

**From:** Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Monday, April 10, 2017 12:05 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors; VTA Advisory Committee Members  
**Subject:** VTA Spring 2017 Take-One is now available

**VTA Board of Directors and Advisory Committee Members:**

The Spring 2017 Take-One is now available. Please click on the link below:

[http://vtaorgcontent.s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/Site\\_Content/Take%20One\\_Final.pdf](http://vtaorgcontent.s3-us-west-1.amazonaws.com/Site_Content/Take%20One_Final.pdf)

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](mailto:board.secretary@vta.org)

**From:** Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Monday, April 10, 2017 5:45 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors  
**Subject:** From VTA: April 8-10 Media Clips



## *VTA Daily News Coverage for April 8-10, 2017*

1. **Morgan Territory Road residents come to terms with washout** San Jose Mercury News
2. **Roadshow: Making fixes at messy 85-280 Foothill interchange** San Jose Mercury News
3. **Five teams vie for California's high-speed rail operations** Progressive Railroading
4. **Jerry Brown's road win** San Francisco Chronicle
5. **Gov. Jerry Brown plays hardball to pass transportation bill** San Francisco Chronicle
6. **Roadshow: Driving in the Bay Area can be relaxing (really!)** San Jose Mercury News
7. **'No' vote on state roads bill a 'yes' for commuter train line** San Francisco Chronicle
8. **Peterson: Sounding off on BART lawsuit, transportation bill and student journalists** East Bay Times
9. **Keeping in step with city by walking to work** San Francisco Chronicle
10. **SMART rail riders will have to pay to park** Marin Independent Journal
11. **Nearly \$1 billion in side deals cemented legislative vote to raise California's gas tax** SF Examiner

### Morgan Territory Road residents come to terms with washout

**Sam Richards**

**San Jose Mercury News**

A correction to an earlier version of this article has been appended to the end of the article.

MORGAN TERRITORY — Looking on the bright side, there's nothing like a road closure to help you get to know your neighbors.

"I've lived here for 34 years, and I'm seeing people now I didn't know were here," said Carolyn Reed, a retired lawyer who lives with her husband Tom and daughter Sarah along Morgan Territory Road.

They're about a mile south of a landslide that on Feb. 24 took out half of the two-lane rural road that connects Marsh Creek Road east of Clayton with Manning Road north of Livermore. The slide occurred about a mile south of Marsh Creek Road.

"It is indeed a new social scene here. And the people are very kind," Reed added.

Those people walk along Morgan Territory Road past the slide all day long, an individual or group traversing the 1,000 or so feet of closed-off roadway every few minutes during daylight. Most are carrying something — groceries, supplies, other packages — either in their arms or by dragging a cart or wagon. Some are on bikes, and a handful of ATV four-wheelers are being driven by local veterans as a shuttle service. The county has allowed limited one-lane traffic to go a few times when conditions have been dry since the road closed, but mostly it's become a walking trail.

Susana Vigil was dragging a wagon of dog food, and a dog named Ferguson, from her van north of the slide to her Camp Four Paws dog boarding business on the other side. "We've had to turn business away — we can't responsibly take all the dogs we normally would."

Reed encountered one neighbor walking quickly back to her home, looking decidedly unhappy. "I've got pneumonia," she told Reed as the rain picked up. "I am so over all of this ..."

Contra Costa County officials have been working on several fronts to not only to get the road open again, which may not happen until June, but to get temporary alternate routes working. Brian Balbas, chief deputy director of Contra Costa Public Works, said the county is negotiating with property owners near the slide to get the rights to improve and use two private roads — Oakhill Lane west of the slide, and Leon Drive to the east — to bypass the slide area until a rebuilt road opens. Balbas said he hopes to have agreements with all landowners within two weeks.

As for fully restoring Morgan Territory Road, Balbas said that can't start until the slide, which begins hundreds of feet above the roadway, stops moving. Monitoring of the soil there indicates that hasn't happened yet, Balbas said. Rains that started Thursday night certainly won't help, and the situation is set to be specifically studied again Monday. Assuming the slide doesn't accelerate, the road might open for one-way, stop-light-governed traffic within the next couple of weeks, Balbas said, "but I don't want to make promises I can't keep."

The long-term fix will likely involve rebuilding substantially more of the road than the immediate 100-foot-or-so slide area, the sub-base as well as some sections of retaining wall on the west (uphill) side. Balbas is optimistic work can begin sometime in May, and that it would take a month or so. As for cost, "It will be in the millions of dollar when all is said and done," Balbas said.

So at least for the next few weeks, most of the 400 to 500 residents of Morgan Territory Road south of the closure will continue "doing the walk" over the slide, as Carolyn Reed puts it. Most residents have a vehicle stationed both north and south of the slide; there's a parking lot on the south side, and to the north both sides of the road are thick with parked cars. Most don't consider the narrow and harrowing road south to Manning Road as a viable alternative.

"It's the road from hell," Sarah Reed said.

It's all disruptive in myriad ways, residents say — there's no mail or commercial parcel delivery; it's hard to bring in hay and feed for the area's many horses, sheep and other animals; and planning for the busy schedules families with kids have is difficult, sometimes impossible.

“It's no fun,” said Krista Brooks, a neighbor of Reed's whose kids ages 3, 6 and 8 have various activities ranging from art class to swimming to horseback riding. “We've struggled a lot of the time, and I've missed things when I forgot to plan an extra hour into anything we're doing. It has completely disrupted our lives.”

Residents like Brooks and Carolyn Reed know the powers that be have a big problem with no quick fixes, and are working to make the best of things. Although Balbas said there is a slide hotline, e-mail alerts and a community kiosk near the slide for updates, Reed said she wishes communications from the county were more regular and succinct, and said the the hotline doesn't always have updated info.

Carolyn's husband Tom Reed had another glass-half-full take on the situation: “I get more exercise, and I spend less money because I go into town less often.”

An earlier version of this story incorrectly reported the length of the slide area that directly affected the road. The area where the roadway itself collapsed is about 100 feet.

**[Back to Top](#)**

## Roadshow: Making fixes at messy 85-280-Foothill interchange

**Gary Richards**

**San Jose Mercury News**

**Q** I live pretty close to the 85-280-Foothill interchange and was not aware upgrades were planned. What are they? Vivian Euzent, Sunnyvale

**A** They involve a short-term fix, a long-term fix and a reality check.

The Measure B sales tax, approved last November, will likely cover the cost of making the northbound Interstate 280 off-ramp to Foothill into a two-lane exit. This could provide short-term benefits but would by no means address all the issues. Design work is all but done, and I suspect construction could begin soon.

A more significant improvement would be the implementation of braided or elevated ramps to separate the on-ramp traffic onto I-280 from off-ramp traffic to Foothill. But it'll take several years to make this change.

Now for the reality check. At the end of the day, the traffic demand at this location far exceeds what any relief widening can accomplish.

Said Casey-the-VTA-planner: “We could make improvements, but what has to also happen is decreases in traffic demand. The morning traffic is commute traffic headed to employment in the northern parts of our county and beyond. This commute demand could be addressed with employers providing new commuting options to their employees so that we lessen the amount of solo driver commuting. Studies have shown that getting decreases in traffic as little as 8 percent

could have a significant effect on congestion. Google “Make Every Day Columbus Day” (for an IBTTA.org report) and you will see what I am referring to.”

**Q** My commute from Mountain View to San Jose involves the frontage road from Calvert Drive at Stevens Creek Boulevard, which mercifully half-opened last month after a painful year of headache-inducing construction.

Happily, the new configuration still allows turns off Stevens Creek onto Calvert into the Fairgrove (Cupertino) neighborhood. The construction vehicles are gone and I haven’t seen a worker there in weeks, but the new traffic light system is not yet activated and the left turn off Calvert onto Stevens Creek is still blocked off with a makeshift barricade.

However, I’m wondering if and when crews might back to finish this process at last? To be able to make a left off Calvert would make my commute so much happier.

Brittany Stevens, Mountain View

**A** That should happen this week. The only thing holding up opening that lane is the installation of traffic signal loops. They were to be installed last week, so the lane should be fully open any day now.

**Q** When southbound on Highway 85 and exiting at Stevens Creek, you must cross two lanes with high-speed traffic exiting to I-280 south. Very scary at times. I have almost been hit by cars failing to allow you to merge.

Hal Smith, Cupertino

**A** This is one nasty merge. However, no major changes are planned.

**Back to Top**

## Five teams vie for California's high-speed rail operations

### **Progressive Railroading**

The California High-Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) has received statements of qualifications from five international teams looking to serve as the agency's early train operator.

The chosen team will assist CHSRA in the system's initial development, including procurement of rolling stock and track. Additionally, the team eventually will operate and manage the Silicon Valley to Central Valley segment, according to the agency's request for qualifications (RFQ) issued in December 2016.

The five teams are:

- China HSR ETO Consortium;
- DB International US, which includes HDR Inc. and Alternate Concepts Inc.;
- FS First Rail Group;
- Renfe, which includes Spain's state-owned rail infrastructure company ADIF; and

• Stagecoach Group plc.

The first phase of the contract is not expected to exceed \$30 million, according to the RFQ.

The entire high-speed rail line is slated to operate from San Francisco to Los Angeles, with the initial Silicon Valley-to-Central Valley segment slated to open in 2025.

**Back to Top**

-

Jerry Brown's road win

**San Francisco Chronicle**

The behemoth transportation funding bill passed by the Legislature this week conforms to the poet John Godfrey Saxe's famous aphorism about laws and sausages — that both “cease to inspire respect in proportion as we know how they are made.” The last leg of the plan's journey through the Sacramento meat grinder only added more of the legislative equivalent of unsavory animal parts.

That said, the bill provides ample and needed sustenance for California's starved infrastructure, raising \$52 billion over 10 years, mostly to shore up roads, bridges and transit systems. Gov. Jerry Brown and Democratic legislative leaders deserve credit for corralling the required two-thirds vote to hike gas taxes and vehicle fees, a politically difficult but sensible means of making those who use the roads pay for them.

Critics suggested plenty of other ways to fund the work but none that made much sense. And while transportation funds have been raided in the past, the bill takes steps to ensure that money is repaid and that new revenue is spent appropriately.

Less auspiciously, the bill's backers made a significant concession to the trucking lobby in exchange for higher diesel taxes, guaranteeing that trucks won't face additional clean-air requirements until they have been on the road for at least 13 years. This week's struggle to reach a supermajority brought further concessions, with more than \$800 million in pork-barrel spending promised to fence-straddling lawmakers, including an extension of the Altamont Corridor Express rail line into the district of the bill's lone Republican supporter, state Sen. Anthony Cannella of Ceres (Stanislaus County). While only a naif would expect legislation of this magnitude to pass without horse-trading, it's unfortunate that the eleventh-hour changes served only to compound the cost of an already expensive bill.

**Back to Top**

Gov. Jerry Brown plays hardball to pass transportation bill

**John Wildermuth**

**San Francisco Chronicle**

Gov. Jerry Brown pushed the transportation bill through the Legislature days after announcing it in Concord on March 30. Photo: Lea Suzuki, The Chronicle Photo: Lea Suzuki, The Chronicle

Gov. Jerry Brown pushed the transportation bill through the Legislature days after announcing it in Concord on March 30.

When 79-year-old Gov. Jerry Brown signs the \$52 billion transportation bill that eked through the Legislature late Thursday night, it will be a tribute to the type of old-school, hardball politics he ran against as a 36-year-old wunderkind in 1974.

“I was working in the Legislature when he was governor the first time, and he could never have pulled this off back then,” said Tony Quinn, a former GOP consultant. “He just didn’t have the connections to people and legislators.”

Brown needed every vote Thursday, pulling the bare minimum in both the state Senate and Assembly to get the two-thirds majority needed to pass a bill that will generate \$5.2 billion a year for a decade by raising the vehicle registration fee by as much as \$175, boosting the gas tax by 12 cents a gallon, and adding a \$100 annual fee for zero-emission vehicles, beginning in 2020.

And when it looked like he might fall short, Brown gathered in the votes the old-fashioned way, showering wavering lawmakers with goodies for their districts.

When Democratic state Sen. Steve Glazer of Orinda refused to support the bill, at least in part because it didn’t ban future BART strikes, the governor and other Democrats quickly turned to GOP state Sen. Anthony Cannella of Ceres in Stanislaus County.

After meeting with Brown at the Governor’s Mansion, Cannella, who will be termed out of office next year, became the lone Republican to back the transportation bill. He said he made the decision after the governor promised to earmark \$400 million from the bill to pay for an extension of the Altamont Corridor Express train to Ceres and Merced and another \$100 million for a parkway from UC Merced to Highway 99.

When Assemblywoman Sabrina Cervantes, D-Corona (Riverside County) and state Sen. Richard Roth, D-Riverside, both started dragging their feet on the transportation plan, they quickly found their districts would get more than \$420 million for local projects.

Brown styled the deals “arrangements” that would benefit the state. Opponents called it pork the governor used to secure votes.

“All Californians should be ashamed of legislators who voted for Senate Bill 1 in exchange for favors and budget promises by the governor and Democratic legislative leadership,” a spokesman for the National Federation of Independent Business said in a statement.

But Brown’s tactics were those of a pragmatic politician, willing to cut deals to get his programs passed.

“Jerry’s learned a lot over the years,” Quinn said. “It’s pure politics: You need a bridge, you get a bridge.” And the governor gets the vote.

Former Republican Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger made a similar choice in 2009, when he wooed then-GOP state Sen. Abel Maldonado of Santa Maria (Santa Barbara County) to become that final vote needed to pass a Democrat-backed budget bill that raised taxes to close a record state deficit.

In return for that vote, the governor dropped a proposed 12-cent gas tax hike, suspended pay increases for legislators in down budget times, and agreed to put an open-primary measure on the ballot. A few months later, Schwarzenegger appointed Maldonado lieutenant governor.

Brown also has learned to pick his spots when it comes time to show the power of his office. That's something he didn't always do in his first stint as governor, when he was seen as an ambitious politician with plenty of ideas but without the discipline — and attention span — to pick the most important issues and get them passed.

The governor now “is very judicious about what he gets involved in,” which works to his benefit, said Mike Madrid, a Republican consultant. “He really knows now how to spend his political capital, which is what a leader does.”

In 2012, for example, he made himself the focus of the Proposition 30 initiative battle to raise sales and income taxes temporarily, appearing in ad after ad promising voters that the new money would get the state out of its deep financial hole.

It worked. The initiative passed, and California's finances were quickly on the upswing.

Brown played to a much smaller audience for the transportation bill, knowing he had to convince only 27 state senators and 54 Assembly members. But that's not as easy as it sounds, even with Democrats holding a two-thirds majority in both houses.

“Even with the two-thirds, the Democratic legislators span a spectrum, from the progressives in the Bay Area to the moderate to conservative members in the Central Valley,” said Larry Gerston, a former political science professor at San Jose State University. “He had to find ways to hold that group together.”

Brown also was working on a tight deadline. Democrats unveiled the long-awaited transportation bill March 29 and needed to pass it by Thursday. Any later and the Legislature would be in recess until April 17, providing plenty of time for opponents to gather strength.

That meant Brown had little more than a week to barnstorm the state, touching down in often unfriendly territory to make his pitch for the bill.

“Everyone agrees (with the idea of improving roads), Republicans, Democrats. The only disagreement is, do we have to spend any money?” Brown told reporters in Riverside on Tuesday. “I think all of you realize that what you're paying now, wrecking your car on the roads, and what you'll save with this measure, it's a hell of a good deal.”

But for Brown, the transportation bill was more important than any one issue. With less than two years left in his last term in office, the governor had to show legislators — and voters — that he is still a power to be reckoned with, someone who can get things done.

“Like it or not, (Brown) is suffering from the same malady that plagues every politician near the end of his term, the lame-duck element,” Gerston said. Pushing through the transportation bill “shows he’s still got his juice.”

**Back to Top**

## Roadshow: Driving in the Bay Area can be relaxing (really!)

**Gary Richards**

**San Jose Mercury News**

**Q** Mr. Roadshow, you say you took a “relaxing” drive on the freeway once? ... Are you kidding me? No one drives to relax on Bay Area roads.

Michael Freda, Paul Diaz and many more

**A** Quite the opposite. When Gregg Dye of San Jose asked what happened to the love of driving, dozens chimed in about their continuing passion to get behind the wheel.

**Q** I have one particularly memorable trip up Highway 1. It was a Sunday morning, and I had to drop off my dad for a 5 a.m. flight out of San Jose. With nothing to do, I decided to drive to the Santa Cruz Wharf. Got there by sunrise. It was a glorious sight.

Still early, and at the proverbial fork in the road, I had to decide. Do I go north, do I go south, or go back? I decided to go north up the coast. It was a glorious February morning. As I drove up Highway 1, I would go miles without seeing another car. It felt like I had the road all to myself. I pulled off the road to take in the views of the ocean, stopping to really appreciate the beauty that surrounds us and that we sadly take for granted. It was a beautiful drive with stops in Davenport, Año Nuevo, Pigeon Point, Pillar Point and finishing up at the Presidio. Had breakfast in San Francisco and drove home to San Jose via 280.

That drive was about a journey and not a destination, and I will remember it for the rest of my life, with a smile on my face.

Mehrdaud Nik-Ahd, San Jose

**A** I bet you will. One of my favorite drives was over Highway 17 on a warm October Saturday morning to ferry my daughter to a swim meet at Cabrillo College. We hit a nearly deserted road with the windows down. The smell of the redwoods was wonderful.

**Q** Back roads and the coast are always good drives. My favorites are McKean/Uvas Road, Hecker Pass, Skyline Boulevard and Highway 9 through Big Basin. ... Highway 35 and 84 and other roads throughout the coastal range are incredible. Ditto for many East Bay venues. ...

Highway 25 can be spectacular, south of Hollister and Tres Piños.

Jim Thurber and more

**A** And there's another way to travel. Read on.

**Q** You asked where the joy of driving went. The answer is simple: It moved to motorcycles. The difference is stark. People drive a car to get to a destination. People ride a motorcycle to ride the motorcycle.

Cars are for travel. Motorcycles are for life.

Mike Heinsohn

**A** My pal Bryan-the-Biker would agree.

**Q** I don't drive to relax, but I am often a bit more relaxed when I drive. Why? I bought a MINI Roadster more than a year ago. And pretty much every chance I get, which I define as pretty much anytime it's not raining, I drive with the top down.

There's little like open-air driving, which is what driving in California is really all about. On warm summer nights, I can look up and see stars. Sometimes, when making the transition from Interstate 380 to Highway 101, a 747 taking off roars majestically overhead and seems almost close enough to touch.

Chuck Martin, San Francisco

**A** That's a relaxing end for today. Folks, head out for a leisurely Sunday drive if you can.

**Back to Top**

## 'No' vote on state roads bill a 'yes' for commuter train line

**Matier & Ross**

**San Francisco Chronicle**

In an ironic twist, East Bay state Sen. Steve Glazer's "no" vote on the governor's mega-transportation tax may have paved the way for the biggest commuter line the Bay Area has seen since BART.

Here's the story.

Gov. Jerry Bown and legislative leaders needed a two-thirds majority in both houses for the \$52 billion tax and fee plan to pass.

Glazer's refusal to go along with fellow Democrats meant that the governor needed to get a "yes" vote from a Republican. In this case, the Republican was Anthony Cannella of Ceres in Stanislaus County. Cannella asked Brown for \$400 million to extend the 86-mile-long Altamont Commuter Express, or ACE, rail line, which runs from San Jose to Stockton, another 72 miles to Ceres and Merced in the Central Valley. And he got it.

Meanwhile, in October, Alameda County Supervisor Scott Haggerty and a group of Central Valley politicians got \$2.2 million from the regional Metropolitan Transportation Commission to

get the ball rolling on extending BART to Livermore and hooking it up to the ACE line — a move designed to take traffic off Interstate 580.

“The 580 corridor is one of the most unhealthy in the region from an air quality and congestion standpoint,” Haggerty said. “Also, making a connection between BART and ACE allows people the opportunity to go from good-paying jobs in the Bay Area to more affordable housing in the Central Valley.”

And while some at BART are skeptical of the plan to connect the systems — and the huge cost that could entail — history shows that even the most ambitious and controversial transportation projects can take on a life of their own in the Bay Area, as evidenced by the state’s troubled high-speed rail project and San Francisco’s trainless Transbay Transit Center.

“So far what we are seeing is a little piece here, a little piece there — and there is the prospect of a bigger whole if they are all connected,” said MTC spokesman Randy Rentschler. “But that may not happen for some time.”

On the waterfront: With the Golden State Warriors booted down to Mission Bay, their original arena site at Piers 30-32 has landed something almost as massive: the 46,154-ton container ship Horizon Spirit.

The 900-foot-long cargo ship has been moored at the base of the Bay Bridge since before Christmas, marring the million-dollar bay views from the neighboring high-rise towers that have sprung up on the land side of the Embarcadero.

“In some ways, it would be preferable to have the Warriors arena ... versus a series of ugly freighters,” said neighbor James Pennington, whose complaints to City Hall have been met with dead silence.

Rafael Porras, who manages Red’s Java House, the burger-and-beer joint on the northwest corner of the piers, says the looming presence of the Horizon Spirit has been the most hotly debated topic since the election of Donald Trump.

Mostly, he said, customers just want to know: “Where is the view? And do we get a discount?”

San Francisco Port spokeswoman Renee Dunn Martin said the Horizon Spirit is part of a fleet owned by the Pasha Hawaii Shipping Line, the same outfit that in August signed a 15-year lease at Pier 80 for an auto import-export operation.

Under a separate deal, Pasha Hawaii was granted permission to park the Horizon Spirit at Piers 30-32 — until it was ready to put the vessel back into service.

“It is expected to leave April 19,” Dunn Martin said, “and by the time it leaves port we will have received around \$100,000 in dockage fees.”

Martin said she’s not aware of plans to dock other freighters long term at the piers. But she quickly added that first and foremost, “we are a port, so we feel ships are welcome here.”

State Sen. Steve Glazer, D-Orinda, speaks during a town hall meeting in San Ramon on March 2. Photo: Michael Short, Special To The Chronicle Photo: Michael Short, Special To The Chronicle State Sen. Steve Glazer, D-Orinda, speaks during a town hall meeting in San Ramon on March 2.

Odd man out: Democrats in the state Senate had one last piece of business before exiting the Capitol Thursday night — a special, behind-closed-doors meeting to beat up on fellow Sen. Steve Glazer of Orinda for not voting for the controversial road repair bills.

“They chewed his ass off,” said one person who was there.

Glazer had committed the unpardonable sin of breaking ranks and voting “no” on hiking both the state gas tax and the vehicle license fee to raise \$5 billion a year to fix the state’s long-neglected roads and bridges.

Glazer, however, appeared unmoved and stood by his call for the package to include a ban on BART strikes, something the governor was unwilling to consider.

“I had a host of concerns, including the hundreds of millions that we are spending on high-speed rail,” Glazer said, adding that the calls and emails “coming into my office were running 2 to 1 against raising taxes.”

Glazer appears ready for whatever retribution may be in store for him when lawmakers return after spring break, be it a broom closet for an office or future bills being stalled in committee.

On the other hand, potholes in his district will still be fixed — and without him having to anger constituents by voting to raise their taxes.

And, in the end, that may not be a bad deal for Glazer.

**[Back to Top](#)**

## **Peterson: Sounding off on BART lawsuit, transportation bill and student journalists**

**Gary Peterson**  
**East Bay Times**

Welcome to the weekend ragout which, as you know, can be served with or without vegetables:

Thumbing through the lawsuit filed against BART this week by two people with disabilities and a pair of advocacy groups, there isn’t much in the way of surprises.

The 34-page complaint, which “seeks to end the systemic civil rights violations committed by BART against people with mobility disabilities,” charges that the plaintiffs are denied equal access because of perpetually nonfunctioning elevators, escalators and fare gates. Anyone who has spent any time traveling on BART is familiar with those kinds of equipment failures — an annoyance for most of us, but a nonstarter for would-be BART passengers with disabilities.

The suit, citing BART's own data, notes that more than 2,500 elevator outages have occurred since October 2015, the "vast majority" of which were unrelated to regularly scheduled maintenance. Again, something we could have guessed.

Here's the shocker: Ian Smith, one of the plaintiffs, said that even when elevators are working, they are rendered effectively unusable because of human waste present in the car. "It has become a predictable part of my commute," Smith said.

You would think an agency that employs a \$270,000-per-year janitor could do better.

The complaint does not ask for monetary damages, but for injunctive relief. That's fancy legal talk for "fix it, already."

You'll get no argument from here that it is past time to shore up California's streets and highways. Driving on certain crumbling, pothole-riddled roadways is akin to taking a ride on a mechanical bull.

That said, there are a couple of features of the \$52 billion transportation bill, narrowly passed by the state legislature Thursday, that are cause for concern.

For one thing, it's the worst kind of tax and fee hike there is: permanent. Even more concerning, the permanent tax increase comes with permanent annual increases tied to the Consumer Price Index.

For another thing, it means the state is essentially waging a war against taxpayers on two transportation fronts — the transportation package and the high-speed rail project (projected cost: \$64 billion).

Here's what I don't get. The high-speed rail project is projected to be completed by 2029. Business Insider estimates there will be 10 million cars with self-driving features on the road by 2020.

By 2029, when high-speed rail may or may not be a reality, we could all be buzzing around like George Jetson in self-driving vehicles. And at that point, who is going to want to drive to a train station, pay big bucks for a ticket and fight crowds to ride a bullet train? Not me, if "Alexa, take me to Costa Mesa and wake me when we get there" is an option.

We can't close without a shout out to the high school journalism students in Missouri who, when assigned to do a profile on their school's new principal, uncovered information that led her to resign her new \$93,000-a-year job.

The students, in checking out the principal's credentials, learned the university where she earned advanced degrees listed no physical address and was subject to consumer complaints. (On her

LinkedIn profile, the principal identified the school as “n/a” and its mascot as the Fighting Redactions. OK, that last line was a joke.)

While the principal’s claim of attending the University of Tulsa held up, she claimed to have earned a degree which, the students discovered, the school did not bestow.

The students have been lauded by the American Press Institute and the Student Press Law Center. No word yet from the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

**Back to Top**

### Keeping in step with city by walking to work

**Carl Nolte**

**San Francisco Chronicle**

Thursday was Walk to Work Day, so I walked to work. It’s good for the soul, but bad for the knees. Concrete is unforgiving.

Walk to Work Day is a national event, fun and festive. As the organizers say, it celebrates “the most healthy, sustainable form of transportation.”

It’s very big in Australia, where walkabouts were invented, practically a national holiday down under. Here not so much. Maybe it was the weather Thursday — gray skies with a spring drizzle — but it didn’t look like there were big crowds afoot in San Francisco. I like to walk, so I gave it a go.

Walking sounds simple, but there is a trick to it. You have to get your mind into it. Walking allows you to see things close up, to get the texture of the terrain. You get the feel of the land in a walk in the woods, an understanding of the city by walking through it.

First thing to remember: Don’t be in a hurry. Walking takes time. If you are in a hurry, run, ride a bike, take the bus, drive. For a walk, you need to make the time, figure it out in advance — the distance you want to go, the time you have available.

Second, you have to clear your mind. No tweeting, no checking your email. Just look at where you are and where you are going. Walk.

I started at the corner of Esmeralda Avenue and Winfield Street. It’s where the neighbors and the city Department of Public Works teamed up to finish a lovely renovation of the Esmeralda Street steps — a slide for kids, trees, an urban showplace. A block down, Esmeralda turns into another set of stairs.

Turned right, or north, on Coleridge Street, named for a poet, left on Coso Avenue, which lines a pretty little park, took a short block of Precita Avenue, and I was on Mission Street, next to Baby Blues Barbecue.

Now it's Mission Street all the way, across busy Cesar Chavez Street, noting Chavez's slogan engraved on the sidewalk: Si, se puede! — Yes, we can. A good thought for the day. Down Mission to 26th, duck into Dianda's Italian bakery for a hot cross bun, a special treat available only during Lent. Past a string of Latino restaurants and a Guamanian place, island food in the heart of the Mission.

Something's always doing at 24th and Mission, but not that morning. Walking on, past a place called That's It, the center of the mile. That was back when this stretch of Mission Street was called the Miracle Mile. Well, maybe. Walking, lots of empty stores on one hand, a new condo complex next to the revived New Mission Theater on the other, past a man talking loudly to himself. The street is lively at night but nearly empty in the morning.

At 17th and Mission, a sign taped to the door of Thrift Town tells the story of the shifting character of the Mission. The store closed on the last day of March because of what the sign says were declining sales and "the changing retail landscape." Thrift Town was a fixture among Mission hipsters.

On to 16th Street, probably the roughest looking corner on the walk. I walked quickly here. Across the street is a Navigation Center, a home for the homeless. At 15th, two men in a tent were having breakfast, it looked like. You see all kinds on a walk.

The big brick fortress of the old National Guard armory at 14th. Mission swings more easterly, and changes. More offices, more condos, more a downtown feel.

When I got to Seventh and Mission, there was a Walk to Work hub station, a long table staffed by volunteers, offering encouragement, a voucher for free coffee, and good cheer. "I walk everywhere I go," said Sheila James, one of the volunteers. "I ride BART and get off at Embarcadero, walk up to my job." She works in Mid-Market, and on the way home, she walks to the 24th Street Mission BART Station, a good mile or two. "Walking is in my DNA," she said. "It keeps me healthy."

Shaana Rahman, a member of the walking nonprofit Walk San Francisco, said she walks to work every day, from Pacific Heights to downtown. "But I take the bus home," she said. "Kind of cheating."

Walk San Francisco sponsors a long walk every fall called a Peak to Peak walk. "No matter how well you think you know San Francisco, you see something new," Rahman said.

They offer a coffee voucher, but I decline. I'm late for work. I make it to Fifth and Mission just in time: One hour and 28 minutes, 8,492 steps, and 2.91 miles from home. A little slow, I thought. I'll be quicker next year.

**[Back to Top](#)**

## SMART rail riders will have to pay to park

**Mark Prado**

**Marin Independent Journal**

While riding new SMART trains will be free when service begins later this year, parking at its stations won't be.

The Sonoma-Marina Area Rail Transit Board of Directors voted to implement a \$2 daily parking fee or \$20 per month for its lots. In Marin, the fee would be applied to 115 spaces at the Hamilton station and 45 spots at the San Marin station. SMART has also negotiated for space at the Marin Civic Center. Parking fees there would be given to the county of Marin.

The agency will use the "Parkmobile" mobile payment system. Customers register for free and pay via the internet, a toll-free telephone service or by downloading a mobile app for the iPhone, Android, Windows or Blackberry smartphones. Parkmobile transactions are linked to the license plate number of the vehicle parking in the lot. It will be an 18-month pilot project.

"It's easy to use, you just download an app," said Jennifer Welch, SMART's police chief. "You choose the lot you are in and enter the space. It's an effective parking management tool."

By comparison, the Bay Area Rapid Transit parking costs between \$5 and \$11 a day, and Caltrain \$5. The Parkmobile system is the same one used at the Larkspur Ferry Terminal, where the parking fee is also \$2 a day.

The SMART parking will be used by commuters only, and overnight use — from midnight to 4 a.m. — of the lots will not be allowed. Cars left for more than 72 hours can be towed.

There was some debate on the rail board as to when to start charging for parking at the lots.

The SMART board voted in January to make the commute service free until the Fourth of July. A start date has yet to be announced. Then from July 5 through Sept. 4 all fares will be cut by 50 percent on all non-discounted regular adult fares.

The free and reduced fare periods will allow passengers to get calibrated to the operation.

Rail board member and Novato City Councilman Eric Lucan suggested a free parking period to match the free rides.

"When we do start charging fares we can start charging for parking," Lucan said.

But Rohnert Park mayor and SMART board member Jake Mackenize worried about the agency's lots being filled by people who don't intend to take trains, and the panel voted in the fee.

"We need to start (charging) right away," Mackenize said. "We can't afford to have those spaces filled with non commuters."

Once the trains roll and fares are charged, only Clipper will be accepted. The Clipper card system is similar to FasTrak, which allows drivers to pass through Bay Area toll booths without having to stop and hand over cash. Clipper works much in the same manner, with patrons signing up and allowing their credit cards to have bus, ferry or rail fares deducted.

Clipper users can scan or “tag” their cards on a reader. A computer chip inside the card reads the transaction, information is displayed on the screen and a beep sounds to alert the passenger the card has been read.

The Clipper system automatically deducts the correct fare and applies any discounts — including transfers — for each trip.

The free period also will allow passengers to better understand operations, including how long it takes to get off and on trains, how to get to stations and how and where to park bicycles or bring them on board.

Using Clipper will make it easier for SMART riders to transfer to other transportation systems, like Golden Gate ferries and buses.

**[Back to Top](#)**

## Nearly \$1 billion in side deals cemented legislative vote to raise California’s gas tax

**Tribune News Service  
SF Examiner**

In one of the biggest legislative victories of his storied political career, Gov. Jerry Brown pushed through a plan last week that will increase gas taxes and vehicle fees to raise \$52 billion over the next decade for the repair of California’s system of crumbling roads, highways and bridges.

But the win didn’t come cheaply — Brown and legislative dealers promised nearly \$1 billion for the pet projects of lawmakers who had been sitting on the fence before they were persuaded to vote for the bill.

The funding “arrangements,” as Brown called them, helped the governor and legislators break a two-year Sacramento stalemate on transportation funding.

Some legislators said the horse-trading taints the legislative process, but Brown defended the deals as justified, a moderate investment compared with the payoff of a bill that will generate \$5.2 billion annually in the first 10 years for road repairs, and billions more in future years.

“I don’t think I’ve ever seen anything as big as this particular transportation bill,” Brown told reporters after the vote late Thursday night. “So I would say some of the arrangements that were entailed in this process, they may look large, but relative to \$52 billion, it’s all pretty modest.”

Republican leaders said the deals were unseemly and set a bad precedent. “Democrats just gave us the largest gas tax increase in state history — a deal so bad they needed \$1 billion in pork to

buy the votes to pass it,” said Assembly Republican leader Chad Mayes of Yucca Valley. “California deserves better.”

The bill, approved by two-thirds votes of the Senate and Assembly on Thursday, raises the gas tax by 12 cents per gallon, boosts diesel taxes and creates a new annual fee when cars and trucks are registered.

Similar proposals have languished for years, but Brown and legislative leaders set a quick-turn April 6 deadline for action, hoping to pressure a compromise before the Legislature’s spring break — ahead of big debates to come in 2017 on the state budget and hundreds of bills.

The side deals, which still require legislative approval, showed up in two changes to the budget bill language, with most of it made public at 4 a.m. on the day of the vote.

The biggest concession made was a \$500-million budget allocation for pet projects helping the districts of state Sen. Anthony Cannella, a Republican, and Democratic Assemblyman Adam Gray, both of whom held out support for the bill until the day before the vote.

Cannella’s vote proved critical. Although Democrats enjoy a supermajority in both houses, Democratic Sen. Steve Glazer voted against the bill, citing opposition from his constituents and a concern that the bill could have been better crafted, leaving it one vote short of the two-thirds majority needed for passage.

The night before the vote, Cannella was called to a meeting with Brown, Senate leader Kevin de Leon, a Democrat, and Assembly Speaker Anthony Rendon, also a Democrat, at the governor’s mansion.

There, the leaders agreed to provide \$400 million in transportation funds through 2027 for the extension of the Altamont Corridor Express, a commuter rail line between the Bay Area and Central Valley. The project would extend the line from Lathrop to Ceres and Merced inside Cannella’s district.

“The ACE train is a big deal for me. It’s important for my district,” Cannella said before the vote. The budget trailer bill was also amended to include \$100 million from the State Highway Account through 2023 for a parkway project at the University of California, Merced campus.

Cannella said the conversation at the governor’s mansion was a long one, ending at 10 p.m. He prevailed.

“I got the things I asked for, so apparently I made the most compelling case,” he said. “It was very hard to get.”

Brown said the deals struck with lawmakers helped the state achieve the larger goal of fixing its roads and bridges.

“Look, everybody here has needs and they have problems,” the governor said. “Everyone I look (at) here has to face the voters. They want to face them with the best foot forward and we want to help them do that.”

The author of the gas tax bill, Democratic state Sen. Jim Beall, downplayed the accommodation made for Cannella.

“He’s getting something specifically earmarked in a way where he can feel comfortable to vote for it,” Beall said. “In the real way of looking at transit funding, it’s still is a system where everybody gets their fair share.”

The money, the governor said, would be well spent.

“Sometimes these bills that take all these different arrangements and compromises help the very people that we came here to serve,” Brown said.

The \$100-million parkway request for UC Merced would help connect the campus to the 99 Freeway. That side deal gave Gray cover to vote for an unpopular tax increase.

“I can go home straight-faced and say to people, ‘This is tough. We’ve got to dig deeper.’ Nobody likes diesel and gas taxes. But this is a tangible, real benefit that I can point to,” Gray said.

He acknowledged that other members might not receive the same infusion of dollars in their districts.

“It’s a fair point, although I would make the argument [that] we’ve historically been underserved. And they’ve historically been overserved,” he said, noting specifically Los Angeles’ large share of transportation dollars.

The new budget language also provides \$427 million for transportation projects in Riverside County. The area’s representative, Democratic Sen. Richard Roth, held off supporting the bill until the last day.

Roth and Assemblymember Sabrina Cervantes, a Democrat, said the extra money was necessary to guarantee that the county was no longer neglected when it came time to distribute road repair dollars. Roth felt Riverside County has not received its fair share of transportation funds in the past.

The governor and top legislators spent pre-dawn hours on Thursday and most of the afternoon of the vote trying to coax Cervantes. She ended up voting yes immediately as the Assembly vote roll was opened.

“For too long, Sacramento has failed to provide Inland Southern California with the resources we deserve,” the two lawmakers said in a joint statement after the vote. “Though this was a difficult vote, the cost of our region not getting its fair share is too high.”

The allocation offered by the governor includes \$180 million for construction of a connector between State Route 91 and Interstate 15 North and \$84.4 million for a bridge to take McKinley Street over busy railroad tracks in Riverside.

The two legislators said they also secured a commitment from Brown to support a bill of Roth's that would provide \$18 million to the cities of Eastvale, Jurupa Valley, Menifee and Wildomar to reimburse them for vehicle license fee revenue they lost through a change in law on newly incorporated cities.

Brown had vetoed previous bills to provide bailout funds for the cities.

Democratic Sen. Connie Leyva, also a holdout vote until the end, said she was able to convince Democratic leaders that something was needed to mitigate pollution from trucks that serve warehouses, including those in her district.

The budget trailer bill was amended at the last minute to include \$50 million from the state Air Resources Board, much of it for grants that warehouses could compete for to provide heavy-duty vehicles that have zero or near-zero emissions.

She said an emissions reduction program already exists at a Fontana warehouse in her district and added that she also represents areas with massive warehouses in Ontario and Chino.

"For me this is all about mitigation and air quality and how do we make sure in this deal that we are not further polluting the air, not only in the Inland Empire but also in the ports, Long Beach and Oakland," Leyva said.

Shortly before 11 p.m. Thursday, just minutes after the gas-tax bill passed the Assembly with no votes to spare, Brown was clearly excited as he stood in front of his Capitol office to talk to reporters about the victory many pundits predicted would elude him.

Asked about the side deals that got him the votes, Brown voiced no regrets.

"You could get a train going to the Central Valley? Does anyone want trains more than me? No," Brown said. "You could get projects and parks in some of the poorest neighborhoods in California? Hallelujah!"

**[Back to Top](#)**

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

**From:** Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 11, 2017 4:50 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors  
**Subject:** From VTA: April 11, 2017 Media Clips



## ***VTA Daily News Coverage for Tuesday, April 11, 2017***

- 1. Here's why VTA and Caltrain like state's new highway repair law** Silicon Valley Business Journal
- 2. Why transit ridership is tumbling in the Bay Area** San Francisco Business Times
- 3. Roadshow: Oops, sign at 17-280-880 gives wrong directions** San Jose Mercury News
- 4. Plans Emerge For Train Service Between Central Valley And Bay Area** CBS San Francisco Bay Area News
- 5. Will Democrats Get Another Supermajority Vote That Could Raise Gas Prices?** KQED News

### **Here's why VTA and Caltrain like state's new highway repair law**

**Jody Meacham**

**Silicon Valley Business Journal**

The highway and road repair bill passed last week by the California Legislature — SB 1, which raises gas taxes for the first time in 23 years — is being cheered by mass transit agencies all around the state.

What's in it for them?

Relief from dependence on the state's flailing cap-and-trade auctions, which in the past four quarters have fallen far short of producing the revenue that agencies like the Valley Transportation Authority and Caltrain depend on for capital projects and operating funds.

"This makes cap-and-trade the gravy and SB 1 the meat and potatoes of state funding, and that's a good thing," said VTA lobbyist Kurt Evans.

What Evans means is that the capital and operating funds that had become unreliable sources when only cap-and-trade revenues were used to replenish them will now get significant money from SB 1, which, in addition to gas taxes, is funded by diesel taxes, a registration fee, and a fee on hybrid and electric vehicles.

According to Caltrain spokeswoman Tasha Bartholomew, transit, intercity passenger rail and commuter rail across the state will have access to an extra \$290 million per year at the start, increasing with the cost of living overtime, because of SB 1. Caltrain would be eligible for \$6.5 million annually for operations and \$1.5 million a year for capital funding.

In addition to other funding, VTA is counting on \$750 million from cap-and-trade for the second phase of its BART extension.

"We look forward to the funding that will come out of this program for critical transportation projects in Santa Clara County," said Jim Lawson, VTA's government and public relations director.

**[Back to Top](#)**

## Why transit ridership is tumbling in the Bay Area

**Antoinette Siu**

**San Francisco Business Times**

Caltrain and other Peninsula public transit modes are seeing ridership slump this year as Bay Area commuters become fed up with delays, outages and crowded trains and buses.

The SamTrans board of directors cite wet weather and a longer winter break at schools as contributing to a drop in youth fares. But the drop in ridership can't really be explained by any one reason, said Tasha Bartholomew, SamTrans communications officer. It could be lower gas prices, special events like Super Bowl 50 resulting in a spike in ridership or the result of more companies using their own shuttles.

"Overcrowding in the peak period and limited parking at stations is thought to be a cause, but could be one of several. Caltrain is experiencing small reductions in sales of all of its ticket types, which would indicate fewer riders in all markets," Bartholomew told the Business Times.

Bus ridership has declined pretty steadily in the past five years, while Caltrain has grown the last five years and has just begun to see a drop in the past last several months.

"People want to get places faster and buses are not very fast," she said. "There are so many options these days, like Uber and Lyft. We're all kind of competing with each other. We even compete with ourselves where people prefer taking the train over the bus."

Research organization SPUR sees a similar trend in people turning to alternatives to escape a frustrating experience on public transit. Companies are investing in employee shuttles to ensure their workforce can get to work quickly and conveniently. Some employers offer work-from-home days to avoid the commuting problem. Other companies are opening satellite offices to help tackle long commutes.

"Either it's an early indicator of an economic slowdown, or people are switching to private alternatives to transit," said Gabriel Metcalf, CEO of SPUR. "The vast majority of people are not on transit to begin with. Most people are driving in their cars."

A 2017 poll from Bay Area Council showed 70 percent of commuters willing to pay taxes to improve the traffic congestion situation. However, most surveyed still drive alone as their primary mode of transportation, with buses, BART and ride-sharing services slightly increasing in usage as a secondary option.

SamTrans operates a fleet of 305 fixed-route buses and 93 paratransit vehicles that run along 76 bus routes in San Francisco, Palo Alto and San Mateo. It sees around 12 million total passengers per year. Caltrain, managed by a joint board that includes SamTrans, saw about 19 million total passengers last fiscal year.

Other transit agencies have experienced ridership slowing down as well, with Bay Area Rapid Transit seeing its first drop in ridership in 10 years and its lowest rider satisfaction in 20 years. AC Transit, serving the larger East Bay with buses connecting to 25 BART stations, reported a 5 percent decline in weekend ridership last year.

**Back to Top**

## Roadshow: Oops, sign at 17-280-880 gives wrong directions

**Gary Richards**

**San Jose Mercury News**

Q I think the sign providing drivers directions from Interstate 280 north to Interstate 880/Highway 17 is backwards.

I've looked at it twice in the last couple of days (usually I ignore those signs because I think I know where I am going). The sign on 280 near Leigh Avenue to north Oakland is to the left and the sign to go south for Santa Cruz is on the right. It should be reversed. I'm confused.

Dee Danna

A As are many others.

Q The sign on northbound I-280 over Leigh Avenue was recently replaced as part of the new retro-reflective sign project, but it directs drivers going to 880 to stay in the second lane to the right instead of the far-right lane. This causes dangerous lane changes. ... An unfamiliar driver would have to change lanes twice when they realize where the ramp is located. ... Is there a way to get Caltrans to fix the sign soon?

Bryon Fan, Derek Young, Doug Temkin, Scott Heise and a lot more

A Yep, the sign is wrong and Caltrans is ordering a new one ASAP. This is one of 435 retro-reflective signs being installed on Bay Area freeways, and all should be up by fall. They are wonderful — when the directions are accurate.

Q I witnessed a strange maneuver by a California Highway Patrol officer that begs for an explanation. I was on south 101 Thursday around 6:33 p.m. when a CHP car near Marsh Road started zig-zagging across all lanes, complete with hand signals to slow down. Traffic was light and free-flowing, and this officer single-handedly caused a freeway backup as no one could go faster than 30 mph.

This went on for several minutes until the CHP car sped away near University Avenue. I saw no signs of problems on the freeway.

I'm at a loss. Please enlighten me.

Vince Liu, Los Altos Hills

A Gladly. This was a rolling roadblock or traffic break to deal with a problem ahead. Sometimes it's done to allow Caltrans workers to remove debris on the freeway, such as bumpers, tires and stalled vehicles. Often the trailing cars, when allowed to proceed at the normal speed, will see only a clear road ahead and are confused as to what happened.

Q I've seen signs advising motorists to pull to the side if involved in a minor accident. I surmise that this is to keep traffic moving. I'm curious as to how police react to motorists who are involved in a slight fender-bender, yet leave their vehicles blocking traffic.

I was caught up in such a mess on Lincoln Way in San Francisco. One lane was backed up for about six blocks because the two drivers were exchanging insurance information. Each car had very slight damage, so the drivers could easily have moved to the curb to exchange that information.

To compound matters, I was on the same street about 30 minutes later and the cars were in the same position. Traffic was still backed up for blocks while other motorists were forced to navigate around these two road boulders.

Dan Murray, San Mateo

A Assuming the cars could be driven, these two motorists should have moved them. Police would tell them to pull to the curb or shoulder.

**Back to Top**

## Plans Emerge For Train Service Between Central Valley And Bay Area

**Phil Matier**

**CBS San Francisco Bay Area News**

New plans are emerging about BART and ACE train service that would connect California's Central Valley with the Bay Area.

A move that could unlock more affordable housing for people who work in the Bay Area and jobs for those who work in the Central Valley.

In exchange for a critical vote to pass the recent gas tax hike, a promise was made to extend the Altamont Corridor Express train, that currently runs from Stockton to San Jose from Stockton all the way to down to Merced.

At the same time — Bay Area and Central Valley lawmakers are quietly moving to push BART to extend to the Livermore area, where it would hook up with the ACE train so passengers could connect between the two systems. Randy Rentschler with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission says, "The goal is to meet with the ACE train a little bit east of Livermore."

And with that hook up, you would instantly create the biggest mass transit system in the state.

Scott Haggerty of Alameda County said, "We're seeing major congestion on all of our interstates right now." Another reason to make it easier to get to the central valley – housing.

Haggerty said, "Get people from the good paying jobs here in the Bay Area to affordable housing."

The median prices of homes in San Francisco, San Jose and Concord and then look at the median price of a home in Merced. Still, there is a hefty cost, about \$1 billion.

"We have tremendous support. Not only on the local level we also have it from the Congressional delegation," Haggerty said.

BART however, has questions.

BART Board President Rebecca Saltzman said, "We need to look at what makes sense for the whole region."

But can BART even handle the extra passengers?

Saltzman said, "Tomorrow? No. But BART, as you know, has a lot of plans to expand the system."

Rentschler said, "What you are seeing are little pieces starting to come together, but the bigger goal is to connect the Bay Area to the Central Valley and to the rest of California."

**Back to Top**

## Will Democrats Get Another Supermajority Vote That Could Raise Gas Prices?

**Julie Cart**

**KQED News**

The power of the California Democratic Party's supermajority was mightily tested last Thursday, with the nail-biting passage of a \$52 billion transportation package that will add 12 cents to the price of gasoline.

What does that bode for the other big lift coming up in the Legislature, the reauthorization of the state's landmark climate change legislation, cap and trade? The carbon auction system survived a court challenge Thursday — with the California appeals court affirming the legality of the program — but it's an open question whether cap and trade can survive a bruising political battle and the likelihood of tacking on more to the price of gas at the pump.

### In Big Win for Brown, Legislature OKs Major Transportation Plan

The transportation bill was a squeaker, passing with a bare minimum of votes in both the Senate and Assembly. Last-minute concessions dragged the package over the line, but at the cost of exhaustion and, for some, distasteful compromise.

If an infrastructure funding bill is such a difficult sell, what does that mean for the future of cap and trade, which will require another two-thirds vote to pass?

“Any two-thirds vote is difficult,” said Sen. Bob Wieckowski (D-Fremont), who chairs the Senate Environmental Quality Committee. “With cap and trade, since 25 percent of money goes to disadvantaged communities, it's a little lighter lift versus transportation package. That said, it's still two-thirds.”

Supporters of cap and trade are seeking a supermajority vote this year to affirm the program's legal standing and eliminate doubts that have reduced participation in the state's carbon market, which has allowed companies to trade permits at auction since 2012.

### Appeals Court Upholds California's Cap and Trade Plan

The original law, AB 32, has a 2020 deadline for meeting its target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels, and that has opened questions as to whether it can operate past that date. Critics say that the law is an illegal tax because it passed with a simple majority vote. A two-thirds vote to extend the program would resolve both questions.

The court also settled the tax point, although there are other potential legal challenges ahead.

Legislators are still discussing whether to extend AB 32 as it exists or to shape an entirely new bill, possibly with an emphasis on environmental justice issues. There are varying versions of what a new or rejiggered cap-and-trade program might look like — continuing the carbon auctions or converting to a carbon tax. Those developments are open-ended.

But if the program is extended in its current form, the price of allowances could greatly increase, according to a nonpartisan analysis. Depending on allowance prices, the cost of gas could rise from 15 to 73 cents per gallon by 2031, according to the Legislative Analyst's Office.

Legislators are understandably sensitive to a dramatic hike in gasoline prices, a core pocketbook issue for voters.

Sen. Ted Gaines (R-El Dorado), who voted against the transportation bill, said permanent gas taxes hurt the most vulnerable.

With Cap and Trade in Doubt, Key Questions Go Unanswered

“There seems to be some confusion in the Legislature about the war on poverty,” Gaines said in a statement. “We should be fighting to end it, not create it. But with this new gas tax we will be serving up poverty by the gallon to millions of families and businesses around the state.”

In any event, cap and trade lived to fight another day, thanks to a 2-1 ruling from the 3rd District Court of Appeal in Sacramento, which agreed with the state Air Resources Board that it has the authority to regulate polluters. The years-long case had clouded the future of cap and trade, with sluggish interest in the state's auctions. The February quarterly allowance auction was another bust, with just 16.5 percent of the emission allowances sold. The next auction is in May.

Analysts say that the future for cap and trade will not be truly assured until it is enshrined in law and not subject to continual legal challenges. Gov. Jerry Brown has asked the Legislature to reauthorize the program with a two-thirds vote, but even the Democrat-heavy statehouse is not committing to anything. Yet.

**[Back to Top](#)**

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

**From:** Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 12, 2017 5:01 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors  
**Subject:** From VTA: April 12, 2017 Media Clips



## ***VTA Daily News Coverage for Wednesday, April 12, 2017***

- 1. Family demands clarity on VTA retiree's presumed bus death** San Jose Mercury News
- 2. Family of VTA Retiree Wants Answers** KNTV
- 3. Crazy driving stunts from highway 17 to I-280 and 580** San Jose Mercury News
- 4. High-speed rail officials grapple with where to put Peninsula tracks** Silicon Valley Biz Journal
- 5. Salvage process weighed for sunken barge atop BART Transbay Tube** San Jose Mercury News
- 6. Roadshow: How the new gas tax could help East Bay-to-South Bay commuters** San Jose Mercury News
- 7. Clash in Oakland over AC Transit buses to hills schools** SF Gate
- 8. Transbay Transit Center rooftop turning into 5.4-acre City Park** San Francisco Chronicle
- 9. Livermore says BART board doesn't care, wants local control** Times Herald

### **Family demands clarity on VTA retiree's presumed bus death**

**Robert Salonga**

**San Jose Mercury News**

The family of Benny Cheung, a freshly retired dispatcher for the Valley Transportation Authority who died in a tragic collision March 23, is demanding more information and a clear statement from authorities that Cheung was killed by a bus for the agency he served for 37 years.

Two high-powered personal-injury law firms, Gwilliam Ivory Chiosso Cavalli & Brewer and Habbas & Associates, are representing Cheung's family and voiced their clients' frustration about having no definitive answers about his death nearly three weeks after he was found gravely injured on North First Street and Hawthorne Way in San Jose.

Investigators have been working under the theory that Cheung was hit by a VTA bus shortly after he got off the same vehicle, and the transit agency has also acknowledged that likelihood. But the sequence leading to his death has not been formally determined.

"It is clear that our victim was hit by a large vehicle," attorney Steven Brewer said in a statement. "Sadly, the victim's body was so badly mangled that the family was unable to have an open casket service for the deceased."

Attorney Omar Habbas alluded to blood evidence on the bus showing up before Cheung was found lying in the street, and that initial evidence suggests the on-board cameras were not working properly.

The law firms also posed the question of whether the driver was aware that the bus might have hit someone. After the death was reported, a VTA spokeswoman said the driver was taken off duty and was put on paid administrative leave pending the outcome of compulsory drug-screening tests.

“We are frustrated by the delay and really feel for the grieving family who has essentially been kept in the dark as to the status of the investigation,” Habbas said.

VTA referred all questions about the case to San Jose police. Officer Albert Morales said the investigation is ongoing and awaits test results from the Santa Clara County Medical Examiner-Coroner’s Office.

“It’s going to take some time,” Morales said. “We’re actively working on it, and hope to provide some answers and closure as soon as possible.”

Releasing information prior to the completion of the investigation, Morales said, could introduce unsubstantiated details to the family that they would have to retract.

“It’s important that we look at all the information so we can come to an accurate conclusion,” he said.

Brewer acknowledged that any financial claims the family will make against VTA hinges on a completed investigation, but noted that if he and his partners get a sense that the probe is stalling, they are prepared to proceed regardless.

“I’m hopeful that in short order there will be some indications that clearly lay responsibility where it needs to be laid,” Brewer said. “We want to resolve these uncertainties for the family as soon as we can.”

**[Back to Top](#)**

## Family of VTA Retiree Wants Answers

**[KNTV NBC](#)**

**[Back to Top](#)**

## Crazy driving stunts from highway 17 to I-280 and 580

**Gary Richards**

**San Jose Mercury News**

**Q** Over the course of 25-plus years of driving in the Bay Area, I’ve witnessed some jaw droppingly horrible driving, from the guy with his iPad propped on his steering wheel while going well over the limit to motorcyclists doing wheelies in traffic to people backing up after missing an exit ramp. What letters have you’ve received that caused you a few stitches in your chin?

Kristin Link, San Jose

**A** Too, too many. Like the person with a pig \_ a big one \_ in the front passenger seat of a pickup.

Roadshow favorite Dennis Cole of Gilroy he saw it just last week and sent me a photo. Said Dennis:

“Welcome to my world.”

From Andrea Shepard on Highway 17: “I saw a guy shaving with one hand and drinking a huge-sized coffee with the other. No idea how he was steering.”

From Chris Borrer, also on Highway 17: “My husband and I were driving over the hill to Santa Cruz. As anyone who drives 17 knows, there are many blind curves. And yet as we rounded one of those curves, here comes a driver heading straight for us as he backed down Highway 17 on the very narrow shoulder. I have no idea what his destination was, but he was hell-bent on going there backward.”

**Q** Now let me share a couple of personal experiences.

Mr. Roadshow, San Jose

**A** There was the fellow who slammed on his brakes ahead of me at a ramp onto Interstate 280. He was miffed when I didn’t take off fast enough when the meter turned green. I came inches from slamming into the rear of his car.

But the worst incident occurred when my then 16-year-old daughter with just her permit and only a few weeks behind the wheel was using the carpool lane one morning on 280. As traffic in adjacent lanes was at a crawl, a guy in large pickup suddenly swerved into the carpool lane to avoid cars slowing him. No blinker, but the back of his truck was over the front part of our car.

My daughter handled it beautifully, maintaining control as she slammed on the brakes. When we got home, there was maybe a five-foot scratch on our Accord from the front headlight to the passenger side door.

Anyone else have tales to share?

**Q** At the risk of appearing like a crazy lady, it has come to my attention that we have no way of communicating effectively with fellow drivers, other than our turn signal or the hopefully infrequent or non-existent finger salute.

When my kids were little, I was especially concerned about semi trucks tailgating me down the 580 Dublin Grade. I made up several cardboard signs to “share” with drivers who were too close. One would say “back off”; another “Pass Me” and then a couple with the speed limit on it. I know this sounds kind of nutty, but it was better than slamming on the brakes, or saluting someone or some other passive aggressive act. What are your thoughts on this? Too distracting?

Denise Davie, Redwood City

**A** I think we all have had days where these signs would have been nice to have. They are distracting, but still funny.

**Back to Top**

## High-speed rail officials grapple with where to put Peninsula tracks

**Jody Meacham**

**Silicon Valley Business Journal**

Two months ago, high-speed rail planners were running computer simulations on three different combinations of passing tracks to see how Caltrain and fast trains could operate efficiently side-by-side along the Peninsula.

Now, although there’s still an option on the table for a six-mile stretch between San Mateo and Redwood City where the railroad would be widened from two to four tracks, high-speed rail is heavily focused on the possibility of no new passing tracks at all.

“There are trade-offs to any approach,” said Ben Tripousis, high-speed rail’s Northern California director. “There are operational trade-offs, there are community impact trade-offs, there are infrastructure trade-offs. So we’re trying to find that sweet spot where we can construct the best solution for the operation of the system.”

Using the current network of tracks, which received a pair of four-track passing sections in 2004 for the addition of Baby Bullet service, would dramatically reduce the cost, construction time and land acquisition requirements to extend high-speed rail from San Jose to its northern terminus.

Tripousis told a community meeting in Mountain View on Tuesday that high-speed trains could be added to the Peninsula corridor for about \$500 million under such a scenario.

But at peak hour service, Caltrain could be delayed so high-speed trains can zip by at 110 mph.

At a similar community meeting in Santa Clara in February, high-speed rail consultant Rich Walter said a high-speed train – which by law must be capable of reaching San Jose from San Francisco in 30 minutes – would take 42.7 minutes during morning and evening rush. A Caltrain Baby Bullet, which today can make the run in 55 minutes, would be slowed by 7½ minutes

All of this computer modeling work is being done by high-speed rail and its consultant Network Rail – the company that owns and manages most of the passenger railroad in Great Britain – in partnership with Caltrain. It assumes Caltrain will solve its electrification funding problem in time for blended service to begin in 2025.

Caltrain is not yet on board with a no-passing-track option, but high-speed rail expects to come to a decision on the Peninsula option by the end of summer.

“We’re trying to take a much more European approach to the operation of the system,” Tripousis said.

“Generally the international model of train operations focuses on the operation of the system, not the infrastructure associated with the system. So train schedules, train operations – how you manage your system – is the way that you identify efficiencies of operation. Intuitively you’d say more tracks, more

infrastructure, better operations. Not necessarily. Certainly the European model tends to bend that way, and that's what we're trying to utilize here given the constrained nature of the infrastructure.”

**Back to Top**

## Salvage process weighed for sunken barge atop BART Transbay Tube

**George Kelly**

**San Jose Mercury News**

Officials weighing next steps toward recovery of a barge that sank during heavy weather last week, coming to rest atop BART's Transbay Tube, say it currently poses no danger to commuters.

Vengeance, a 112-foot-long freight barge, capsized and sank Friday morning in 50 feet of water south of the Oakland-San Francisco Bay Bridge. The barge was carrying 4,000 gallons of diesel fuel and 300 gallons of hydraulic oil, and observers said a sheen initially seen on waters nearby has faded.

In addition to the 25- to 30-foot layer of compacted sediment atop the tube that protects it for now, officials said regular inspections and sonar scans are helping to assess the tube's integrity.

Such tests are also key to assessing any challenges a recovery effort may encounter, U.S. Coast Guard spokeswoman Loumania Stewart said Tuesday.

“The process is complex and requires extensive planning to ensure it is conducted safely,” Stewart said. “Scans provide accurate assessments of how the barge sits on the bay floor and the sediment that shelters the tube.”

A unified command consisting of Coast Guard and BART officials, the state Department of Fish and Wildlife's Office of Spill Prevention and Response, San Francisco's Department of Emergency Management and Vortex Marine Construction, which owns the barge, are handling the assessment, which is expected to take several more weeks in the planning process.

Vortex has hired Global Diving and Salvage to assess the barge and come up with a salvage plan.

Naval architects and unified command members will weigh barge dimensions, surface weather forecasts and ongoing tidal conditions alongside the plan.

Observers have not seen or found any oil-fouled wildlife, but say anyone who finds any should immediately call 877-UCD-OWCN for recovery.

**Back to Top**

-

## Roadshow: How the new gas tax could help East Bay-to-South Bay commuters

**Gary Richards**

**San Jose Mercury News**

**Q** You said you haven't heard from people against increasing the gas tax? Well, here's your first.

Darlene Brannen, San Jose

**A** Actually, yours is the first of many following the Legislature's unprecedented decision to raise the state gas tax by 12 cents a gallon, the diesel tax by 20 cents and registration fees by \$38 a year to raise \$52 billion over the next decade. Potholes are the top priority.

**Q** I can't support these higher taxes until you name a project that will significantly improve my commute from the East Bay to the South Bay.

Alice Steffen, Livermore

**A** Try this, from Hans-the-Fremont-Traffic-Czar:

"Perhaps the most exciting thing Senate Bill 1 provides for Fremont, Caltrans and all of Silicon Valley is the opportunity to finally get the State Route 262-Mission Boulevard connector between I-880 and I-680 upgraded to a full freeway. The concept being pursued is a below-grade expressway allowing traffic to pass through without stopping at the two signals at Warm Springs and Mohave.

"This corridor is practically congested 24/7 and uncorking this bottleneck should be a welcome relief for daily commuters to Silicon Valley jobs, Silicon Valley's weekend warriors heading to Tahoe, and increasingly for truckers hauling shiny new electric vehicles emerging from the Tesla Motors factory.

"This project was previously thought as unfundable due to anemic levels of state funding, but SB 1 has changed that. There is now over \$500 million available annually for improving congested corridors and freight corridors. I can't imagine there are many more worthy highway corridors across the state for this investment than 262."

Me, neither.

**Q** Please list where the \$52 billion from the 12-cent-per-gallon gas tax would go so your readers, many of whom are all for it, know it won't be used just to fix roads. Public transportation, infrastructure and culverts were all mentioned. Potholes could still be far down on the list.

John Cole, San Jose

**A** Potholes will be at the top of the list because paving work can be done fast. Freeways and city streets will get \$34 billion of the \$52 billion.

Said Dawn-the-Santa Clara County-Expert:

"I'm still on Cloud 9 over the passage of SB 1! We can reverse what has been a steady decline in pavement conditions for the 565-mile unincorporated road system and 62-mile expressway system. Prior to the passage of SB 1, the outlook was bleak."

**Q** The 12-cent-per gallon raise is a historic theft and clearly another anti-car sneak attack.

John Rogers

**A** Anti-car? A sneak attack? Historic theft? Interesting choice of words.

**Q** WHOA! Hold the horses. Back up the wagon. I bet that most of those who want a gas tax are electric or plug-in hybrid owners.

Lou Horyza, Milpitas

**A** And for the first time, they'll pay a \$100 fee. There are no free rides. We are all in this together.

**Back to Top**

## Clash in Oakland over AC Transit buses to hills schools

**Jill Tucker**

**SF Gate**

Parents and Oakland school officials are expected to jam an AC Transit board meeting Wednesday to protest the proposed elimination of bus routes to Skyline High, Montera Middle and Community Day schools.

Hundreds of students now take the buses each day to and from the schools, which are located in the Oakland hills, where public transit is minimal or nonexistent.

The meeting Wednesday could be the first step in eliminating service to the schools as of this fall. The AC Transit board is expected to address whether to hold a special public meeting to get input on the proposal. A vote on the issue could come in May.

The meeting is part of a battle between the school district and the transit agency over bus service to the three sites — and who should pay the extra costs to get students to class.

Oakland Unified had been paying AC Transit \$2.25 million annually to help cover the costs, which far exceed fare revenue, but abruptly cut off payments in January. District officials have argued that other districts and private schools that receive similar service aren't paying anything.

“We definitely feel this is an issue of equity for our students,” said John Sasaki, a district spokesman. “Why would we have to pay when nobody else does?”

Sasaki said students pay full youth fare for the rides, as do those from other districts or private schools.

But AC Transit officials see the situation differently. They say making trips to the three schools in the hills costs significantly more than supplemental service provided to other schools in the region — with 56 buses required each day.

Overall, AC Transit spends \$10 million to provide supplemental rides to schools across the East Bay, and \$4.45 million for schools just in Oakland, said agency spokesman Robert Lyles. The three hills schools amount to \$3 million of that, he said.

In other words, he said, Oakland gets supplemental bus service like other cities or schools, and on top of that they get even more because of Skyline, Montera and Community Day School.

“We can say it’s lopsided,” Lyles said. “We’re not designating the level of resources to any other schools to the extent we’re offering that service to just three schools.”

Even if the transit agency eliminates special routes to the three hills schools, it would continue to provide supplemental service to other public schools in the city.

District and transit officials have been working to resolve the situation, but haven’t found an amicable solution that would continue the routes after this school year.

Oakland has little wiggle room. The district is struggling financially, looking for cuts to save about \$10 million needed to pay bills through June.

It appears that the district is trying to balance its books at AC Transit’s expense, Lyles said.

“They see AC Transit as low-hanging fruit,” he said. “OUSD is reneging on their agreement.”

On Monday evening, adding fuel to the feud, the district sent an automated phone call to all families advising them of the AC Transit meeting.

“We decided to inform our families that the meeting is happening because this is something that potentially affects a lot of people,” Sasaki said. “It’s entirely possible some families will choose to go to the meeting and voice their concerns. That’s certainly the American way.”

Lyles, in response, encouraged families to call school board members and demand that they come up with a workable solution.

Parent Naomi Levy, whose son is a sixth-grader at Montera, plans to be at Wednesday’s AC Transit meeting.

“Any dollar that OUSD gives to AC Transit is a dollar they’re not spending in the classroom,” she said. “The No. 1 mission of OUSD is to educate kids. The No.1 mission of AC Transit is to provide transportation.”

But right now, it’s like the two public agencies are playing a game of chicken, leaving students potentially in the lurch, Levy said.

“Bottom line,” she said, “is if these bus lines don’t run, there are going to be a lot of kids who have no way to get to school.”

**[Back to Top](#)**

## Transbay Transit Center rooftop turning into 5.4-acre City Park

**J.K. Dineen**

**San Francisco Chronicle**

The trees are trucked to the Transbay Transit Center in the dead of night.

They're hoisted by crane 70 feet up onto the quarter-mile-long rooftop City Park that stretches above one of the busiest corridors on the West Coast. A few hours later, thousands of workers from companies like Salesforce and Trulia will be hustling to jobs in the glass towers that line Mission Street.

It's a little eerie up there at 2 a.m., said Patrick Trollip, who is heading up the tree-planting project for McGuire and Hester, the landscape contractor for the park.

"You are elevated, surrounded by these skyscrapers, yet it is quiet and peaceful and there is no traffic," Trollip said. "Then all of a sudden these massive trees are lowered onto the roof. I know these trees intimately, but it takes a while to get used to seeing them up there."

The Transbay Transit Center is set to open late this year and will serve numerous bus lines, including AC Transit, Muni, Golden Gate Transit and Greyhound. It's still unknown when it might connect to high-speed rail or Caltrain, which will operate the station, how much it will cost to operate, or what shops and restaurants will occupy the 100,000 square feet of retail space.

But what is known is this: Tree by tree, San Francisco's next significant public open space, a 5.4-acre green rooftop boxed in by towers of glass, is taking shape atop the transit center. And amid all the questions about the future of the transit center, it is the park — with its carefully curated collection of flora — that has the potential to make the project an attraction in the years before the trains arrive.

"This is going to be one of the great parks of San Francisco, and it's going to be a public space unlike anything else we have," said Gabriel Metcalf, president of the urban think tank SPUR.

The trees — about 60 have been delivered so far — will eventually number 469.

The oldest trees are 40 years old, and the heaviest weigh 30,000 pounds. For the past 18 months, Trollip and landscape architect Adam Greenspan have scoured 17 nurseries across California and Oregon in search of the perfect specimens.

There are Chinese elms from Rainbow in northern San Diego County, and olive trees from Farmington in San Joaquin County. From Gilroy come island oaks, while Escondido was the source for five or six cork oaks. A Columnar Hornbeam came from a nursery outside Portland, while a rare torpedo-shaped Chilean wine palm was tracked down near San Diego.

Greenspan, a resident of San Francisco's Duboce Triangle who has designed green spaces around the world, was guided by the trees in his own backyard. Driving down Folsom Street in the Mission late one recent morning, he pointed to the row of Chinese elms growing on both sides of the street — five of them will be planted in the transit center park.

“This is one of my favorite tree streets,” said Greenspan, who is a partner at PWP Landscape Architecture. “I was definitely inspired by Folsom Street.”

The idea for Maytems came from Buena Vista Park, while the inspiration for river birches, with their cinnamon-colored bark, came from Golden Gate Park.

Buying trees is a surprisingly cutthroat business. And it’s been especially challenging to locate desirable specimens because Apple has been buying up 3,000 trees for its new Cupertino headquarters. When Greenspan and Trollip found a tree they fancied they would “tag it” with a locking yellow tag, so that nobody else — like Apple — could get it. Eventually all the tagged trees were moved to a nursery in Sunol, where the transbay project team leased 4 acres.

In Sunol, arborists from McGuire and Hester cared for the trees, transferring them to larger boxes when they outgrew the old ones. Some of the trees arrived damaged, and at least one was stressed by a particularly cold night in Sunol.

“We are always checking the trees for wind damage, for damage from hawks and birds of prey that roost on the tips of the branches,” Trollip said.

Once the trees arrive at the rooftop park, they are positioned where they will be planted. Workers are waterproofing the roof and adding a layer of foam that will provide fill underneath the soil.

On a recent morning, Greenspan walked around spray-painting “N” — for north — on tree boxes to indicate which direction the tree should be positioned. He spent 15 minutes studying the five Chinese elms — like those on Folsom Street — that will provide shade in the “picnic meadow.”

“These are important trees,” he said. “And hard to find. Even though you see them around, there are not that many being grown these days.”

First impressions are important, and Greenspan designed the park to accentuate dramatic entrances. People arriving by escalator will land in a grove of Brisbane boxes. Those coming by elevator from the terminal’s Grand Hall will walk into a bamboo forest. The funicular that will whisk visitors from Mission Street will depart from a group of redwoods and arrive in a second grove on the roof.

The park will have signage explaining the various species and which trees are safe for kids to climb, like the *Rhus typhina*, or staghorn sumac.

“I think there is going to be a tree for everyone,” Greenspan said. “We have grand and stately trees, and we also have weird trees, quirky ones.”

At 1,400 linear feet, the park will have an area dedicated to South African trees, another to Australian. There will be areas for succulents and cacti, a manzanita and chaparral section, a fern garden and an oak meadow. There will be at least one cafe, a children’s play area, an amphitheater and bridges connecting two abutting towers.

“Because it’s long and skinny instead of it being a big forest or a bowl, transbay is something people will experience episodically. So it’s a lot of small gardens rather than one big garden,”

Greenspan said. “The idea we had early was to make it sort of a horticultural botanical gallery of plants that are specially suited to this area.”

While it will be eight or nine months before the park opens, downtown workers are already taking notice of the greenery on the roof. Attorney Michael Sullivan, author of “The Trees of San Francisco,” said he was walking to work at First and Howard streets when he saw what looked like a Norfolk Island pine poking into the sky on top of the transit center.

“I thought, ‘Wow, someone has some imagination around tree planting,’” he said. “It will be so great to have a mini botanical garden right downtown where people actually have an opportunity to see the trees, as opposed to a botanical garden you might visit every year or two.”

## **Back to Top**

### **Livermore says BART board doesn't care, wants local control**

**Angela Ruggiero**

**Times Herald**

Fed up with delays, the City Council on Monday backed a proposal to take away control from BART directors for building an extension to Livermore.

“There is no leverage that we have on the BART board,” said Councilman Bob Woerner. “They allow strikes, they’re the highest paid, have terrible service, incredible reliability issues, they can’t keep the escalators clean ... they’re not particularly good and they don’t care.”

Woerner, along with other council members and Michael Tree, executive director of the Livermore Amador Valley Transit Authority, said it seems no BART board directors support a BART-to-Livermore concept, with the exception of Director John McPartland, who represents the city.

“It’s the moment to take control of a project that’s basically been floundering for 50 years,” Tree said. “It’s been planned to death. This is the moment to stand up and say ‘We’re gonna get local control and we’re gonna get this project done.’ “

Tree said that BART directors “have no intention of bringing BART to Livermore.”

The council supported proposed legislation, Assembly Bill 758, introduced by Assemblywoman Catharine Baker (R- San Ramon) and Assemblywoman Susan Eggman (D-Stockton), to create a new rail authority for the BART-to-Livermore project. The Tri Valley-San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority would plan a regional rail connection between BART, Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) in the Tri-Valley, or a new regional connection between the valley and San Joaquin County, according to a city report.

The bill recommends transferring any funds already dedicated to the Livermore project to the new panel. The bill also states that BART would assume ownership and operations once the extension is built.

BART President Rebecca Saltzman said she found the comments by the council and Tree both “frustrating and surprising.” She said BART is working on an environmental impact report, which would include alternatives and pricing. She said BART needs to be able to work collaboratively on this project with the city.

Saltzman said that BART has been working diligently, and that the EIR is expected to be finalized this year. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission contributed \$10.23 million for the EIR and the Alameda County Transportation Commission \$1.17 million.

“We are committed to having a transportation solution for Livermore,” she said.

BART and the city agreed to study building a BART station at Isabel Avenue in 2012. She agreed it has taken some years, but the study is moving along.

But, it is not moving along fast enough for the Livermore City Council.

“It’s so urgent that something gets started ... we’ve been talking about this since the 1970s. To a cynic like myself, it doesn’t seem like we are that much closer,” Councilman Bob Coomber said.

Baker said Tuesday that the inspiration for the bill came from seeing a real need to see progress for sending BART deeper into the Tri-Valley.

“I think the consensus is that decades of waiting and paying for a BART system was no acceptable,” she said.

Regarding the council’s comments on Monday night toward the board, Baker said she believes they are “a very real reflection of how the Tri-Valley feels about this particular extension.”

The council’s goal on Monday night was to offer direction on the proposed legislation before a regional working group that Livermore is a part of meets this week. That group, the Altamont Regional Rail Working Group, also has been presented with alternatives for the BART-to-Livermore project, including using diesel-powered trains.

The Antioch BART extension project will use the diesel trains, which are about 60 percent cheaper than the conventional BART trains.

But in Livermore’s case, adoption of any of these new train alternatives would be inconsistent with the city’s General Plan policy established with the adoption of the “Keep BART on I-580 Initiative.”

The initiative was adopted by the council in 2011 and strengthened language in the General Plan supporting a freeway alignment, instead of an underground station downtown and an above-ground station along Vasco Road.

A BART report from 2010 said the extension from the Dublin/Pleasanton station to Livermore is expected to cost \$1.2 billion. However, Livermore Councilman Steve Spedowski said the Altamont Regional Rail Working Group estimates the extension could cost \$800 million.

Last week, legislators passed a \$52 billion transportation bill, which included \$500 million for projects including an extension of the ACE train to the Central Valley.

In September, the BART-to-Livermore project received \$2.26 million from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission.

**[Back to Top](#)**

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

**From:** Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 13, 2017 12:13 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors  
**Subject:** From VTA: April 13, 2017 Media Clips



## ***VTA Daily News Coverage for Thursday, April 13, 2017***

1. [BART to look at service cuts, reduced discounts to trim costs](#)
2. [Major BART delays caused by brakes, not sunken barge sitting atop Transbay Tube](#)
3. [Transit agencies rarely hire women and minority contractors. Here's why that matters.](#)

### [BART to look at service cuts, reduced discounts to trim costs](#)

#### **San Francisco Chronicle**

Reduced BART service and smaller discounts are among the proposals expected at the rail system's Thursday Board of Directors meeting in Oakland to close a multimillion-dollar budget shortfall.

The proposals by BART staff, which had been previously announced, are intended to help BART balance its budget for next year.

Among the ideas are starting weekday service at 5 a.m. instead of 4 a.m. and reducing the amount of the youth-senior-disabled fare discount from 62.5 percent to 50 percent.

In addition, the nine BART directors will consider imposing a 50-cent surcharge on traditional paper BART tickets in an effort to encourage patrons to use Clipper cards, which are cheaper for BART to process. Other proposals to address the budget shortfall call for cutting 15 positions and reducing the amount of operating budget that goes into capital expenditures by \$16 million.

BART's Board of Directors, faced with a \$25 to \$35 million budget deficit for next year, explored various fare raising options to put in the budget come June.

If the board goes along, the changes would be enacted at a time when the system is facing a projected budget deficit of \$25 million to \$35 million for the budget year that starts July 1 and ridership that is stagnating.

"BART wants to get rid of its deficit in ways that impact the public the least," BART spokesman [Taylor Huckaby](#) said. "BART is much more interested in reducing waste than increasing fares."

Sources say BART directors are less inclined to reduce discounts and service than to make other cutbacks.

BART fares are already set to go up 2.7 percent across the board in January under a policy the agency has adopted to raise prices automatically with inflation. That will raise the cost of a \$5 ticket by 10 to 15 cents.

The board is expected to make a final decision on the revenue-saving proposals in June.

[Back to Top](#)

## [Major BART delays caused by brakes, not sunken barge sitting atop Transbay Tube](#)

### **San Francisco Examiner**

Another day, another BART delay — except this time, there was a larger worry.

A 112-foot oil-carrying barge, the Vengeance, is sitting atop BART's Transbay Tube right now. It sunk there last Friday, and though the oil leak has been plugged, the ship has not yet been dredged. There's about 30 feet of Earth between the underwater Transbay Tube and the barge, according to U.S. Coast Guard officials.

So when news of the transbay delays hit around 4 p.m. Wednesday, and BART tweeted, "We've got a mainline technician working on the train in the tube," it was only natural people would worriedly ask exactly why BART was working on the tube.

"What exactly is happening?" asked one person, Dave Hughes of Concord, on Twitter.

Well, it's not the Vengeance, BART confirmed both in email to the San Francisco Examiner and in a reply to a tweet.

Taylor Huckaby, the famous social-media manager who was so honest with riders about BART's woes that his tweet for BART became news in the New York Times, wrote on Twitter that the delays were caused when "brakes engaged during propulsion" on a train "and locked."

"Almost done! Working to fix," he wrote. Trains started moving again by 4:30 p.m.

But after questions from the Examiner regarding the sunken ship the Vengeance arose, Huckaby fired off one more tweet:

"It is NOT the barge," he wrote.

[Back to Top](#)

## [Transit agencies rarely hire women and minority contractors. Here's why that matters.](#)

Transit agencies around the country award millions of dollars in contracts every year, but only a fraction of those dollars go to businesses owned by women or minorities.

As we reported [over the weekend](#), the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority set a goal last year to award 25 percent of its contracts to woman- or minority-owned firms. The agency hit 11 percent and has lowered the goal for this year.

Though Metro's not the only agency in the country that fell far short of its goals, it is among the worst. The Federal Transit Administration [maintains statistics](#) for the 50 transit agencies nationwide that receive the most federal funding, tracking targets and annual performance for the diversity among outside contractors.

For the 2016 federal fiscal year, Metro failed its goal for diverse contracting by 54 percent. Here were the other worst performers, based on the margin by which they failed to meet their

**The 10 transit agencies that underspent their goals for minority and woman contractors in 2016**

Of 50 of the largest transit agencies in the country, these 10 agencies performed worst in meeting their goals for participation by women and minority contractors.

AGENCY	REGION	SPENDING GOAL	ACTUAL SPENDING
<b>Detroit DOT</b>	<b>Detroit</b>	<b>11.4%</b>	<b>0%</b>
Los Angeles DOT	Los Angeles	11.2	<1
Sacramento RT	Sacramento	10.8	<1
Long Beach Transit	Long Beach, Calif.	13	4.8
WMATA	Washington, D.C.	25	10.9
MBTA	Boston	14	6.5
Sound Transit	Washington	12.4	6.4
CATS	Charlotte	17.2	8.9
LA Metro	Los Angeles	26	13.8
Metro Transit	St. Louis	20	10.7

target: Source: The Federal Transit Administration

THE WASHINGTON POST

The best performers? The Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority in Buffalo, the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon and the Puerto Rico Highway and Transportation Authority. Other transit agencies in very diverse cities such as Honolulu, Chicago and Miami also made the top-10 list.

**The 10 transit agencies that outspent their goals for minority and woman contractors in 2016**

Of 50 of the largest transit agencies in the country, these 10 agencies performed best in meeting their goals for participation by women and minority contractors.

AGENCY	REGION	SPENDING GOAL	ACTUAL SPENDING
<b>NFTA</b>	<b>Buffalo, N.Y.</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>100%</b>
TriMet	Portland, Ore.	11.6	46.3
PRHTA	Puerto Rico	31	100
Westchester Bee-Line	New York	13	12.7
Miami-Dade Transit	Miami	18	50
Honolulu DTA	Honolulu	10.3	28.9
RTC Transit	Las Vegas	4.1	9.8
AC Transit	Oakland, Calif.	8	17.5
CTA	Chicago	26	51.5
UTA	Salt Lake City	6.2	11.6

Source: The Federal Transit Administration

THE WASHINGTON POST

All told, 19 of the country's 50 largest transit agencies fell below their goals for diversity in outside contractors.

[\[Metro kept falling short of diversity goals for private contractors, so it lowered them\]](#)

Some readers of our original story asked: What's this a big deal? After all, Metro's workforce is well-represented by people of color. Of Metro's 12,514 employees, 74 percent are black, nearly 15 percent are white, almost 6 percent are Hispanic, just over 5 percent Asian or Pacific Islander, and 0.4 percent are American Indian.

But there's a difference between workforce diversity and diversity among contractors.

It comes down to wealth and assets.

The history of transportation infrastructure is one of lucrative projects that funnel wealth to the people with the most connections and the best institutional knowledge about how to get their company picked for big government contracts. Sure, rank-and-file workers benefit from the jobs and wages that these projects provide. But usually, the biggest beneficiaries of government contracts are people who own the businesses that manage to land these contracts. And, in the long-term, it makes a difference whether these opportunities are spread around. Wealth begets wealth. Small companies use modest-sized projects to gain the experience and capital that help them grow and land bigger projects. Once the market fills with larger and more experienced companies in a particular contract industry, it becomes increasingly difficult for smaller businesses to compete — even if, for decades, there were myriad legal and social hurdles that prevented women and people of color from gaining the years of experience and asset acquisition that would allow them to become big players in the world of government contracting.

What were some of these hurdles? [Access to credit](#). Restrictions on available job opportunities, [especially in fields like construction](#) or tech. Urban renewal projects that demolished neighborhoods and [bankrupted businesses](#) owned by minorities.

In an October 2016 report called [“The Color of Wealth in the Nation’s Capital,”](#) the Urban Institute offered some evidence that these disparities in opportunity have long-term effects: *Although there is a fairly sizable share of Black-owned firms in DC, especially relative to Black-owned firms nationwide, the share of business sales receipts going to Black-owned firms in DC and the nation is much lower than for White-owned firms. Comparable statistics for Latinos and Asians reveal that Latinos, business sale receipts in DC and across the United States are lower, while Asian business sales receipts are on par or higher than what would occur if business sales receipt were racially and ethnically equally distributed.*

The report goes on to explain the cycle that keeps wealth out of the hands of the people who have historically had the least access to entrepreneurial opportunities:

*There is a tendency to attribute the racial wealth gap to individual character flaws among people without wealth. ... history of the structural barriers in local and national policies, Supreme Court rulings, programs, and practices ... created wealth for many White families and prevented wealth accumulation or stripped wealth from many Black families.*

That’s why, [in 2015](#), Congress decided to strengthen the requirements for transit agencies to increase and document the participation of women and minorities in contract work.

Earlier this month, D.C. Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton (D) argued why she believes this legislative language was necessary — and why agencies like Metro need to work harder to increase the diversity among the ranks of contractors who provide critical services.

“You don’t do it to be nice, but you do it because of the long history of discrimination in the construction trade — as manifested in Metro as well,” Norton said. “We’re still in the process of curing historic discrimination.”

[Back to Top](#)

**From:** Board Secretary

**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2017 12:35 PM

**To:** VTA Board of Directors

**Subject:** VTA Standing Committee Agenda Packets - April 2017 Meetings

**VTA Board of Directors:**

You may access your VTA Standing Committee Agenda Packet for **the April 2017, Regular Meetings** by clicking on the links below:

- **Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP) Committee** – [CMPP Packet](#)
- **Administration and Finance (A&F) Committee** – [A&F Packet](#)
- **Safety, Security and Transit Planning & Operations (SSTPO) Committee** – [SSTPO Packet](#)

Please also find attached Work Plans for CMPP, A&F and SSTPO for your reference.

We would like to thank you for your support of VTA's Sustainability Program and to **“GO GREEN”** by subscribing electronically to the packets.

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](mailto:board.secretary@vta.org)

**From:** Board Secretary

**Sent:** Friday, April 14, 2017 5:00 PM

**To:** VTA Board of Directors

**Subject:** VTA Correspondence: Thank-You Letter to Senator Beall Regarding SB 1; Comments Regarding Clipper and MTC Means-Based Fare Study

**VTA Board of Directors:**

We are forwarding you the following:

<b>From</b>	<b>Topic</b>
VTA	Thank-you letter to Senator Beall regarding SB 1
Members of the Public	Comments regarding Clipper and MTC Means-Based Fare Study

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](mailto:board.secretary@vta.org)

April 11, 2017

The Honorable Jim Beall  
California State Senate  
State Capitol, Room 2082  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Beall:

On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), I want to thank you for your unrelenting efforts over the past two years that resulted in the enactment of SB 1.

SB 1 can easily be called the most significant transportation bill in more than 25 years. The importance of this landmark piece of legislation to the future of California and Silicon Valley cannot be overstated. By providing more than \$5 billion a year in new revenues and by shoring up existing funding sources, SB 1 will result in a vast array of improvements to the multi-modal transportation infrastructure in Silicon Valley and communities throughout the state, including state highways, local streets/roads, public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and trade corridors. These improvements will enhance the quality of life of Californians now and for years to come.

We recognize that SB 1 was a long and arduous journey. Without your commitment to this bill, that journey would never have been completed. When others would have given up, you persevered. You championed the cause, and through determination, dedication and hard work, you made it happen. California and Silicon Valley are indebted to you for this historic accomplishment. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Jeannie Bruins, Chairperson  
Board of Directors  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

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

From: Stephen Rock  
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 5:19 PM  
To: Board Secretary  
Subject: Please direct Clipper update

To make clipper simpler and more fare

- 1) On CalTrain, make the fare proportional to distance traveled. The current system of regions penalizes those who cross boundaries (even one stop) and rewards those who go many stops within the same region.
- 2) Transfers. If I go from Palo Alto on Caltrain to SF, then get on the N-Judah, I should not have to sign out of Cal Train in SF. Swiping the card on the N-Judah is enough to tell the system where I got off of Cal Train. Same with transfer to BART or to other connecting buses on other systems.
- 3) People on buses that must change cross county lines should not be penalized since those transferring within a county do not pay extra.
- 4) It should not take several days to recharge a card via the web.
- 5) Make it easier to get senior card.

Stephen Rock  
palo alto, CA 94303

---

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

From: Stan Hutchings  
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 5:23 PM  
To: Board Secretary  
Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

I'd really like to use public transportation, but so far it just doesn't work for me. It would be nice to take Caltrain from Palo Alto to SFO, but the difficulty of luggage and poor connection times make it no-go. The same issue taking Caltrain to Mt. View, Santa Clara and Redwood City to Kaiser: it's quicker to bike and arrive at the appointment time!

I had free pass on VTA, but only used it a few times in 5 years. The reason: I could bicycle faster than the transit and get my exercise at the same time. Why would I PAY do use the VTA? Now that I have a Prius, the cost for two of us to drive to San Francisco, Berkeley or elsewhere is more than gas cost. And the convenience of portal to portal transportation would over-ride any lower cost of public transportation. In a few years, I will have a fully autonomous vehicle, and it will not make any sense at all to use public transportation.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Stan Hutchings  
Palo Alto, CA 94301

---

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

From: Julie Spickler

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 6:11 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

I live in Palo Alto and use VTA, Caltrain, and BART frequently, and sometimes Muni also. I would use thee transit systems more often if my Clipper card didn't have to be swiped every time I change from one to another, which can sometimes be problematic, especially if I'm hurrying.

As you know well, the region is updating the aging Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Yours for transit,

Julie Spickler  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

---

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

From: Jacob Wasserman

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 7:19 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares

- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares

- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jacob Wasserman  
San Francisco, CA 94112

---

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

From: Ellen Franzen

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 8:03 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

I am an AC Transit and BART user.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Ellen Franzen  
Berkeley, CA 94710

---

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

From: Carol Cook

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 8:09 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As a frequent user of BART, MUNI and Caltrain, I strongly urge you to take every possible step to provide more seamless and more equitable transit fares.

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,

Carol Cook  
San Mateo, CA 94403

---

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

From: Carl Stein

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 9:10 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,

Carl Stein  
San Francisco, CA 94103

---

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

From: Christina Castro

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 9:39 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Make public transit an attractive option for Bay Area residents and workers who have to cross county lines, using the services of multiple transit agencies. More cars on the roads, more carbon emissions, more road repairs is not the future of transit in the Bay. A robust, seamless, and equitable public transportation system is.

Thank you for your consideration,

Christina Castro

San Francisco, CA 94118

---

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

From: Jaime Guerrero

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 9:57 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Jaime Guerrero  
San Francisco, CA 94110

---

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

From: lee mei

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 10:22 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

lee mei  
mountain view, CA 94041

---

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

From: Evan Goldin

Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 11:07 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Next-gen Clipper system should simplify fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As part of the Clipper 2.0 system, I strongly urge you to consider regional fare simplification. We're more than a lot of nearby cities — we're one region, and we need to start acting like it. That starts with things like the ability to pay a single, simple fare based on distance when riding mass transit.

In my day job, I run product management at Chariot, the on-demand shuttle system — so I know exactly how difficult it can be to have a simple fare structure and make the fares work for everyone. But I can tell you, with direct experience, that riders absolutely love fare simplicity and straightforward pricing over large areas.

As a regular Caltrain, Muni, WETA and BART rider, it's incredibly frustrating to see the lack of integration between transit services. Let's start with pricing.

- Evan

Evan Goldin

San Francisco, CA 94109

---

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

From: Sue Dinwiddie

Sent: Saturday, April 01, 2017 9:07 AM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Sue Dinwiddie  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

---

**From:** Cliff Bargar

**Sent:** Saturday, April 01, 2017 10:39 AM

**To:** Board Secretary; board@samtrans.com; board@caltrain.com; boardcomments@actransit.org; BoardofDirectors@bart.gov; DistrictSecretary@goldengate.org; BoardofDirectors@watertransit.org; hill@countyconnection.com; Heminger, Steven; Ed.Reiskin; hartnettj; mhursh; DMulligan; rannells; ckuester; afremier; wbacon@mtc.ca.gov; mchoy@mtc.ca.gov

**Subject:** Comments on Clipper 2.0 - striving for fare integration

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Cliff Bargar**

**Date:** Sat, Apr 1, 2017 at 10:28 AM

**Subject:** Comments on Clipper 2

**To:** [feedback@futureofclipper.com](mailto:feedback@futureofclipper.com)

Hi,

I live in San Francisco and work in Sunnyvale by the border of Santa Clara; I'm a daily Caltrain commuter, a frequent user of MUNI and BART, and an occasional user of SF Bay Ferry, Golden Gate Ferry, VTA, and Capitol Corridor. I am thankful that Clipper brings together so many (but not all) of these transit operators but there's a lot more that we can do in Clipper 2.

Here are my largest suggestions of what could truly revolutionize Clipper:

- **Integrated fares** - riding multiple transit types as part of a single commute or trip is onerous enough as it is, we shouldn't be actively discouraging riders by charging so much.
  - This should apply to transfers between different agencies - there should be a larger discount or the cost should be based more around total time/distance traveled
  - Here are a few examples from my own experience:
    - As a grad student at Stanford, to get to downtown SF I could either take Caltrain to BART or just drive. I often wound up choosing to drive for visits to the City because it wound up being a lot cheaper; a round trip on Caltrain/BART from Palo Alto to Market St. was about \$18
    - Currently, if I want to get to Downtown Oakland after work I have three options - (1) I can drive, (2) I can bring my bike on Caltrain, bike from 4th/King to Embarcadero Station and take BART from there, or (3) I can bike to the Great America station and take Capitol Corridor. It's absurd that options (1) and (2) are both so much less expensive than option (3), especially as a Caltrain monthly pass holder.

- **Get more agencies on Clipper**
  - As a public transit agency operating largely in the Bay Area, **Capitol Corridor** should accept Clipper Cards. I shouldn't need to buy a ticket through their app or on board.
  - I've never ridden it, but the same goes for **ACE**

Here are a few smaller ones, based on issues I've run into by using Clipper so frequently:

- Different "autoloads" or payment types should be able to use different credit cards
  - I have a Caltrain monthly pass that autoloads from my pre-tax commuter benefit account. I've run into issues with this twice trying to set up a cash autoload for BART/Muni/Ferries:
    - I first set up a cash autoload assuming that it DID use a different credit card; this resulted in my regular credit card, instead of my pre-tax account, being charged for my \$230 Caltrain monthly pass that month
    - Several months later I had fixed the above issue but I happened to be using BART at the start of a new month that fell on a weekend (before I had autoloaded my Caltrain pass); when my account balance fell below the threshold, my cash was replenished from my pre-tax account, later preventing my Caltrain pass from being charged there
  - Because of these issues I don't still have a cash autoload for my clipper account
- When you buy a pass or load cash online it shouldn't take several days to reach your card
  - And, if it continues to, there should be more machines at transit stations allowing you to load cash to your account
- All agencies using Clipper should have standard policies when it comes to things like tagging on/off at the same station
  - On Caltrain if I tag on/off at the same station I don't get charged anything
  - On BART if I tag on/off at the same station I get charged \$5
  - On the SF Bay Ferry if I tag on/off at the same port I've been charged what seems like the maximum fare
- Monthly passes should load automatically (if I have it set to) or should at least load if I tag on/off at the same station; I shouldn't have to remember to tag off at my destination for my Caltrain monthly pass to load properly
  - I don't know how this compares to other agencies' monthly passes

Also, I want to voice my strong support for integrating Clipper payment into bike share and other quasi-public transit modes.

Thanks,  
Cliff

---

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

From: John Brazil

Sent: Saturday, April 01, 2017 12:09 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Include Means-based, streamlined fares in Clipper update

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As the Bay Area updates its aging Clipper system, please be sure to:

- \* Include a strategy to streamline fares and direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit
- \* Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional “insurance fund” to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. (Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.)

I am a daily Caltrain user and weekly VTA light rail and bus user. Including these features is critical to retaining existing transit riders and attracting new ones.

Thank you for your consideration,

John Brazil  
Mountain View, CA 94041

---

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

From: Jesse Cupp

Sent: Saturday, April 01, 2017 1:51 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

I use VTA and Caltrain in conjunction with my bike to get around every day.

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Jesse

Jesse Cupp  
Mountain View, CA 94040

---

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

From: Loring Pfeiffer

Sent: Saturday, April 01, 2017 7:11 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,

Loring Pfeiffer

San Francisco, CA 94110

---

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

From: Virginia Smedberg

Sent: Saturday, April 01, 2017 7:19 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

I truly think that the easier the fare system is among all the Bay Area transit groups, the more riders will use them. I use my Clipper on Caltrain and BART, and have noticed that it could also be used for parking in some areas. I would love to know that I could use it with ease and cost-effectively all over this great Bay Area, and that it would be cost-effective for all the people that SHOULD be riding transit instead of sitting in their cars in rush hours! Also that it would be ready to include any and all NEW transit systems that we develop in the future.

The rest of this letter you'll have read from others, but I wanted to put my personal perspective out to you.

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining is the right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.
- \* Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial

impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Virginia Smedberg  
Palo Alto, CA 94301

---

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

From: Matt Colyer

Sent: Sunday, April 02, 2017 1:25 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares

\* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional “insurance fund” to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Matt Colyer  
Redwood City, CA 94061

---

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

From: Dana Bolstad  
Sent: Sunday, April 02, 2017 5:47 PM  
To: Board Secretary  
Subject: Please consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

I am a resident of San Francisco, and I sold my car in 2013. I now rely on Caltrain to get to work and Muni, BART and ride sharing to get around outside of work.

I understand that the region is updating the Clipper system with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users like myself. I also appreciate that the region is considering ways to improve access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

I realize that fare streamlining is challenging, because you must collaborate across agencies and because agencies are concerned that they might lose incremental revenue. However, I urge you to try. Fare streamlining is the right thing to do. Please direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares.

One way to address concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue is by supporting a regional “insurance fund” to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since trans-bay trips often involve more multiple transit agencies.

Thank you for your consideration,

Dana Bolstad  
San Francisco, CA 94107

---

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

From: Janelle London

Sent: Sunday, April 02, 2017 7:45 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

I'm an occasional transit user. I care about air quality and carbon emissions, and would very much like to use transit more. We're in the Bay Area -- the high tech capital of the world -- which hopefully means the technology is already available to make our transit easy and convenient to use. Here's what I think is necessary to get me and others like me onto transit:

1. Make it seamless. Let me use multiple types of transit systems with one payment method and coordinated schedules.
2. Streamline fares.
3. Increase frequency. Studies have shown that when transit runs every 7 minutes or less, many more people use it.
4. If there's a concern over any one transit agency losing money, put in place an insurance system.

Thank you for your consideration,

Yours truly,  
Janelle London  
Menlo Park, CA 94025

---

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

From: Timothy Bauman

Sent: Sunday, April 02, 2017 8:16 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Timothy Bauman  
Redwood City, CA 94062

---

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

From: Matthew Cleinman

Sent: Sunday, April 02, 2017 11:07 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Clipper 2.0 must include streamlined fares

In reviewing the current Clipper 2 documents, I'm struck by the lack of details on the rider experience. Even more importantly, I believe Clipper 2.0 could be an incredible opportunity to direct our myriad of agencies to work more closely together - And that not doing so is a missed opportunity for our region.

- C2 should incorporate some form of fare policy rationalization throughout the region. We have far more transit agencies than most regions our size, and users can financially penalized when they switch systems. Transfers between systems should not result in paying full fare twice.
- Instead of monthly passes, we should look at fare capping (aka pay-as-you-go), as is being implemented in Portland. When users hit a monthly max, all further rides are free.
- Overall, C2 should work towards more consistent fare policies across our agencies. All together, this would allow for a cheaper-to-implement system, as it would have fewer business rules.
- Clipper 2.0's transactions adding value to a card (including buying online) should be near real-time - within 5 minutes. Taking several business days to add value just isn't good enough.
- Clipper 2.0 should have an open data portal, so outsiders can use our public travel information.

Thanks for your consideration.

Thanks,  
Matt Cleinman  
SF Transit Riders

San Francisco, CA 94110

---

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

From: Elizabeth Megas

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 12:40 AM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Next-generation Clipper feedback

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

Imagine for a moment that you have just arrived by plane from Brazil. English is your third language and your phone doesn't work here yet. You used airport WiFi to learn that to get from SFO to your convention in Santa Clara, you'll need to take BART to Caltrain, to VTA light rail.

Clipper should make this process far easier, but it doesn't yet.

I hope we will streamline and integrate fares across the Bay Area's diverse transit services. I know that's a difficult thing, but it's also an essential thing, for usability, for affordability, and for technical simplicity. It's harder for transit riders on the go to figure out the transitions between the different services.

While I anticipate a move to a mobile phone-based Clipper, I don't think we should eliminate the ability to use a simple, inexpensive card. Phones, however ubiquitous, are not universal. They can run out of battery at inconvenient times. And they may not be a ready option for someone who just arrived from overseas.

For the card as it is now, there is not much to tell a new user which retailers supply it. In Montreal, we got off the plane and purchased a transit card at a vending machine at the airport. In Washington, D.C., the vending machines are in every subway station. Yet I can't buy a Clipper Card at the light rail station, and I can't add fare at most Caltrain stations. (The few machines there are, don't accept cash.)

Please also give some thought to user interface if the fare machines are upgraded. The language should be simple and the steps intuitive. (In D.C., we were fortunate not to arrive at a busy time. A transit employee had to help us select and purchase the right thing from the machine—and we're intelligent folks, capable of reading instructions.)

Give some thought, too, if you upgrade fare machines, to how you might best avoid a "forklift upgrade" later. Can the machines themselves be made flexible enough so that a new option or feature could be "pushed" in software and implemented from a central location, as it is ready to release? That way, the hardware stays put, and the upgrade is seamless.

I'll close with a couple requests based on my personal experience. First, integrating Clipper with Bike Share and bike e-locker services would help make the first and last mile connections a

seamless part of Clipper. (Combined with more widespread availability, it might even reduce the crowds of bikes on transit at peak hours.)

Finally, my employer administers pretax transit benefits through WageWorks. I realize you may have limited interaction with such entities, but they make adding Clipper fare unwieldy. Besides their awful web design, the process can take upwards of a month, and there's a surcharge for adding fare directly to Clipper. For no added cost, they send a special purpose Visa card, which may then be used to add fare, in person, at a fare machine. Isn't this the reason we have computers?

Thank you for your consideration.

Elizabeth Megas  
Santa Clara resident  
Santa Clara, CA 95050

---

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

From: Charles Ruhland

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 5:30 AM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

As a frequent rider of Muni, BART, and AC Transit, I would like to have streamlined fares because (1) they will be much less expensive to implement; (2) they will be simpler for riders to

understand, increasing the the number of inter-regional trips; (3) they will increase overall ridership due to being more fair for those with low incomes.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares

- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares

- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Charles Ruhland  
San Francisco, CA 94117

---

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

From: Leora Tanjuatco

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 9:25 AM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

I use Caltrain every day, and some days I use Clipper on the bus. I'm a loyal customer and I always tell my friends that taking the train is the most fun you can have.

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that

any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare is the streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares

- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares

- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,

Leora Tanjuatco  
San Francisco, CA 94116

---

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

From: Yvonne Kao

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 11:50 AM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update to consider streamlined fares

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

My most-used transit route is from Mountain View to San Francisco. I ride a mix of Caltrain, Bart, and Muni. I would much appreciate a new Clipper system that integrated fares between agencies and recognized transfers from one agency to another.

Unfortunately so far, the plans for updating Clipper have deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Sincerely,

~Yvonne Kao  
Mountain View, CA, CA 94041

---

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

From: Chris Lepe

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 1:18 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

\* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares

\* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares

\* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Chris Lepe  
San Jose, CA 95112

---

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

From: Amanda Staight

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 1:24 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Amanda Staight  
San Francisco

---

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

From: Cat Carter

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:08 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Cat Carter  
San Francisco, CA 94110

---

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

From: Andy Welfle

Sent: Monday, April 03, 2017 2:55 PM

To: Board Secretary

Subject: Please direct Clipper update and Means-Based Fare study to consider streamlined fares

To customize this letter, describe the transit services you use, and the reasons you want to see more seamless and/or more equitable transit fares.

Dear Transit Board Members and Executives,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Unfortunately so far, the Clipper program has deferred consideration of fare streamlining, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based program also recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

I urge you to:

- \* Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
- \* Direct the Clipper 2.0 project to pursue seamless fares
- \* Direct the MTC Means-Based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.

Address the concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop the budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. Regional Measure 3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose, since transbay trips often involve more than one transit agency.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Signature,

Andy Welfle  
San Francisco, CA 94131

---

**From:** Adina Levin

**Sent:** Monday, April 03, 2017 5:40 PM

**To:** MTABoard@sfmta.com; BoardofDirectors@bart.gov; board; Board Secretary;  
boardcomments@actransit.org; DistrictSecretary@goldengate.org; BoardofDirectors@watertransit.org;  
hill@countyconnections.com

**Subject:** Opportunities for more equitable and seamless Bay Area Transit

Honorable board members and staff,

Attached please find a letter with recommendations for more equitable and seamless Bay Area Transit service, with regard to the Clipper 2.0 and MTC Means-Based Fare programs.

Thank you for your consideration,

Adina Levin

Friends of Caltrain

<http://greencaltrain.com>

Chris Lepe

TransForm

<http://transformca.org/>

Thea Selby

San Francisco Transit Riders

<http://sftransitriders.org/>



**FRIENDS  
OF  
CALTRAIN**



Monday April 3, 2017

Attn: Members of SFMTA, BART, VTA, Caltrain, SamTrans, AC Transit, Central Contra Costa County TA, WETA, Golden Gate Transit Authority, and Clipper Executive Board

**Please consider fare streamlining for the Clipper 2.0 and Means-Based Fare programs**

Honorable Board Members,

As you know well, the region is updating the aging and obsolete Clipper system, with a goal to be more adaptable to the needs of transit users and agencies, and to keep up with evolving payment methods and transportation modes. Meanwhile, the region is considering ways to improve equitable access to transit as part of the MTC Means-based Fare study.

Other cities that are currently upgrading their payment systems - including Portland Oregon, and Sydney, Australia - have taken the opportunity to streamline fares across transit services - so riders no longer need to pay extra each time they enter a vehicle with a different color scheme. Seattle, with a similar need to upgrade their Orca Pass, has also set a direction toward streamlining.

Portland and Sydney are implementing “pay as you go pass” systems, with a capped total fare. In addition to being more convenient for everyone, these fare structures provide more equitable access for lower-income riders, since riders don’t need to pay up front for a monthly pass - and the total amount paid per month has a fixed limit.

When the Clipper projects asked technology vendors for advice this past summer, with a Request for Expressions of Interest, the experts replied that the region would get a cheaper, more reliable system if the region streamlined fares first.

But so far, the Clipper project has deferred consideration of seamless fares, because it is a challenge to collaborate across agencies, and because agencies have concerns that any given agency might lose incremental revenue. As a result, the MTC Means-based study recommends against equity solutions involving fare streamlining.

Executives and board members often agree that fare streamlining right thing to do - but have refrained to move forward considering the challenges.

We urge you to:

1. Overcome the inertia and do the right thing - resolve for the region's agencies to work together on a strategy to streamline fares
2. Direct the executives on the Clipper board to pursue seamless fares
3. Direct the MTC means-based fare project to reconsider fare streamlining solutions, as part of a roadmap toward more equitable access to transit.
4. Address concerns that some agencies may lose incremental revenue, by supporting a regional "insurance fund" to backstop budgets of individual agencies that may see financial impacts, even though overall ridership is likely to increase. RM3 may be an appropriate fit for this purpose since transbay trips often involve more than one agency.

Thank you for your consideration,

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain

<http://greencaltrain.com>

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Adina', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Chris Lepe, Transform

<http://transformca.org/>

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading 'Christopher Lepe' in a cursive script.

Thea Selby, San Francisco Transit Riders

<http://sftransitriders.org/>