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Sent: Monday, April 09, 2018 11:32 AM
To: VTA Board of Directors; VTA Advisory Committee Members
Subject: VTA Connections Newsletter - April 2018

VTA Board of Directors and VTA Advisory Committee Members:

Below is VTA’s newsletter for April 2018. It can also be accessed using this link:

https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/CAVTA/bulletins/1e7bc01

Please share with your constituents.

Thank you.
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VTA Connections

Stay in the know about transportation in Silicon Valley
VTA Board Approves Staff Recommendation for BART Silicon Valley Phase II Project

VTA’s new battery charged electric buses take to the streets soon!

IN THIS ISSUE

- VTA Board Approves Staff Recommendation for BART Silicon Valley Phase II Project
In a unanimous vote Thursday evening, April 5, VTA Board members approved the staff recommendation for VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension Project.

The Board approved a single-bore tunneling methodology for the 5-mile subway through downtown San Jose. The two station options approved include Downtown San Jose West (between Market and Fourth Streets in downtown San Jose) and Diridon Station North (adjacent to the south side of West Santa Clara Street, between Autumn Street and the San Jose Diridon Caltrain Station.)

The Board also certified that the Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) for Phase II meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Construction to Begin Soon on Highway 237 Express Lanes

• Construction to Begin Soon on Highway 237 Express Lanes
• High Schoolers Learn the Ropes at VTA
• Calling All Bicyclists: Become a Certified Bicycle Instructor

BOARD UPDATE

The VTA Board of Directors met on April 5, 2018. The Board:

• Approved VTA’s BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension Project, certified the environmental document, Downtown San Jose West, Diridon Station North, and single bore tunnel methodology.

• Adopted a resolution of necessity for the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project. The other
March marks six years since the first Silicon Valley Express Lanes started operations. Now VTA is ready to embark on the State Route 237 Express Lanes Project Phase 2 extension. Construction is scheduled to begin in early April, weather and conditions permitting.

The Phase 2 project will extend express lanes operations on State Route (SR) 237 from Zanker Road in San Jose to Mathilda Avenue in Sunnyvale by converting the existing HOV lanes to express lanes. The lanes will extend about 2.9 miles in the westbound direction and 4.8 miles going east toward I-880.

Read more Back to Top

High Schoolers Learn the Ropes at VTA

property was not considered by the Board because it was settled prior to the Board meeting.

- **Approved** all action items on the agenda.

### UPCOMING EVENTS

**Wednesday, April 11**

1:30 pm  
**Technical Advisory Cmte.**  
Meeting  
3331 N. 1st St., San Jose

4 pm  
**Citizens Advisory Cmte.**  
Meeting  
3331 N. 1st St., San Jose

6:30 pm  
**Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Cmte.**  
Meeting  
3331 N. 1st St., San Jose

**Thursday, April 12**

4 pm  
**Policy Advisory Cmte.**  
Meeting  
3331 N. 1st St., San Jose

**Friday, April 13**

12 pm  
**Financial Stability Cmte.**  
Meeting
On a recent rainy Thursday morning, VTA’s Maintenance Training Shop was buzzing with more than a dozen high school students eager to see how the “real world” of automotive repair works.

Independence High School’s Automotive Technology Program has an ongoing relationship with the professionals who maintain VTA buses, as VTA trade specialists visit the school’s state of the art garage for welding lessons and one on one mentorship, and the students make field trips to VTA’s Chaboya Maintenance Training Center to learn from the experts about hybrid propulsion technology and how to build and maintain electric traction motors.

Calling All Bicyclists: Become a Certified Bicycle Instructor
Every year, students in elementary and middle schools throughout Santa Clara County participate in classroom talks and hands-on “bike rodeos” to learn vital safety and bike handling skills through Safe Routes to Schools programs.

Unfortunately, local Safe Routes to Schools programs can’t serve all the schools that want bike rodeos because trained instructors are limited.

VTA funds many of the Safe Routes to Schools programs in the county, and wants to help fill this gap. We are teaming with the County Public Health Department to provide League of American Bicyclists’ League Cycling Instructor (LCI) Seminars in August and September 2018. Become an LCI and you will be certified to lead bicycle rodeos and teach adults and children the rules of the road and important bicycle safety skills.

[Read more] [Back to Top]
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1. BART Train Testing Noise Complaints (NBC Bay Area) – link to clip
2. VTA study plugs autonomous vehicles for MV transit (Mountain View Voice)
3. Google says it’s close to owning enough downtown San Jose properties for ‘viable’ development (Mercury News)
4. Bay Area’s transit agencies looking at fare cuts for low-income residents (San Francisco Chronicle)
5. More Poorer Residents Are Driving Cars, Presenting New Issues for Transit Agencies (Governing)
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Back to top

VTA study plugs autonomous vehicles for MV transit (Mountain View Voice)

Building expressways for autonomous vehicles could be the best option for creating a new transit link to Mountain View’s North Bayshore neighborhood, according to a new report produced by the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA).

The report released this week is the product of a lengthy partnership between Google and VTA officials that was originally announced back in 2015. At the time, Google paid the transit agency $1 million to study
extending the light-rail system out to the heavily congested North Bayshore tech hub.

For the last three years, there have been almost no public updates on the study, and its status has been kept a secret even after it missed completion dates. Officials with VTA and Mountain View have told the Voice they could not disclose details because the study was owned by Google.

Now complete and available online, the final version of the transit report indicates that the study was retooled midway. Originally, traffic engineers focused solely on building a light rail extension (expected to cost up to $500 million), but they were later asked to broaden the study to include other alternatives.

Given that direction, apparently no transportation idea was too far-fetched for consideration. The study's authors examined the merits of electric skateboards, segways and motorcycles (both regular and with attached sidecars). Various types of aircraft were also examined, such as helicopters, blimps and personal jets. They even considered some outlandish prototypes like flying cars, hover bikes and automated drones.

All these aviation ideas were eliminated for being too immature, but the study indicated they could someday be dusted off as feasible transit options.

In the end, the rapidly advancing technology for autonomous vehicles rose to the top as one of the best options in the Google-funded study. No mention was made of the company's own self-driving division -- Waymo -- but the study did reference various other companies developing this technology.

The VTA report graded transit options based on price, the ability to move riders and the level of impact on the environment and surroundings. The study authors also wanted a transit system that could be easily linked to current systems and expanded later in the future.

Autonomous vehicles were seen as one of the most promising options in the study. The VTA report pointed out that this technology could soon be adopted for mass transit: a self-driving bus, for example. Alternatively, self-driving cars could be chained into a "platoon" that could operate more like a train. VTA officials studied the possibility of building dedicated tracks for self-driving cars so they could speedily move past traffic congestion. Another option would be to build an elevated track.
Along with autonomous vehicles, the VTA study also plugged dedicated bus lanes and the agency's own light-rail system as qualified options that could satisfy North Bayshore's transit demands.

Any transit systems would need to start at the Bayshore / NASA light rail station and go about 2.5 miles to the center of Google's campus at Shoreline Boulevard and Charleston Road.

Two potential routes were proposed in the study. A dedicated expressway for autonomous vehicles could run west along Highway 101 from the Bayshore / NASA station to Inigo Way, where it would turn into North Bayshore. Alternatively, a route for self-driving cars, buses or light rail could be brought up R.T. Jones Road along the NASA Ames campus. This option would require a new bridge to be built across Stevens Creek.

Going forward, it will be up to Google officials to decide what to do with the new transit report, according to VTA officials.

The Mountain View City Council is scheduled to discussed the VTA report at their April 17 meeting, according to city staff.

Google says it’s close to owning enough downtown San Jose properties for ‘viable’ development (Mercury News)

SAN JOSE — Google is nearing ownership of enough downtown San Jose properties and parcels to create a “viable” transit-oriented development near the Diridon train station, a top company executive told a key advisory group this week.

During a meeting of the Station Area Advisory Group, formed to gather and process citizen input about Google’s proposal to develop a massive transit village near Diridon Station, Google executives offered the company’s first major presentation of its development philosophies and plans for downtown San Jose. The search giant also indicated that it is creating a critical mass of properties where it could build a transit-oriented community downtown.

“Just to get the sites together by itself is obviously very complicated, and it’s not completed yet, and it’s taking a while,” Mark Golan, Google’s vice president real estate development, told the advisory group during its Monday night meeting. “But we are getting close to having a site that is viable.”
Mountain View-based Google and its development ally Trammell Crow have spent at least $221.6 million buying an array of properties on the western edges of downtown San Jose, within and near a one-mile stretch that begins north of the SAP Center and reaches south nearly to Interstate 280.

Among the major recent deals: The Google and Trammell Crow venture bought a large site that now is occupied by Orchard Supply Hardware, and the search giant has struck a deal to purchase a huge property from Trammell Crow that is approved for 1 million square feet, hundreds of residences and retail.

Despite the extensive work and investments that have occurred already, construction isn’t going to begin tomorrow, Google executives cautioned.

“This is a marathon — this is a major, major project,” Golan said. “It will take a while. A lot of it revolves around the Diridon Station and the transportation improvements there.”

Nevertheless, the opportunities for downtown San Jose seem dramatic, even if construction isn’t on the immediate horizon, said Joe Van Belleghem, Google’s senior director of development.

“Diridon can be a catalyst to fuel the momentum of what is happening in downtown San Jose,” he said during the gathering. “We can create a reality downtown where the project integrates with the neighborhoods and the broader downtown San Jose area. We really can do well by doing good.”

Van Belleghem recently spent three months living in downtown San Jose and has now moved to the nation’s 10th-largest city.

“I can see places happening in downtown San Jose, you can see how the city is working hard to activate vibrant and more places, you can see young people downtown, you can see more restaurants and shops happening,” he said at the meeting.

One vocal skeptic regarding Google’s downtown San Jose plans, Maria Noel Fernandez, an advisory group member and an official with Silicon Valley Rising, told this news organization Tuesday that plenty of concerns remain unaddressed, including displacement of low- and middle-income residents from downtown San Jose and what kinds of jobs would be available.

“We still have no real understanding of what the project is shaping up to be,” she said. “I still have more questions than answers.”

Theresa Alvarado, director of the San Jose office of SPUR, a planning and development group, said the development has the opportunity to transform
downtown San Jose on a grand scale, far more than a single project typically can.

“The Google representatives were very genuine and open in their approach, and they were thinking very expansively and holistically about this district-level type of project,” Alvarado said Tuesday. “San Jose has never had the opportunity to think at this scale and plan at this scale.”

Bay Area’s transit agencies looking at fare cuts for low-income residents
(San Francisco Chronicle)

In an effort to make public transportation fares more affordable to the Bay Area’s least affluent residents, four of the region’s largest transit agencies and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission are proposing a 20 percent discount to low-income riders.

If the plan is enacted, Muni, BART, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain would offer the discounted fares to anyone with an annual income of less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level: $24,280 for a single person, $32,920 for a couple or $50,200 for a family of four. The proposal will be discussed Wednesday at an MTC committee hearing.

“As long as there is significant income inequality in this country, what we can do for people on the wrong side of that inequality is going to be a topic of discussion,” said Randy Rentschler, an MTC spokesman.

Steve Heminger, the commission’s executive director, wrote in a memo to Planning and Allocations Committee members, who will talk about the issue Wednesday, that the affordability of public transportation has increasingly become an issue in recent years.

The matter of making transit fares affordable for the Bay Area’s poorest residents has come up repeatedly in the past decade with proposals to fund free rides for low-income youth in San Francisco and to subsidize transit to schools in Oakland.

The MTC developed a plan tying transit fares to the incomes of the Bay Area’s poorest residents within the past year, with any losses in fare revenue to be covered primarily with funds it receives from the state.

The initial idea was to cut fares by 50 percent. While most of the region’s two dozen transit agencies expressed interest, many were afraid that they’d lose too much money. So the commission focused the plan on the six largest
transit agencies and reduced the proposed discount to 20 percent. Still, AC Transit and SamTrans dropped out because of the financial risks, leaving only Muni, BART, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain.

The discount would be available to those who use Clipper cards. The discount would cut the price of a BART ride from Oakland to San Francisco from $3.50 to $2.80 and reduce the cost of a Muni ride from $2.50 to $2.

By comparison, BART offers discounts of 50 percent for youths up to 18 and 62.5 percent for seniors older than 65. Muni gives seniors, youths and disabled persons a 50 percent discount. Muni also has a free-fare program for low-income youths and seniors.

MTC would reimburse transit agencies for up to $20.7 million. BART estimates the program would cost $10.6 million, Muni $8.6 million, Caltrain $900,000, Golden Gate Transit $400,000 and Golden Gate Ferry $200,000.

At this point, it’s not clear whether the program would be a limited test or permanent.

No decision will be made Wednesday, but the committee is expected to continue discussing the program with a goal of firming up a plan by May. Directors of each transit agency would need to approve their participation, which would likely take place during the summer. The tentative goal would be to start the discounts in summer 2019.

More Poorer Residents Are Driving Cars, Presenting New Issues for Transit Agencies (Governing)

The good news is that more low-income Americans report they have access to vehicles than they did a decade ago, before the Great Recession.

Only 20 percent of adults living in poverty in 2016 reported that they had no access to a vehicle. That’s down from 22 percent in 2006, according to a Governing analysis of U.S. Census data. Meanwhile, the access rates among all Americans was virtually the same (6.6 percent) between those two years.

The bad – or at least, unsettling – news is that even a subtle shift in car usage could have big impacts on transit ridership and other transportation policies, and public officials are still trying to determine how to respond.
“What it does is it reduces our productivity,” says Joe Calabrese, the CEO and general manager of the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority. “If we have 40 people waiting at a bus stop and one of them gets a car, we still have to send a bus. But [the reduction] impacts public perception. Everyone likes to see full buses.”

Calabrese says transit agencies around the country have started seeing noticeable ridership drops in both rail and bus services. In Cleveland, they’ve considered a number of factors that could be causing those decreases, including lower gas prices, the rising number of people living downtown (instead of commuting), and the growing number of people telecommuting instead of driving to work. But the shift in auto ownership could also be a factor, he says.

In February, researchers at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) said increasing car ownership, particularly among lower-income residents, was likely the biggest factor in declining transit ridership in southern California.

“We focused on the larger L.A. region,” says Evelyn Blumenberg, one of the authors of that study and a UCLA urban planning professor, “but it’s clearly true for the U.S. as well. Even for households with incomes less than 50 percent of the federal poverty level, the number of no-vehicle households is down.”

There are a number of factors that are likely contributing to the upswing in vehicle ownership and access. And each of those could present different challenges for policymakers to address.

First, a brief increase in the number of zero-vehicle households after the Great Recession disappeared by 2016, as the economy improved.

“There was a big debate when [the rise of zero-car households] first started happening: Is this the economy or is this a fundamental shift?” says Sarah Jo Peterson, an urban planner and transportation consultant in Washington, D.C. “With what’s happened in the last two years, it’s pretty clear it was the economy. The collapse in car-free living is literally across the board throughout the country.”

The only three states where the gain in zero-car households did not disappear (or the data isn’t conclusive) are Illinois, Nevada and Washington.

And Americans are finally driving more. It took U.S. drivers six years to drive the same amount of miles per year as they had at the beginning of the
recession in December 2007. But the number of vehicles miles traveled has been steadily increasing for five years now.

That means the U.S. is “reverting to the norm,” when it comes to car use, says Peterson.

“The country is becoming more car-oriented, because the country is moving south. If you’re moving from transit-oriented cities in the Northeast and moving to Texas, you’re going to become more car-oriented,” she says.

Urban planners who want to push for walkable neighborhoods and transit-oriented development can still make a compelling case for certain areas, particularly urban centers, she says. “What they don’t have is wind at their backs.”

The rise in car ownership also demonstrates how important it is for planners to consider the needs of suburban residents and others who live or work in areas that aren’t well-served by transit, Peterson adds.

Another big factor in the increased access to cars for lower-income residents appears to be easy access to car loans.

The amount of auto loans has increased for six and a half years, “thanks to record-high levels of newly originated loans,” according to the Federal Reserve Board of New York.

Auto sales hit record highs in 2016 and remained high last year despite a small drop-off. Those sales also put more used cars on the market, which made them more affordable.

Car dealers have been trying to move those off their lots, often by lowering prices or offering loans with longer pay-off periods. That’s led to an increasing number of sub-prime loans, particularly from auto financing companies (rather than banks).

New loans from auto lenders made up a quarter of new auto loans as recently as 2015, the highest they’d been since the recession. That’s leveled off since then, but delinquency rates (9.7 percent) for those subprime loans are at their highest levels since the recession.

The flurry of activity around subprime auto loans has grown so much that representatives from the major credit bureaus had to reassure lenders at an industry conference last year that there was no “bubble” in the market, and that auto loans don’t pose the same threat to the economy as subprime mortgages did.
But cars are also easier to get than a house, loans or not. “Most low-income households are not taking out loans to buy a car. They’ll pick up a car from a friend or get one from Craigslist when they get an influx of money, like a tax refund,” says Blumenberg from UCLA.

Getting a car can be an economic boon for poor residents, she adds, which is why advocates have tried for years to develop programs that would give poor families access to vehicles.

“Research shows there’s a very strong relationship of having a car and likelihood of getting a job. For lower-income households, it’s really beneficial to have access to a car,” Blumenberg says. “The question is: Do the benefits of having a vehicle outweigh the costs? It’s expensive to own and operate a vehicle. Transit for riders is relatively cheap.”

Peterson, the urban planner from Washington, D.C., also cautions that policy makers often look at how expensive it is to own and operate a vehicle, when, in many cases, it can be quite cheap.

Family members pass around cars to other family members, even in well-off households, she says. So a person’s income may not be the most important factor in whether they can get a car; their household income may matter more. A middle-age parent might buy a new car early, so that they can give their old car to a child who just got a new job. And that kid may only put enough money into repairs to “keep it from blowing up,” Peterson says.

Another factor that is likely leading to higher car ownership rates by low-income residents is the migration of poor families to the suburbs, where housing is cheaper but transit service is spotty or nonexistent.

“It’s definitely much more challenging to rely on transit in suburban environments. Whether you’re low-income or not, you’re more likely to have cars, because it’s the only way to survive,” says Blumenberg.

She says that’s one reason urban planners, who tend to promote transit, need to think differently about how to approach suburbs than dense urban centers. In the suburbs and in car-friendly cities, it may make sense to encourage families to only have one car, rather than two or three, to reduce air pollution and traffic. But encouraging them to become a zero-car household would be unreasonable.

At the same time, the fluctuating ridership numbers of transit agencies shows how they are subject to outside forces, some of which have to be addressed by other agencies. Cities, for example, can encourage transit ridership to job centers downtown by cutting down on cheap or free parking.
“Transit ought to be focused on areas where transit works best,” she says. “We have to do something about our policies related to driving. The burden can’t only be on transit agencies.”

Conserve paper. Think before you print.
From: VTA Board Secretary  
Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2018 1:11 PM  
To: VTA Board of Directors  
Subject: VTA Ad Hoc Financial Stability Committee April 13, 2018 Meeting

VTA Board of Directors:

Attached is the link to the VTA Ad Hoc Financial Stability Committee meeting that will be held on Friday, April 13, 2018 at 12:00 p.m. in the VTA Auditorium, 3331 N. First Street, San Jose, California.

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
3331 North First Street, Building B  
San Jose, CA 95134-1927  
Phone 408-321-5680
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Community groups issue demands to Google over downtown San Jose village (Mercury News)

A coalition of community groups issued an array of demands to Google on Thursday regarding the search giant’s plans for a transit-oriented development in downtown San Jose near the Diridon train station.

The groups, operating as Silicon Valley Rising, demanded Thursday that Google step up efforts to address displaced residents and homelessness; bolster jobs geared toward low- and middle-income residents; give San Jose residents first crack at new Google-related employment; support tenants’ rights; ensure legal defense for tenants facing eviction; support local schools to promote education and career opportunities for children; widen access to mass transit; and ensure oversight of community benefits.

The organization presented its demands at Google’s iconic headquarters in Mountain View.

“As Silicon Valley Rising engaged residents across San Jose, we heard again and again how the Google development could exacerbate gentrification, displacement, inequality and traffic,” according to a report released Thursday by the coalition. “This raises serious questions about how Google’s proposed mega-campus will affect working families in San Jose.
On Feb 28, the 38-member Station Area Advisory Group — including political, business, labor, civic and community leaders — kicked off a series of wide-ranging meetings to engage the public regarding Google’s development. Silicon Valley Rising and one of its community allies, Working Partnerships USA, are among the members of the advisory group. Google also is a member.

“We all share the goal of creating a more affordable and equitable community, and I appreciate Google’s willingness to work with us to confront these challenges,” San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo said Thursday in comments emailed to this news organization. “In fact, we’ve already seen Google engaged in our community, including recent grants of $325,000 to Catholic Charities and $500,000 to Somos Mayfair to help broaden opportunity for low-income children and families.”

Mountain View-based Google plans a transit-oriented community totaling 6 million to 8 million square feet of offices, residences, shops, restaurants and open spaces where 15,000 to 20,000 of the company’s employees would work in a development integrated with nearby neighborhoods.

“We want an open dialogue with the San Jose community surrounding our proposed development and look forward to discussing the points raised in this report throughout the public engagement process,” said Javier Gonzalez, Google public affairs manager.

An estimated 79 percent of San Jose residents favor the Google development in the Diridon station area, while 16 percent oppose it, according to a poll by Silicon Valley Leadership Group this year.

“I’m surprised Silicon Valley Rising left out world peace in their demands, but it sounds like it’s the only thing they left out,” said Carl Guardino, president of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group. “Google coming to downtown San Jose is overwhelmingly supported by 79 percent of the taxpayers and voters who actually live in San Jose. But I’m sure that Silicon Valley Rising is well representing the 16 percent who do not.”

Maria Noel Fernandez, an official with Working Partnerships, questioned whether Silicon Valley Leadership Group is concerned about ordinary South Bay residents.

“I’m disappointed that the largest business association in the region is mocking the very real needs of working families in Silicon Valley,” she said. “The expectations that we have of Google address the crisis far too many people are facing Silicon Valley every day.”

Silicon Valley Rising surveys have determined that 82 percent of those it polled believe Google has a responsibility to provide jobs with livable wages for residents and that 73 percent think Google has a responsibility to protect current residents from being displaced.

“We look forward to our continued discussions of how we can work together to address these serious issues and build a vibrant, world-class development that will help generate millions in
public revenues to support police patrols, library hours and other important city services,” Mayor Liccardo said.

Silicon Valley Rising said it hopes Google doesn’t follow the approach taken for other major tech campuses.

“If Google follows the technology industry’s status quo and largely ignores the impacts of its development on the community, our working families, seniors and future generations could be dealing with the negative consequences of this project for decades,” Fernandez said.

**Downtown San Jose tech campus edges closer to reality (Mercury News)**

Developers who have proposed a big tech campus in downtown San Jose have edged closer to launching the project by requesting construction permits for the project, where thousands of people could someday work.

The latest documents filed this week with San Jose city planners show that the development would total 1.02 million square feet. The project would be perched near the banks of the Guadalupe River and be located a short distance from the Diridon train station downtown.

“This is one of the most anticipated development projects in downtown San Jose, other than what Google is doing,” said Bob Staedler, principal executive with Silicon Valley Synergy, a land use and planning consultancy.

The project, which has an official location of 440 W. Julian St., consists primarily of three office buildings, each six stories high. The site is bounded roughly by West Julian Street on the south, North Autumn Street on the west, train tracks on the north and Autumn Parkway on the east. The campus is being developed by a venture of TMG Partners and Valley Oak Partners.

“We have an opportunity to create an iconic headquarters location that will appeal to Bay Area employers of all sizes,” Matt Field, an executive with TMG Partners, said in comments released earlier this year regarding the project. TMG and Valley Oak executives didn’t comment Thursday about the latest application. If staffers approve the proposal, developers would be able to demolish the existing building on the site and then launch construction.

Devon, one of the most respected general construction companies in the Bay Area, has been brought on board to build the development, the city planning documents show.

“The involvement of Devcon shows TMG and VOP are serious about getting this site developed,” Staedler said. “It looks like the idea is to make this a development worthy of a brand-name tech company.”

Even if city staffers were to quickly approve the demolition and construction permit, the project won’t necessarily be built right away.
Still, observers deem the site to be attractive. Multiple residential towers, restaurants, night spots and entertainment sites have begun to sprout or are being actively planned throughout downtown San Jose. Adobe Systems intends to dramatically expand its three-building headquarters campus by building an adjacent fourth office tower on a site the tech giant purchased in January.

The existing Diridon train station already has light rail, Amtrak, Caltrain, ACE Train and bus connections serving the downtown transit nexus. Plus, plans have been approved for BART lines and high-speed rail that could create one of the busiest mass-transit hubs in the nation.

The development is a short distance from areas on the western edges of downtown San Jose where Google has been purchasing an array of properties where it has proposed a transit-oriented development of offices, homes, retail, restaurants, open spaces and other amenities where eventually 15,000 to 20,000 of the search giant’s employees might work.

“You are starting to see the beginning of an innovation district in this area,” Staedler said.

Opposition waters down controversial California housing-transit measure (Silicon Valley Business Journal)

California State Sen. Scott Wiener’s controversial measure to build more housing units near transit has been downzoned.

In response to critics, the bill to upzone development sites near public transit corridors and stations and provide more affordable units to help solve California's housing crisis was amended Tuesday.

The legislation, called the Transit Zoning Bill, or SB 827, would've limited local control over density, parking spaces and heights for housing projects near transit stops. New projects would've had to meet requirements to provide low-income housing of as much as 20 percent of new units. On Tuesday, the senator made these changes:

- Reduced the maximum height of apartment and condo structures that could be built within a half mile of transit stops from eight to five stories.
- Pushed back the effective date of the measure from 2019 to 2021.
- Relaxed restrictions on parking and density.
- Required developers to provide free monthly transit passes to residents of the new projects.
Sen. Wiener conceded that even with these latest changes, the "aggressive" measure has generated so much opposition that it may not pass this year. Still, the legislation is scheduled to be heard by a Senate committee on April 17.

"This bill has triggered a robust and passionate discussion about housing in California, and I appreciate all the feedback we’ve received, including from critics who have engaged thoughtfully on the bill," Wiener said.

#SB827 - my bill allowing more housing near public transit - has sparked a long overdue discussion about whether we actually want to solve the housing crisis. It’s also unleashed lots of psychedelic artistic creativity. When this is all over, we may do an art showing in my office pic.twitter.com/Of07BCAJmB

— Scott Wiener (@Scott_Wiener) April 3, 2018

Wiener’s proposal would up-zone most of San Francisco and South Los Angeles. Transit corridors in Oakland, San Diego, San Jose and Sacramento would be able to build more housing. Proponents estimate that up to 3 million new housing units could be situated near transit hubs.

"We'll get more housing through 827 even with the amendments that Sen. Wiener has proposed because there are so many locations where builders can take advantage of it," said Brett Gladstone, head of law firm Hanson Bridgett LP's land use practice.

Bay Area’s transit agencies looking at fare cuts for low-income residents (San Francisco Chronicle)

In an effort to make public transportation fares more affordable to the Bay Area’s least affluent residents, four of the region’s largest transit agencies and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission are proposing a 20 percent discount to low-income riders.

If the plan is enacted, Muni, BART, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain would offer the discounted fares to anyone with an annual income of less than 200 percent of the federal poverty level: $24,280 for a single person, $32,920 for a couple or $50,200 for a family of four. The proposal will be discussed Wednesday at an MTC committee hearing.

“As long as there is significant income inequality in this country, what we can do for people on the wrong side of that inequality is going to be a topic of discussion,” said Randy Rentschler, an MTC spokesman.

Steve Heminger, the commission’s executive director, wrote in a memo to Planning and Allocations Committee members, who will talk about the issue Wednesday, that the affordability of public transportation has increasingly become an issue in recent years.
The matter of making transit fares affordable for the Bay Area’s poorest residents has come up repeatedly in the past decade with proposals to fund free rides for low-income youth in San Francisco and to subsidize transit to schools in Oakland.

The MTC developed a plan tying transit fares to the incomes of the Bay Area’s poorest residents within the past year, with any losses in fare revenue to be covered primarily with funds it receives from the state.

The initial idea was to cut fares by 50 percent. While most of the region’s two dozen transit agencies expressed interest, many were afraid that they’d lose too much money. So the commission focused the plan on the six largest transit agencies and reduced the proposed discount to 20 percent. Still, AC Transit and SamTrans dropped out because of the financial risks, leaving only Muni, BART, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain.

The discount would be available to those who use Clipper cards. The discount would cut the price of a BART ride from Oakland to San Francisco from $3.50 to $2.80 and reduce the cost of a Muni ride from $2.50 to $2.

By comparison, BART offers discounts of 50 percent for youths up to 18 and 62.5 percent for seniors older than 65. Muni gives seniors, youths and disabled persons a 50 percent discount. Muni also has a free-fare program for low-income youths and seniors.

MTC would reimburse transit agencies for up to $20.7 million. BART estimates the program would cost $10.6 million, Muni $8.6 million, Caltrain $900,000, Golden Gate Transit $400,000 and Golden Gate Ferry $200,000.

At this point, it’s not clear whether the program would be a limited test or permanent.

No decision will be made Wednesday, but the committee is expected to continue discussing the program with a goal of firming up a plan by May. Directors of each transit agency would need to approve their participation, which would likely take place during the summer. The tentative goal would be to start the discounts in summer 2019.

Coming soon to the Uber app: bikes, rental cars, and public transportation
(TheVerge.com)

Uber CEO Dara Khosrowshahi is in Washington, DC today to extend the hand of friendship to cities and make some product news

Remember back in the day when you’d open the Uber app and just see cars? Well, that’s all about to change. Uber CEO Dara Khosrowshahi is in Washington, DC today to make a wide-ranging announcement on Uber’s plans to integrate a variety of new transportation options to its app, including bikes, car-sharing vehicles, and public transportation like buses and trains.
Uber will also share more of its data on traffic patterns and curbside usage with cities in an effort to become “true partners to cities for the long term,” Khosrowshahi said.

It’s a bold expansion into new modes of transportation for a company that is still trying to shake its reputation for rule-breaking and only a few weeks ago suffered one of its worst setbacks to date after an Uber self-driving car killed a pedestrian in Arizona. But since taking the helm last year, Khosrowshahi has been rushing to remake the company in his own image. Acquiring dockless bike-share company Jump earlier this week was his first major deal. And today’s announcement is the next step in his plan to transform Uber from a mere ride-sharing company into a global marketplace for transportation.

“As we think about where we want our cities to be in the future, we know we can do more,” Khosrowshahi writes in a blog post, “and we will.”

Coming fast on the heels of the Jump acquisition, Uber announced today that Washington residents could now reserve and pay for Jump bikes using Uber’s app. The electric, dockless bike-share startup has been operating in DC since September 2017, and now those bikes will be available to rent on Uber’s app.

Uber is also dipping its toes in the world of car-sharing. Later this month, Uber will launch a new product in San Francisco called “Uber Rent,” in which users can rent cars on Uber’s app through a partnership with Getaround. Uber and Getaround, a peer-to-peer car-sharing startup, have been working together in San Francisco for nearly a year to provide daily car rentals to people who want to drive for Uber but don’t own their own vehicle. Now, that service will be available to anyone who needs a car for a few hours or maybe a whole day — also through Uber’s app.

Using Uber to reserve someone else’s car to run errands or take a day trip to Lake Tahoe may seem like cannibalizing Uber’s core ride-hailing business, but the company insists it serves the broader mission of reducing personal car ownership. “Not all trips are well-serviced by Uber,” said Jahan Khanna, head of product for Uber’s mobility division. “Without this offering, our platform really can’t compete holistically with the value proposition of owning your own car. And we’re chipping away at that piece by piece, and this is an important aspect of that.”

Uber Rent will only be available in San Francisco to start out, but if all goes well, it could eventually find its way into other cities served by Getaround such as Boston, New Jersey, Portland, and Washington, DC, said Sam Zaid, the company’s CEO. That said, Zaid doesn’t see this collaboration with Uber as an audition for an eventual acquisition, à la Jump. “I can’t rule out what the outcomes could be,” he said. “Getaround has been around much longer than Jump. We’re a much more mature company.”

Zaid said he is fully on board with Uber’s mission of reducing personal car ownership. “What we heard loud and clear from our users when they start to use Getaround actively and they move away from car ownership, they still have to use things like public transit, biking, walking, as well as ride-sharing to get the complete experience,” he said. “I think that’s true on the Uber side as
well... how do you give people a full suite of mobility solutions, recognizing that any one particular mode is insufficient to replace owning a car?"

Another piece of the puzzle is public transportation. Recent studies show that ride-hailing services like Uber and Lyft tend to poach riders away from public services like buses and subways. But Uber says it’s committed to providing further links to public transit. The company just inked a deal with London-based mobile ticketing company Masabi to allow Uber users to buy and use transit tickets on the app. The two companies are still working out in which markets and for what transit systems Masabi’s integration into Uber will work.

It will likely work much like Masabi’s partnership with Transit, a popular public transportation app in the US, in which users are able to browse fare types, make payments, and receive mobile tickets — all within the same app they use to hail Uber cars. Masabi’s mobile ticketing technology is currently being used by more than 30 transport authorities and operators worldwide, including New York’s MTA, Boston’s MBTA, the UK’s National Express Bus, Las Vegas’ RTC, Los Angeles’ Metrolink, and The Hague.

The partnership with Masabi would appear to be in line with Khosrowshahi’s ambitions to expand more aggressively into public transportation. Earlier this year, Khosrowshahi said that Uber could eventually become a marketplace for other transportation providers, just like Amazon is a marketplace for third-party merchants today, and highlighted the variety of Uber’s existing businesses, which range from food delivery to trucking.

“I want to run the bus systems for a city,” Khosrowshahi said at an event sponsored by Goldman Sachs. “I want you to be able to take an Uber and get into the subway... get out and have an Uber waiting for you.”

On the data-sharing side of the equation, today, Uber announced its plans to expand its Movement project to over a dozen new cities. First launched by Uber last year, Movement is an online tool expressly for cities for mapping travel times, powered by the company’s vast store of ride data. The site allows users to measure travel times between various parts of a city, tracking how those trips get faster or slower over time. Cities that will now have access to Uber’s Movement tool include Amsterdam, Bangalore, Brisbane, Cairo, Hyderabad, Melbourne, Mumbai, Nairobi, New Delhi, Perth, Pittsburgh, and Toronto.

More locally, Uber is teaming up with the city of Washington, DC and SharedStreets, a nonprofit collaboration between the National Association of City Transportation Officials and the Open Transport Partnership, to compile and analyze data on curb usage in Washington, DC. Uber will share its data on popular curbs for ride-hailing pickups and drop-offs in the city in the hopes of convincing officials to designate more space for ride-hailing services like Uber.

“Better understanding curb utilization can help cities around the world prepare for a future where more and more of us are accessing transportation through a combination of shared modes, rather than relying on our own vehicles,” Khosrowshahi said in a blog post.
On the surface, Uber’s Washington announcement may seem like only a handful of pilots and some one-off experiments. But Andrew Sulzberg, Uber’s head of transportation policy and research, said the aims are much more ambitious.

“As I think about the core challenge in urban transportation, not just in the US but in cities around the world, a lot of it is how to manage cars,” Sulzberg said. “There’s a huge emphasis on the city side of how to do get people into other modes of transportation that is not driving their own car.”

But Uber isn’t a nonprofit, and its motivations shouldn’t be seen as entirely altruistic. Clearly, the company sees the profit to be made in bike-sharing, car-sharing, and transit ticketing. And for a company that has never been profitable — Uber ended 2017 $3.2 billion in the hole — finding new revenue streams outside of its core business of ride-hailing is growing increasingly urgent.

“We’re still really small as a share of overall travel in this country and around the world,” Sulzberg said. “Single-digit percentage, 1 percent, give or take. So there’s a lot of space to grow by adding more options into the app. It’s not a new strategy for us, in terms of lower price points and new options.”
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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.

Kind regards,

Edna Liu
Dear Supervisor Peskin,

Thank you for your kind comments about the effectiveness of peer review panels.

It is in this context that I would like to attract your attention to the California High Speed Rail Peer Review Group (CAHSRPRG) letter dated February 7th 2017 (http://www.cahsrprg.com/files/PRG-letter-of-7-Feb-2017-Reduced.pdf) which advised the Legislature as follows (3rd paragraph on page 3):

"An alternative potential response would be to use bi-level trains at the outset for HSRA service. **We have recommended in past letters that the Authority consider adopting bi-level trains from the outset because the loading platform level would be consistent with the lower level used by Caltrain and Metrolink (and ACE if there are joint operations in future). In our discussions, the Authority indicated that they will consider inputs from the new system operator (discussed below). We recommend that this issue be addressed carefully before HSRA commits itself to a rolling stock fleet design.**"

I am attaching a copy of a document I recently forwarded to the Authority's staff for your consideration. This document outlines the specifics of a solution adopted by a majority of countries in the European Union and Russia.

I hope that you find this information useful and that you will direct the High Speed Rail Authority to follow the recommendations of its own peer review panel.

Sincerely,

Roland Lebrun

cc:
SFTCA Board of Directors
SFTCA CAC
SFMTA Board of Directors
TJPA Board of Directors
TJPA CAC
Caltrain Board
Caltrain CAC
Caltrain BAC
CHSRA Board
MTC Commission
VTA Board
VTA CAC
Here is a follow up on the platform height compatibility issue

1) **The problem** (bi-level door at a North East Corridor (NEC) high platform)

2) **The solution** (California High Speed Rail Peer Review Group February 7th 2017 letter to the Legislature)
“We have recommended in past letters that the Authority consider adopting bi-level trains from the outset because the loading platform level would be consistent with the lower level used by Caltrain and Metrolink (and ACE if there are joint operations in future). In our discussions, the Authority indicated that they will consider inputs from the new system operator (discussed below). We recommend that this issue be addressed carefully before HSRA commits itself to a rolling stock fleet design.”

Legislation establishing the Peer Review Group

“The authority shall establish an independent peer review group for the purpose of reviewing the planning, engineering, financing, and other elements of the authority’s plans and issuing an analysis of the appropriateness and accuracy of the authority’s assumptions”

Recommended solution (June 5 2012 APTA Rail Conference)

Low Floor Cars: A Growing Opportunity

• FRA’s emerging “Alternative Compliance” policy will facilitate wider use of European design cars which provide equivalent or better occupant safety in the event of a collision

• Demonstrated safe level boarding in shared track environment

• Demonstrated safe one person train operation

Faster, Safer and Cheaper than most other car/platform interface options

Low-level boarding compatibility between HSR and UTDC bi-levels
European platform height standards:

Application of the EU standard heights for new construction: **Green** = 550 mm, **Pink** = 760 mm, **Yellow** = both, dark gray = New builds in other heights than the EU standards

"**1,100 mm (43.3 in)** high platforms are gradually changing to **550 mm (21.7 in)** platform height."[17]"
“TRAC proposes that the State work towards a universal platform height of 24", and not follow the example of the Northeast Corridor, which has very expensive-to-implement 48" platforms.”

Roland.