, transit, and elsewhere" on this stretch of Homestead Road?

In summary, we need a high-quality, connected bikeway on Homestead Road between Foothill Expressway/Grant Road and 85/Bernardo Ave that provides children safety from motorized vehicles. Given the sheer number of jurisdictions present on this stretch of road, a history of injury collisions involving students, and the lack of current plans, we request the VTA to take a more active role in this priority Cross County Bicycle Corridor in terms of partnering with other agencies to fund, design, and ensure an end-to-end safe route to school is implemented timely and with priority. We request the VTA lead this project and secure its funding.

Please feel free to reach out if you would like to discuss this further.

Stacy and Sandeepan Banerjee
CUSD Parents