

From: Baltao, Elaine

Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 4:34 PM

To: VTA Board of Directors

Cc: Childress, Brandi

Subject: VTA Receives Federal Record of Decision for BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension Project

Importance: High

VTA Board of Directors:

Please see email from Brandi Childress, Media and Public Affairs Manager, about the FTA Record of Decision for the VTA's BART Silicon Valley Phase II Project. If you have any questions, please contact Brandi at 408-464-7877.

Thank you.

VTA Board of Directors:

Moments ago, we were notified by FTA that a Record of Decision (ROD) has been issued for the next six miles of VTA's BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension. Receiving the ROD is a required next step for projects seeking federal funding, making this a critical milestone. It signifies that VTA satisfied the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act for the \$4.7 billion project.

The attached press release will be shared with media and posted to our website.

Brandi Childress

Media and Public Affairs Manager

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

3331 North First Street, San Jose, CA 95134

Phone [408-952-4297](tel:408-952-4297)

Mobile [408-464-7877](tel:408-464-7877)



Find us on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [Instagram](#), [YouTube](#) and [LinkedIn](#)



VTA Receives Federal Record of Decision for BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension Project

San Jose, CA – The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) was notified today by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) that a Record of Decision (ROD) has been issued for the next six miles of VTA's BART Silicon Valley Extension into downtown San Jose and Santa Clara (Phase II). Receiving the ROD is a required next step for projects seeking federal funding, making this a critical milestone. It signifies that VTA satisfied the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the \$4.7 billion project.

"This Record of Decision by the FTA puts us in a strong position to secure the final federal funding necessary to extend BART all the way to Downtown San Jose and Santa Clara," said VTA Board Chair Sam Liccardo. "As we come one step closer in our two-decade campaign to complete a ring of rail around the Bay, I'd also like to thank my predecessors – Mayors Ron Gonzales and Chuck Reed – as well as leaders like Carl Guardino at the Silicon Valley Leadership Group who've played instrumental roles in advancing this transformative project for our residents."

As the project sponsor, VTA is applying for \$1.5 billion in FTA New Starts Program funding, completing the Phase II funding plan. VTA has already secured 70% of the funding through two local sales tax measures and a [\\$750 million Senate Bill 1 state grant](#).

The ROD is issued once extensive environmental analysis and public review is completed, which is documented in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS). The FSEIS assessed alternatives considered, public comments made during the draft environmental document phase and responses to those comments, and provides the basis for the decision and measures required to mitigate potentially adverse effects.

Now that a ROD has been issued, VTA will begin the engineering phase of the project and apply for federal funding.

"As an unwavering supporter of the full vision for BART Silicon Valley, I know how critical this milestone is in our efforts to connect the San Francisco Bay Area's three largest cities that are experiencing tremendous growth," said California State Senator Jim Beall. "It is important that we continue to work on the federal support and ensure the project is built on time and on budget."

VTA's BART Silicon Valley Phase II Project is a six-mile, four-station extension that will expand BART operations from Berryessa/North San José through downtown San Jose to the City of Santa Clara. The Phase II Project completes the full 16-mile extension from the Warm Springs/South Fremont Station into Santa Clara County, enhancing regional connectivity linking BART with VTA's light rail and bus network, Amtrak, ACE, Caltrain and Capitol Corridor. It will help reduce regional traffic congestion and spur transit-oriented development around stations, providing increased access to jobs, housing, and education.

Phase II includes an approximately five-mile subway tunnel, three underground stations (Alum Rock/28th Street, Downtown San Jose, Diridon), and one at-grade station (Santa Clara). Construction is planned to start by 2021 with passenger service by 2026, serving a projected 52,000 weekday riders by 2035. Once constructed, the extension will be operated by BART, as part of its regional rail system.

About VTA

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) is an independent special district that provides sustainable, accessible, community-focused transportation options that are innovative, environmentally responsible, and promote the vitality of our region. VTA is responsible for bus, light rail and paratransit operations and also serves as the county's congestion management agency.

###

Contact: Brandi Childress
Brandi.Childress@vta.org
408-464-7810

June 4, 2018

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 5:12 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: June 4, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Monday, June 4, 2018

1. [VTA Ridership Down \(KPIX Ch. 5\)](#)
2. [RM3 Coverage KRON Ch. 4](#)
3. [BART cited 1,300 fare evaders in 2 months. Only about 100 paid up \(San Francisco Chronicle\)](#)
4. [Modernization: How Caltrain Will Meet Growing Demand \(Mass Transit\)](#)

[VTA Ridership Down](#) (KPIX Ch. 5)

(Link to video)

[RM3 Coverage](#) KRON Ch. 4

(Link to video)

[Back to Top](#)

[BART cited 1,300 fare evaders in 2 months. Only about 100 paid up](#) (San Francisco Chronicle)

BART's fledgling effort to crack down on widespread fare evasion has run into a stark problem: People unwilling to pay a few bucks to ride the rails are rarely willing to cough up \$75 when handed a citation.

In March and April, the first two months of ticketing riders who couldn't show they'd paid their fares, a team of transit agency inspectors issued roughly 1,300 citations — but only about 100 of the alleged cheats paid up, officials said.

To critics, the low rate of return is evidence that the [\\$800,000-a-year](#) crackdown on fare scofflaws is a waste of money that would be better spent raising barriers in stations or installing fare gates to make it tough on fare evaders to vault over or squeeze through.

To BART's police union, it's proof that sending civilian inspectors to issue citations is ineffective without the accompaniment of sworn police officers with the power to arrest.

BART officials, meanwhile, say it's too early to make any judgments and insist that the goal of the team of six roving fare inspectors assigned to catch fare cheats is not to make money through citations but to reduce the number of violators.

"We are not in business of writing tickets," said Jim Allison, a BART spokesman. "We want people to buy tickets — to ride."

Citations begin at \$75 for adults and \$55 for juveniles up to age 18 and increase after a second offense, and why so few people pay up is unclear. One possibility is that some of those cited are giving false names or addresses.

When fare evaders are caught, they're asked for identification. Most are able to produce some form of identification, said Lance Haight, BART's deputy police chief. Those who can't are asked to provide their name and current address, which are then checked on the spot via police radio against a database.

Ultimately, fare cheats are given a copy of their citation, including directions on how to pay. They can choose community service, instead, or appeal. Violators have 30 days to act, and BART reminds them of that in letters, some of which are returned because of incorrect postal addresses.

The names of those who don't take care of their citations can be turned over to the state Franchise Tax Board, which can dock any state income returns or state lottery winnings, Haight said.

But that's the extent of BART's collection effort. The transit agency does not turn over non-payers to a private collection agency — yet.

"We're not saying we wouldn't consider it," Haight said. "It could be a remedy we would seek in the future."

The proof-of-payment system is part of a strategy the BART board approved in 2017 after learning that fare cheats are costing the agency as much as [\\$25 million a year](#). It means that about 5 percent of riders aren't paying.

Other facets of the strategy include a campaign reminding riders to pay or be fined. BART has also started "hardening" stations against cheats by building taller barriers around paid areas, reconfiguring elevator entrances to prevent them from being used to avoid fare gates, and controlling some swing gates that act as emergency exits or disabled access so they're tougher for scofflaws to sneak through.

Fare gates are also being designed to make them difficult to breach without paying. And the transit system plans to install additional cameras to monitor gates, count cheaters and help determine the system's most vulnerable areas.

The improvements will come gradually. Meanwhile, the bulk of the war on fare evasion involves enforcement. BART police have always been able to cite fare evaders, but only if they caught them in the act.

The proof-of-payment system, featuring random fare inspections, was the answer. It wasn't a novel idea. Such systems are in place at 34 transit operators around the nation, according to the American Public Transportation Association. They require passengers to carry valid transit tickets, passes, smart cards or transfers, and be prepared to show them.

At BART, the six fare inspectors wear blue, black and white checkered vests, reminiscent of British police, with a large patch on the back identifying them in bold letters. They typically work together, traveling from station to station, spending more time at those with the biggest problems. They also ride trains where they inspect fares.

"Please be ready to show your transit tickets or Clipper cards," inspector Carlos Escobar called out as four of the team gathered on the Civic Center Station platform Thursday morning at the bottom of an escalator. Two other inspectors headed for a nearby elevator.

MORE INFORMATION

BART's fare evasion problem

Starting in 2017, BART took steps to crack down on fare evasion, estimated to cost the transit system \$25 million a year, but the agency isn't done. BART plans to add to its efforts in the fiscal year that begins July 1.

What's under way

Signs that can't be missed have been installed at all station entrances warning that fare evasion is illegal and subject to citation.

Civic Center and Downtown Berkeley stations have replaced 3½-foot walls around their paid areas with 5-foot barriers.

Elevators at South Hayward and Berkeley stations have been enclosed inside paid areas.

Swing gates were controlled and installed with alarms at the 16th Street Mission, 24th Street Mission, Embarcadero, Civic Center and Downtown Berkeley stations.

BART police stepped up enforcement at station entrances, and six fare enforcement officers began conducting random inspections for proof of payment.

What's coming next

Entrance railings or walls will be raised to 5 feet at Embarcadero, Richmond, Daly City and Balboa Park stations.

Elevators will be enclosed in paid areas at El Cerrito del Norte Station, and a fare gate will be created for the Montgomery Station elevator.

Alarms and controls will be installed on swing gates at Montgomery, Powell, Balboa Park, Glen Park and Daly City stations.

Two more fare enforcement officers may be added (pending budget approval), bringing the total to eight, and community service officers will be empowered to conduct fare inspections.

BART police will put more emphasis on fare enforcement and riding trains.

Source: BART

Using handheld scanners, the inspectors who'd staked out the escalator checked the tickets and Clipper cards of each person. The machines beep or buzz and flash a message to inspectors, indicating whether a passenger has legally entered through the fare gate.

Passengers without valid fares are pulled aside, asked for identification and given citations. The first two citations are civil citations, similar to parking tickets. But three or more offenses can result in criminal citations, with fines up to \$250.

During the hour and 15-minute enforcement effort Thursday at the Civic Center Station platform, 17 citations were issued, slightly lower than usual, Haight said, probably because the focus has been on that station, which also has new, harder-to-climb 5-foot walls around its concourse.

Among those cited was Pastia Johnson, 23, of San Francisco, who was on the way to her job in the hospitality industry.

"I don't have either one," she told the inspectors asking for tickets or Clipper cards. One took her aside and wrote her a citation.

As she jumped aboard a train, Johnson said she wasn't offended by the fare inspection process, or the ticket she was now holding in her hand.

"They're doing their jobs, and I didn't pay," she said.

But will she pay the ticket? The train doors closed before she could answer.

Most people approached by fare inspectors, even those given citations, are cooperative, said Sgt. Jaswant Sekhon, who's in charge of the fare inspection team. But some spot the team and head the other way, and others try to push past the inspectors, usually unsuccessfully.

Inspectors are not allowed to chase or apprehend fare evaders, but they'll try to block their path of escape or tell them to stop. They can radio for help from a sworn police officer, but the suspected cheat usually disappears into the crowd or onto a train quickly.

“Sometimes they just walk away,” said Karen Seiler, an inspector. “There’s not much we can do about it.”

The union representing BART’s police officers said the program would work better if the fare checkers were accompanied by a sworn officer able to stop those who would flee inspections or cite those who give false identification.

“I think it’s a start,” said Keith Garcia, union president, “but it needs to be improved upon. I don’t see the current model being efficient. There needs to be a sworn police officer in uniform.”

Three other Bay Area transit agencies — Muni, Caltrain and the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority — use proof-of-payment systems.

Muni relies primarily on civilian fare-enforcement officers, though they sometimes work with San Francisco police officers in crackdowns on specific lines. About 38 percent of the 48,000 citations issued in 2017 were paid.

On Caltrain, conductors, who are not sworn officers, conduct intermittent fare checks, writing 300 to 500 citations a month. Caltrain did not make the percentage of paid citations available.

Santa Clara VTA issued 1,357 citations in 2017, all by sworn law-enforcement officers on its light-rail lines. The citations are handled by Santa Clara County Superior Court, so VTA receives no information on how many are paid — and no revenue when they are.

In Los Angeles, 20 to 30 percent of fare evasion citations, primarily issued by non-sworn officers, are paid, said spokesman Dave Sotero.

BART UNDER SCRUTINY

As for BART, its directors are divided on the efficacy of the proof-of-payment program. The program is due for a six-month review this fall.

Director Joel Keller of Brentwood said he backs the idea of fare enforcement, if only to keep the number of fare evasions from growing. Nick Josefowitz, a San Francisco director, also said he believes it’s necessary.

“BART obviously suffers when people are fare-evading and not paying their fair share,” he said, “but it is also insulting to people who work hard and commute on BART every day, to see people just walking in and out without paying. It’s not a cheap system, and everyone should pay.”

For Debora Allen of Clayton, the low citation-payment rate reinforces her skepticism about the program. From the beginning, she said, she thought the money would be better spent on building walls and barriers to keep cheaters out.

“If we’re giving out tickets and no one is paying and there’s not much consequence,” she said, “it’s not going to have much impact.”

[Back to Top](#)

Modernization: How Caltrain Will Meet Growing Demand (Mass Transit)

San Francisco is the most densely populated county in California and serves as the region's largest job center, bringing in 150,000 employees each day, according to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission. According to a survey of 1,360 cities in 38 countries released earlier this year by Inrix, San Francisco came in as the fifth-most congested city in the world.

The commuter rail line connecting San Francisco to the Silicon Valley is Caltrain, a joint powers authority put together by three counties: San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Francisco. Caltrain runs along the San Francisco Peninsula, through the South Bay to San Jose and Gilroy.

The passenger rail service started when Abraham Lincoln was in office and while it certainly has changed over time, Caltrain Executive Director Jim Hartnett joked it has been put together with Band-Aids to keep it together.

The creation of Caltrain

The San Francisco and San Jose Railroad Company began passenger rail service on the Peninsula in 1863. In the 1990s, San Mateo County, San Francisco County and Santa Clara County came together to talk about acquiring the right-of-way from Southern Pacific to preserve the rail service, which goes through the three counties.

There was a joint powers agreement that established the basic rules of the road, Hartnett explained. It was determined at that time, the rail service shouldn't have its own separate bureaucracy, that it would be managed by another agency. "The agency that was chosen was the San Mateo County Transit District.

"Again, it was so there are not separate bureaucracies, you can leverage people resources and all the other resources necessary to do the business," he explained.

While all the counties worked together to get state monetary support to buy the right-of-way, the three counties together had to make up the difference to purchase it and he said San Mateo County was the only one that came up with its share.

"Had the purchase of the right-of-way not occurred, there wouldn't be any reason for the joint powers agreement and the joint powers authority because we wouldn't have rail service anymore," Hartnett said.

The Caltrain system as it's known today, started in 1992 when the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board took over operation of the train.

Caltrain contracts with the San Mateo County Transit District to manage the commuter rail service. And, the San Mateo County Transit District contracts with a private company, TOSI,

Transit America, to do the day-to-day operations and maintenance of the rail line. Caltrain does not have any of its own employees.

While Hartnett is executive director of the Caltrain commuter rail service, he is employed by the San Mateo County Transit District as its chief executive officer, general manager.

At capacity

In the congested Silicon Valley, Caltrain ridership has been on the rise. “For us, it’s a continual demand for more service,” Hartnett said. “At commuter hours, we’re standing room only. People would like more capacity to not have to stand.”

That change is coming with the Caltrain Modernization (CalMod) Program, a major investment by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board consisting of three major elements: an advanced signal system that includes positive train control, conversion of the propulsion power system from diesel to electric, and the procurement of new electric multiple unit rail vehicles.

Hartnett said electrification could not come at a better time for them. They were going to need a new fleet anyways with the aging of the fleet and it’s better for the environment from them to have an electric fleet.

A key challenge is doing a major \$2 billion upgrade while maintaining existing revenue service, explained John Funghi Executive Officer of the Caltrain Modernization Program (electrification). “Basically we try to minimize impact of the riding public for the 65,000 riders that ride the system every day.

“Most of the work is done during off-peak times, with the bulk of the work being done between 8 at night and 5:30 in the morning. We also do some temporary shutdowns at the weekends.”

Some of the challenges in coordination are things like holding back on a concrete pour or accelerating something else, so that the work can be accomplished within the window.

“It’s fairly complex and involves a lot of folks, a lot of advanced coordination,” he explained. “Track allocation is a big deal for us in order to maintain the overall schedule.”

At one time, Caltrain ran through a bit of a greenfield, but there’s been major development up to the rail line, so oftentimes they’re right in people’s backyards, he explained.

Director of Government & Community Affairs Casey Fromson said that as this project goes along 51 miles with a couple dozen communities, it’s required a very strong outreach process to ensure people know about the work and know about it in advance.

“There’s a lot of coordination with the community about how we’re actually building the infrastructure, in addition to the riders who are very interested in what the experience will be and the service changes that will come with the modernization project,” she said.

They've worked closely with community leaders and elected officials through standing community groups that they meet on a monthly basis to provide updates and they have both physical notices and electronic updates for residents.

Fromson said being committed to an inclusive outreach process has meant investing the time and resources to be where the people are to get good feedback on the project.

Key to this communication is keeping people informed of what they're doing, why there's doing it and what it's going to look like after it's done. Funghi said, "I think communication is a big challenge and if we do it well, it will help with the construction and acceptance of the overall line."

By the Numbers: CalMod Program Cost

Electrification: \$1.98 billion

Advanced Signal System: \$231 million

Total: \$2.21 billion

Electrifying benefits

At the end of April of this year, the California State Transportation Agency announced a \$164.5 million investment from the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, which will support the replacement of Caltrain's diesel fleet, the addition of Wi-Fi onboard the new electric fleet and enhanced bicycle facilities at the Caltrain stations.

The initial Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project had the funds to replace 75 percent of the fleet with electric trains. This funding will allow Caltrain to fully electrify its mainline service between San Francisco and San Jose.

The grant will also provide for the lengthening of boarding platforms at some stations, to accommodate longer, 8-car electric trains.

Once fully electrified, Hartnett said they will have better operating characteristics to stop more, to have longer trainsets and to have more trains.

"Because of the number of stops that we have, it was important to us to have the operating characteristics that we do so that we could run our same routes more quickly," he said. "It gives us the opportunity to have the combination of running the same schedule in terms of number of stops, but it doesn't take you as long, so you can still have some quick service with more stops or you can have the same service, just going more quickly.

"It gives us the opportunity to get people to where they want to go more quickly. It also gives us the opportunity to stop more often so people can get on and off at more places."

The contract for the EMUs is a design-build contract. Hartnett said, "It was a process in terms of here's what we need in terms of characteristics; it's up to them to design it and then build it. "

They're going through the design process right now. They did a strong wave of outreach to get feedback from riders on the design elements, gathering more than 15,000 comments over the last couple years.

While the board was making decisions on larger areas of the trains, such as how many bathrooms there would be on board or what the configuration was going to look like, there was rider involvement for many of the design elements.

"It takes time for these projects to come to full fruition. It's our job to bring them along," Fromson said, but she added, to also temper expectations.

With e-newsletters and a website specific to the CalMod project, people can see the progress that is being made. Fromson said, "They can see the point we're going to be painting the trains in the design that they helped pick." She continued, "They will see it throughout the process over the year it will take to get the trains here, where their decision helped influence our final product."

The public role of the design is largely complete; they've gotten the feedback they needed. Catering to the high-tech riders in the Silicon Valley, later this year Caltrain will roll out a virtual reality simulation of what the trains are going to look like.

"We'll be at stations with cardboard virtual reality headsets," explained Fromson. "People will be able to walk through the train and get the experience that way."

"Frankly, it's a cost-efficient way to getting to a broad group of people and let them experience it, without necessarily spending all the resources on a physical structure."

She added, "We thought it was an exciting way to give people a feel of what the new trains are going to look like."

Dedicated funding

Caltrain does not have its own taxing authority or any dedicated taxes that went into it, so since that time, Hartnett said it has had to be innovative in terms of how it has funded itself. "Over time we have had to have contributions to subsidize the service from each of the three counties as required under the joint powers agreement, and to seek grants ... for capital and other needs."

Over the years, he said the counties have been constrained on what they can contribute on an annual basis, so it's been difficult to keep up on the state of good repair side of things.

"We've had the good fortune on ... how we reinvented ourselves in the early 2000s to restructure the service with the Baby Bullet service, which became much more attractive to the riders," Hartnett said. Since 2004, the ridership has more than doubled without fundamentally changing the service since then.

“We basically have a Baby Bullet service plus some local and limited service,” he said. “We haven’t dramatically changed the number of trains we run, we’re just able to fill people’s needs by how we structure our service ... it’s a service people find reliable, generally speaking economical, and it gets them to where they want to go in a much more timely manner than if they were driving or a much more enjoyable manner than if they were driving. For most, it’s a lot less costly than if they were driving.”

While the farebox recovery is a consistent, dependable revenue source, it’s not enough to cover the full operations and maintenance. The farebox recovery rate is over 70 percent and then with advertising and property they lease along the right of way, he said that gets them to over 75 percent.

“We’re very proud of our farebox recovery but it’s a question of how far you can go in funding your services and the state of good repair from the farebox,” he explained. “We’re going through our budget process again, as we do every year, and we’re looking at whether or not we need to raise fares again.”

The state legislature passed a law in 2017 that would allow the Caltrain joint powers agency board to put a measure on the ballot for a sales tax to support Caltrain. “As is typical in California, because it’s not a general tax, it has to get two thirds support collectively in the three counties,” said Hartnett. “There are actually seven agencies that would have to approve us putting it on the ballot.

“It’s somewhat of an elongated process to get something on the ballot. It requires the three boards of supervisors – that is the Santa Clara County, San Mateo County and San Francisco County to approve – and it requires the three member transit agencies to approve it as well: the Santa Clara County VTA, in San Mateo County it’s the San Mateo Transit District and Muni in San Francisco. Each of their boards would have to approve as well that it’s going on the ballot.

Looking to the future

Caltrain has a business plan underway that is an operational business case study for what they expect by 2040 to be the actual demand, what it would take operationally to meet that demand and what it would take in terms of capital investment to meet that demand. It will also look at what policy decisions would have to be made in order to get there.

“It’s a multi-million dollar study that is a real-world one,” Hartnett explained. “We have regional support for this to take a really good deep dive into both a technical and practical perspective.”

They’re scheduled to have that plan completed by the end of the year and that will set the stage for a regional conversation about what Caltrain will look like. It also will set the stage for a good narrative to support a sales tax on the ballot in 2020.

“The discussions have been oriented to a 2020 ballot for that sales tax,” Hartnett said. “It would be an incredible thing for Caltrain.”

[Back to Top](#)

From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Monday, June 4, 2018 5:41 PM

To: VTA Board of Directors

Subject: FROM VTA: Memorandum from Jim Hartnett, Executive Director, Caltrain, re: Caltrain Service to South County

VTA Board of Directors:

We are forwarding you the following:

From	Topic
Memorandum from Jim Hartnett, Executive Director, Caltrain	Caltrain Service to South County

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





BOARD OF DIRECTORS 2018

JEANNIE BRUINS, CHAIR
GILLIAN GILLET, VICE CHAIR
CHERYL BRINKMAN
CINDY CHAVEZ
DEVORA "DEV" DAVIS
JEFF GEE
DAVE PINE
CHARLES STONE
MONIQUE ZMUDA

JIM HARTNETT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Date: June 1, 2018

To: Nuria Fernandez, General Manager/CEO, Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

From: Jim Hartnett

Nuria,

Thank you for working with Caltrain on the recommendation that VTA provide \$4.3 million dollars in Measure B funds for the purpose of overhauling MP 36 locomotives. This overhaul will augment future Caltrain service capacity for both mainline and South Santa Clara County service.

This item was presented by VTA staff with JPB staff in support at the VTA Administration & Finance Committee meeting on Thursday May 17. The Committee requested that this memo be created for the purpose of: 1) Articulating Caltrain's commitment to the inclusion of South County service as part of the Caltrain Business plan process; and 2) Clarifying the road map for increasing South County service in the future, in part resulting from the completion of the midlife overhauls of the 9 Caltrain locomotives that will remain in service following the completion of the electrification program.

Background

Caltrain is committed to the continued delivery of Caltrain service in South County, and to increasing service throughout the corridor to accommodate continued job and population growth. *See the attached Caltrain system map.* Currently, Caltrain has the right to operate five round trip slots on the Union Pacific owned corridor south of Tamien station in San Jose. Caltrain operated four weekday round trips on the line until 2005, when declining ridership led to the current service level of three round trips.

Recently, VTA and Caltrain staff have discussed the possibility of restoring increased South County service levels. It is our intention to work with South County to find the best solution to increase service in the near future.

Measure B provides the opportunity to provide funding to overhaul the locomotives and operate increased service levels. We do understand that the distribution of funds is contingent on the favorable resolution of pending litigation and would be made to Caltrain on a reimbursement basis.

The Caltrain Business Plan and South County

During VTA's Administration & Finance Committee meeting concerns emerged about how the Caltrain Business Plan will address the need for increased service to South County. The Caltrain Business Plan launched last year, and will be complete in early 2019. The plan includes development of a vision for Caltrain service that would be operated following completion of corridor electrification in 2022. **South**

County service is a critical element of this service vision. To emphasize the importance of South County service to the overall service vision being developed as part of the Business Plan Caltrain has:

1. Encouraged continued South County representation on the Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee
2. Conducted outreach to South County officials including VTA Director Larry Carr and other city-level officials to discuss the Caltrain Business Plan
3. Established the Local Policymaker Group (LPMG) as a key advisory committee for development and completion of the Caltrain Business Plan and expanding its membership to include South County representatives.
4. Expanded membership of the City Staff Coordinating Group (CSCG) to include members from Morgan Hill and Gilroy.

Continued South County representation as a part of the Business Plan process will be critical to forming the appropriate service plan and vision for the entire Caltrain system including service to South County both before and after the Gilroy line is eventually electrified as a part of the California High Speed Rail project.

The Path to Increased South County Service

We understand the desire for increased service. In the near future we will work with VTA and the South County cities to see if schedule adjustments to the current three train schedule are possible to better serve the south county market.

Beyond schedule adjustments, our intention is to explore options for increased service to South County in the near future and to work within the Business Plan and other key projects for long term solutions to increased service to South County.

It bears emphasizing that the consequences of not funding the \$4.3 million to complete the locomotive overhaul would impact the ability for Caltrain to expand service to South County and all other parts of the system. Without the VTA contribution, other Caltrain JPB partners will not contribute their share, leaving a gap in excess of \$12m in the Caltrain capital budget. This gap would be bridged by eliminating the overhauls and other State of Good Repair (SOGR) projects.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.



Jim
Executive Director



From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Tuesday, June 5, 2018 10:16 AM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: VTA Information: Ridership Memo for April 2018

VTA Board of Directors:

Attached is a memorandum from Chief Operating Officer Inez Evans regarding VTA ridership for April 2018.

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



TO: VTA Board of Directors**THROUGH:** Nuria I. Fernandez
General Manager/CEO**FROM:** Inez Evans
Chief Operating Officer**DATE:** June 4, 2018**SUBJECT:** VTA Ridership for April 2018

April 2018 total monthly system ridership for bus and light rail was 3,041,045, a decrease of 1.0% over April 2017. April 2018 had 21 weekdays, one less than April 2017. Core bus route recorded a 1.8% decrease in average weekday ridership. The Local routes recorded a 2.3% decrease in average weekday ridership, while Community bus routes recorded a 9.7% decrease in average weekday ridership. Light Rail recorded a 2.4% increase in average weekday ridership.

There was one major event at the Levi's® Stadium in April 2018, the Monster Jam, that recorded 4,506 riders, an increase of 19% over last year's Monster Jam event.

April 2018 total monthly ridership recorded a 0.3% decrease compared to March 2018. Ridership change from March to April typically averages -3.0%.

Ridership	Apr-2018	Apr-2017	Percent Change	Mar- 2018	Percent Change
Bus	2,317,164	2,355,075	-1.6%	2,347,027	-1.3%
Light Rail	723,881	718,195	0.8%	702,737	3.0%
System	3,041,045	3,073,270	-1.0%	3,049,764	-0.3%

Four key core routes, lines 64, 72, 73 and 522 recorded an overall average weekday ridership improvement of 14.1% over April 2017. Line 522 recorded a 17.0% improvement over April 2017 as shown in the table below:

Route	Apr-2018	Apr-2017	Difference	Percent Change
522	7,109	6,075	1,034	17.0%
73	2,817	2,357	460	19.5%
72	2,818	2,467	351	14.2%
64	3,222	3,093	129	4.2%
Totals	15,966	13,992	1,974	14.1%

50 of the 69 bus routes, or 72%, did not meet the weekday standards as defined in the Service Design Guidelines. The top five core routes and light rail stations that had the most average weekday ridership declines are shown in the table below:

Route	Apr-2018	Apr-2017	Difference	Percent change
22	10,064	11,286	(1,222)	-10.8%
23	6,635	7,089	(454)	- 6.4%
26	2,842	3,073	(231)	- 7.5%
60	1,708	1,933	(225)	-11.6%
55	2,004	2,204	(200)	-9.1%
Totals	23,253	25,585	(2,332)	-9.1%

Station	Apr-2018	Apr-2017	Difference	Percent change
Tasman Station	1,727	1,898	(171)	-9.0%
Great Mall Station	950	1,057	(107)	-10.1%
Ohlone-Chynoweth Station	1,358	1,446	(88)	-6.1%
Cottle Station	382	469	(87)	-18.6%
I-880 Station	291	366	(76)	-20.7%
Totals	4,708	5,236	(528)	-10.1%

The fiscal year-to-date total system ridership for bus and light rail recorded a 4.2% decrease.

Ridership	(Current) Jul'17-Apr'18	(Prior) Jul'16-Apr'17	Percent Change
Bus	23,357,503	24,149,341	-3.3%
Light Rail	7,062,626	7,619,324	-7.3%
System	30,420,129	31,768,665	-4.2%

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Wednesday, June 6, 2018 11:18 AM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: June 6, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Wednesday, June 6, 2018

1. [Bay Area voters OK higher bridge tolls to curb traffic \(San Jose Mercury News\)](#)
2. [Big north San Jose live-work development of offices, shops, homes is proposed \(San Jose Mercury News\)](#)
3. [Council approves 'workforce housing' project \(Palo Alto Online\)](#)

Bay Area voters OK higher bridge tolls to curb traffic (San Jose Mercury News)

Faced with packed freeways and loaded BART cars, Bay Area voters on Tuesday appeared willing to dig into their own pockets to curb traffic congestion as the region continues to add new jobs and residents.

Partial results Tuesday night showed a measure to raise bridge tolls was headed toward victory. If approved, Regional Measure 3 would raise tolls on all seven state-owned bridges by \$3 over six years, not including the Golden Gate, raising an estimated \$4.45 billion over the next decade for capital projects and roughly \$60 million annually to support transit operations. It needs a simple majority across all nine Bay Area counties to pass.

Carl Guardino, the president and CEO of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, which helped spearhead the campaign to bring the toll measure to voters, along with the Bay Area Council and urban planning think tank, SPUR, said he was overjoyed with the partial results.

“Along with housing, traffic is the other twin demon that plagues everyone in the region,” he said. “But it also unites us to find true solutions and this measure is a part of that solution.”

The money from the measure is dedicated to help pay for nearly three dozen transportation projects, including new BART cars so the agency can add capacity by running longer trains, the four-station BART extension to San Jose, a Caltrain extension into downtown San Francisco, new toll lanes on freeways throughout the Bay Area, more frequent ferry service and new boats, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and several interchange improvements, among others.

Roughly 61 percent of the money is dedicated to capital projects to help expand or upgrade public transit, 34.4 percent will go toward highway improvements or other road projects, 1.3

percent is dedicated to supporting transit operations and 3.3 percent will go toward bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Supporters of the measure say the money is badly needed to ease congestion from the anticipated one million jobs that will be added to the Bay Area by 2040 and from the two million new residents those jobs are expected to draw, according to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Bay Area's transportation planning agency. As the region struggles to add housing near jobs, residents are facing longer and longer commutes.

The average Bay Area commuter now spends 64 minutes commuting to work and back each day, up from 56 minutes in 2011, a 14 percent increase. People taking transit spend even more time going to and from work, almost two hours, or an average of 102 minutes.

It's a trend that's all too familiar for Burlingame resident Nanci Nishimura, who used to live in Los Angeles. She sees Bay Area gridlock starting to look a little too close to the home she left in Southern California.

"Something has to be done," she said.

But opponents of the measure — which included the unlikely allies of some progressives and Republicans — say it burdens those who can least afford it.

"It hurts working people who can't afford to live near their jobs and they have to commute, so it'd be better to have some sort of other tax than tolls on bridges," said Linda Roy, 72, a retired college teacher at Evergreen Valley College. "I'm retired so it doesn't matter to me personally, but I don't think it's good for the (region) either."

Mountain View Mayor Lenny Siegel agreed. He's hoping his city will approve a ballot measure this year that would tax large employers to help fund transportation projects in his city.

"Some day voters will wake up," he said. "The entities with all the money should pay their share."

Others, including Congressman Mark DeSaulnier, D-Concord, have taken issue with the mix of projects proposed, equating them to a grab-bag for politicians' pet projects that won't put a dent into easing the region's commuting woes. The MTC supplied the legislature with an initial mix of projects, largely based on Plan Bay Area 2040, a regional planning roadmap updated every five years. But, in some cases, state senators and representatives added projects or changed the funding amounts of others.

"That's one thing we need to change," DeSaulnier said, adding those types of decisions should be "engineering first and politics, second."

"We should always be trying to do better," he said.

But with pressure mounting from rising rents and longer commutes, Oakland resident Judith Shahvar, who supported the measure, said something had to be done now, even if it isn't the final solution.

"It's gotta happen one way or the other," she said. "I just want to do anything I can."

[Back to top](#)

Big north San Jose live-work development of offices, shops, homes is proposed **(San Jose Mercury News)**

A big mixed-use development is being eyed in north San Jose, an ambitious project that developers tout as a live-work complex of offices, homes and retail that could help ease the region's traffic woes.

Sand Hill Property, the developer and owner of the project site, has requested a preliminary review of a proposal for 505,000 square feet of offices, 800 residential units and 13,000 square feet of retail on 9.3 acres at the southwest corner of North First Street and Orchard Parkway in San Jose.

"We are looking at a jobs-housing balance with this project," said Steve Lynch, director of planning and entitlement with Palo Alto-based Sand Hill Property. "This is a significant site right on the light rail line."

The proposal is in the very preliminary stages and is being floated as a way for Sand Hill and San Jose city officials to consider what sort of project would work at that location. The early stage review is occurring amid a wide-ranging effort by San Jose to establish guidelines for future development in the area.

North First Street is a heavily traveled route whose main transit is a light rail line and whose primary businesses are a diverse array of tech companies.

"What Sand Hill is talking about is a mix of offices and residential, with some retail along North First Street," said Patrick Kelly, a supervising planner with the city of San Jose. "It would be a transit employment center."

Although considerable review of the proposal is still needed even in this preliminary stage, it's possible this type of development conforms with the sorts of projects San Jose officials envision in the area, Kelly said.

"We don't want to upset the apple cart and we want to work with the city on this," Lynch said. "What the city is trying to do is bring more jobs to North First Street."

Sand Hill's proposal could bolster such efforts. Using some commonly accepted employment ratios, the office buildings in the development could accommodate 2,000 to 2,500 workers.

"What we are talking about here is a middle-urban live-work environment," Lynch said. "The residences would be workforce housing."

San Jose, the Bay Area's largest city, is battling to add jobs at a faster pace than it gains residents. For decades, San Jose has emerged as the bedroom community for cities such as Menlo Park, Palo Alto, Cupertino, Mountain View and Sunnyvale that have raced to embrace more tech jobs, but have sauntered to build housing to accommodate the increasing squadrons of workers in their cities.

The unbalanced employment and housing dynamic has shoved a fast-expanding Silicon Valley workforce into brutal commutes that can grind on for hours in each direction. Plus, tech titans such as Google, Apple, Facebook and Amazon, through combinations of office leases and property purchases, have been adding huge new sites for their operations.

San Jose is attempting to encourage more villages that contain offices, homes and retail in the same development — and near current or future significant transit hubs or stops — as a way to ease people out of their cars and to offer workplaces near their homes.

One such ambitious effort is Google's transit-oriented community proposed for downtown San Jose's Diridon Station area, where 15,000 to 20,000 of the search giant's employees could work in a transit-oriented community that would also include residences, shops, restaurants and open spaces.

With its North First Street and Orchard Parkway project, Sand Hill Property hopes to place the jobs in the development as close as possible to on-site housing. This way the project could offer both residents and workers direct access to a speedy light rail system, Lynch said.

"This could be a new model for development going forward," Lynch said.

[Back to top](#)

[Council approves 'workforce housing' project](#) (Palo Alto Online)

Few projects reflect Palo Alto's hopes and fears like the 57-apartment development that the City Council approved early Tuesday morning for the traffic-congested corner of Page Mill Road and El Camino Real.

Supporters used words like "workforce housing" and "car-light" to describe the Windy Hill Property Ventures project at [2755 El Camino Real](#), which secured a 7-2 vote, with Council members Karen Holman and Lydia Kou dissenting. With the building's central location and apartments averaging 526 square feet each, proponents see it as the perfect project to address the "missing middle" class -- employees and residents who make too much money to qualify for traditional below-market-rate housing but not enough to afford the city's sky-high market rates.

By giving each resident a suite of incentives to avoid driving -- including public transit passes, bike amenities and an on-site trip coordinator -- the project also represents a critical test case in Palo Alto's much-touted pivot toward "transit-oriented development."

Councilman Adrian Fine, who made the motion to approve the development, called the development "exactly what we've been asking for and exactly the kind of units we need in Palo Alto."

Critics, on the other hand, charge that the apartments -- for all their merits -- are hardly the kind of "affordable housing" that council members have often talked about. Twelve units will be earmarked for individuals who make between 140 and 150 percent of the area's median income, or \$115,800 to \$124,000 for an individual. The rest will be sold at market rate, with preference given to those buyers who work or live within 3 miles of the property. Holman observed during the council's long discussion that \$3,000 rent for a studio apartment is hardly affordable.

She also questioned whether Windy Hill would really target the local workforce -- a concern shared by some of her colleagues. The city's agreement with Windy Hill requires the developer to give preference but city staff have yet to work out a regulatory agreement to make sure this provision is enforced.

Tod Spieker Jr. of Windy Hill tried to alleviate these concerns by noting that the project will submit annual reports to the city about the building's tenants to ensure compliance. It will also allow the city to conduct compliance audits.

"The goal of the whole project -- the location, the size of the units, the TDM (transportation-demand management) program -- is premised on getting people to live where they work," Spieker said. "That's the goal of the whole thing."

Holman suggested that the regulatory agreement return to the council for approval, but her proposal fell by a 4-5 vote, with Kou, Vice Mayor Eric Filseth and Councilman Tom DuBois joining her.

For the council majority -- as well as for most of the speakers who opined on the development - the project represented a rare victory on the housing front. The council [adopted a goal](#) earlier this year of producing 300 housing units per year between now and 2030, consistent with the aim of the city's newly approved [Comprehensive Plan](#). This is the first significant project approved this year.

Eric Rosenblum, a former planning commissioner who co-founded the citizens group Palo Alto Forward, was one of more than a dozen public speakers who urged the council to approve the development. Rosenblum noted that the council often talks about housing being a "top priority" but then criticizes actual projects for being too big or too small, or for being located in neighborhoods where the transitions are awkward.

"It's time for us to put our money where our mouth is," Rosenblum said.

For some council members and residents, zoning was the chief problem. The property is zoned as "public facility," which -- as the name suggests -- is earmarked for public buildings and municipal amenities. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority had used it as a parking lot before selling it to a private developer.

In approving the project, the council rezoned the site to create the new "workforce housing combining district," which allows higher building density and relaxed parking standards for projects within half a mile of railroad stations (in this case, the California Avenue Caltrain station).

Even some supporters of the project, including Vice Mayor Eric Filseth, expressed reservations about rezoning a "public-benefit" parcel for a different use. Resident Becky Sanders, who took it a step further, called the rezoning proposal "legalized theft of a public-benefit property." She suggested that given the zone change, the project should be required to provide 100 percent below-market-rate housing. If Windy Hill can't do that, the city should find another developer who would.

Kou shared this concern and called the proposal "a customized ordinance to benefit one property."

"We have a responsibility to the city," she said; but instead, "everything is being rushed through to make something happen that might not benefit the city."

She also took issue with the very idea of "workforce housing."

"Are you saying retired people will not live there? Will those people not be considered, if they can pay the rent? Are we discriminating now?" Kou asked.

But most of her colleagues agreed that while the issues surrounding the "public facility" zone merit further consideration, this particular project is laudable and merited support. Windy Hill has already gone through two years of public hearings and has modified the project repeatedly to address concerns. Revisions include lowering the number of proposed units from 60 to 57

(with 40 studios and 17 one-bedroom apartments), decreasing the project's floor-area ratio, increasing parking from 45 to 68 stalls and adding space for guest parking and for deliveries.

Mayor Liz Kniss lauded the project as "good housing." Fine, one of the council's leading housing advocates, called the redevelopment of the parking lot with much-needed housing "a win for the city."

"If we're not going to do this kind of housing, we should not do any housing," Fine said. "We should remove it from our priorities and stop talking about it."

[Back to top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Tuesday, June 5, 2018 12:54 PM

To: VTA Board of Directors

Subject: Letter from select Board Members re: improved publication lead time for board agenda and staff reports

VTA Board of Directors:

Attached is a letter addressed to the VTA Board of Directors from Board Chair Liccardo, Vice-Chair O'Neill, and Directors Khamis, Jones, and Vaidhyanathan regarding improved publication lead time for board agenda and staff reports.

Board Secretary's Office

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

3331 North First Street, Building B

San Jose, CA 95134-1927

Phone **408-321-5680**

board.secretary@vta.org



DATE: June 1, 2018

TO: Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority Board of Directors

FROM: Chair Liccardo, Vice-Chair O'Neill, and Directors Khamis, Jones, and Vaidhyathan

SUBJECT: Improved Publication Lead-Time for Board Agendas and Staff Reports

In 2007, then-Director Reed recommended multiple open government initiatives, the first being *"Require staff recommendations on policy matters be published and made available to the Board or committees not less than 10 days before the meeting."*

Ultimately the Board did not adopt the recommendation, as they were advised by VTA staff that providing a 10-day notice prior to standing committee and/or Board of Directors meetings would result in unnecessary delays.

However, given the complexity of issues and projects considered by the Board, often with multimillion-dollar price tags attached to them, we feel that standard VTA staff practices do not provide sufficient time for proper review and preparation. Therefore, we request that the VTA Board **adopt a standard for posting Board agendas and staff reports no later than seven (7) business days prior to all Board of Directors meetings.**

Currently, the VTA's open government policy does not state a number of days that the agenda must be posted prior to a Board of Directors meeting. The staff presently follow the minimum Brown Act requirement of 72 hours. To VTA's credit, they have a standard practice of posting Board agendas roughly six calendar days ahead of meetings. However, that frequently does not include all staff reports. In practice, the Board agenda typically gets posted the Friday before a Thursday Board Meeting. Given busy schedules and other responsibilities of the Board; such as weekly City Council meetings these agendas are not viewed until Monday morning. That leaves Monday through Wednesday to read, review, check in with VTA staff and the staff of our respective agencies, and prepare for Thursday's Board Meeting. It also provides the public with less time to engage with the reports and with VTA or Directors on the topics at hand.

Adopting a seven-business-day standard for posting of agendas will result in better-informed, more well-prepared Directors, allow for staff to better engage with interested parties and stakeholders, and provide the residents of Santa Clara County greater transparency and notice. This will also allow stakeholders and members of the public to attend meetings where items of interest will be discussed, engage with staff or Board Members, and provide helpful feedback.

cc: Nuria Fernandez, General Manager
Jim Lawson, Director of Government Affairs

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Tuesday, June 5, 2018 1:55 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: June 5, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Tuesday, June 5, 2018

1. [San Jose's subway gets environmental approval, invitation to federal funding \(Silicon Valley Business Journal\)](#)
2. [SCVTA receives ROD for Phase 2 of BART extension \(RT&S\)](#)
3. [Santa Clara VTA unveils 2017 sustainability report \(Progressive Railroading\)](#)
4. [On the Eve of Measure 3, a Poll Asking What People Might Pay to Make Traffic Go Away \(KQED\)](#)
5. [RM3 Broadcast Coverage](#)

San Jose's subway gets environmental approval, invitation to federal funding (Silicon Valley Business Journal)

The Valley Transportation Authority has received official word from Washington that it may apply for the last piece of the funding mix for San Jose's BART subway.

VTA spokesperson [Brandi Childress](#) said Monday that the federal "record of decision," or ROD, for the subway beneath Santa Clara Street from the yet-to-open BART station in Berryessa to Diridon Station downtown and then north to Santa Clara is, in effect, an invitation to apply for \$1.5 billion from the Federal Transit Administration's New Starts program.

"It's the last piece that we need for the funding strategy that we have," she said.

The other 70 percent of the \$4.7 billion project will be funded by two sales tax measures already approved by Santa Clara County voters and a \$750 million grant from the state funded by increased gas taxes under last year's Senate Bill 1.

There has been concern that the Trump Administration could end or severely restrict New Starts grants, based on public statements and its budget proposal earlier this year. Congress, however, has been more supportive of transportation funding. Alarms were also raised in 2017 when California's Republican congressional delegation blocked a similar New Starts grant for its electrification project for five months.

State Sen. [Jim Beall](#) of Campbell referred to this lingering uncertainty in a statement included in VTA's press release saying, "It is important that we continued to work on the federal support and ensure the project is built on time and on budget."

The project timeline sets the beginning of construction in the second half of 2020, when a final funding agreement is expected. Construction is expected to take about four years followed by two years of testing before service begins in 2026.

Officially, the federal ROD certifies the three-volume environmental filing called an SEIS/SEIR, which includes the transportation authority's plan to build the first single-bore rail transit tunnel in the United States, a construction method it researched and worked with BART for more than two years to agree on.

The environmental filing anticipates 52,000 daily riders by 2035, more than half using the downtown station to be built beneath Santa Clara between Market and Third streets.

The ROD will allow final engineering of the subway, which will include three underground stations in San Jose and an at-grade terminal in Santa Clara adjacent to that city's Caltrain station.

The subway is the last six miles of a two-stage BART extension from its previous terminus at Fremont. Construction of Phase I has been completed to Berryessa in San Jose and testing has been underway for about a year.

[Back to Top](#)

[SCVTA receives ROD for Phase 2 of BART extension \(RT&S\)](#)

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) notified the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (SCVTA) on June 4 that a Record of Decision (ROD) has been issued for the next six miles of the transportation authority's Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) Silicon Valley Extension.

The extension will span into the downtown San Jose and Santa Clara, Calif., areas in its second phase.

Receiving the ROD is a required step for projects seeking federal funding and marks a critical milestone for the project, SCVTA said. The transportation authority has satisfied the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the \$4.7 billion project, a statement explained.

"This Record of Decision by the FTA puts us in a strong position to secure the final federal funding necessary to extend BART all the way to Downtown San Jose and Santa Clara," said SCVTA Board Chair Sam Liccardo. "As we come one step closer in our two-decade campaign to complete a ring of rail around the Bay, I'd also like to thank my predecessors — Mayors Ron Gonzales and Chuck Reed — as well as leaders like Carl Guardino at the Silicon Valley

Leadership Group who've played instrumental roles in advancing this transformative project for our residents."

As the project sponsor, SCVTA plans to apply for \$1.5 billion in FTA New Starts Program funding in order to complete the project's Phase 2 funding plan.

The transportation authority has secured 70 percent of the funding so far, utilizing two local sales tax measures and a \$750 million Senate Bill 1 state grant.

The ROD is issued after the completion of an extensive environmental analysis and public review, as documented in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS).

Following the issuance of the ROD, SCTA will now launch the engineering phase of the project and apply for federal funding, officials said.

"As an unwavering supporter of the full vision for BART Silicon Valley, I know how critical this milestone is in our efforts to connect the San Francisco Bay Area's three largest cities that are experiencing tremendous growth," said California State Sen. Jim Beall. "It is important that we continue to work on the federal support and ensure the project is built on time and on budget."

The BART Silicon Valley Phase 2 Project is a six-mile, four-station extension intended to expand BART operations from Berryessa/North San José through downtown San Jose to Santa Clara.

Phase 2 of the project will complete the full 16-mile extension from the Warm Springs/South Fremont Station into Santa Clara County, and improve regional connectivity with BART and SCVTA's light-rail network, Amtrak, Altamont Corridor Express, Caltrain and Capitol Corridor.

The project's second phase includes a roughly five-mile subway tunnel, three underground stations and one at-grade station.

Construction is planned to begin by 2021, with passenger service set to launch by 2026. SCVTA expects the service to reach a projected 52,000 weekday riders by 2035. After it is built, the extension will be operated by BART and function as part of its regional rail system.

[Back to Top](#)

[Santa Clara VTA unveils 2017 sustainability report](#) **(Progressive Railroading)**

The [Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority](#) (VTA) has released a [report](#) that charts the agency's sustainability efforts in 2017.

Last year, the agency used 4 percent less traction power energy for its light-rail system, registered a 2 percent decrease in greenhouse gas emissions and a 13 percent reduction in waste, the report states.

The agency also logged an 11.5 percent increase in electricity usage at its facilities, as well as an

11 percent increase in natural gas use.

Going forward, VTA will continue to replace light fixtures with LEDs and install bus shelters that use solar power for lighting and advertising. The agency also aims to increase ridership by making service more accessible for pedestrians and bicyclists.

"I am particularly excited about VTA's future as we introduce various additions to public transit to proactively reduce the consumption of natural resources, minimizing the creation of greenhouse gases to help protect the environment for future generations," wrote VTA General Manager and Chief Executive Officer Nuria Fernandez in the report's introduction.

For example, [Bay Area Rapid Transit's planned Silicon Valley extension](#) will provide an alternative to driving for "tens of thousands" in the San Francisco Bay Area, said Fernandez. VTA is overseeing construction for that project.

[In 2016](#), the American Public Transportation Association awarded VTA with gold level recognition for its sustainability efforts.

[Back to Top](#)

[On the Eve of Measure 3, a Poll Asking What People Might Pay to Make Traffic Go Away \(KQED\)](#)

A new poll released by one of the chief proponents for the Bay Area bridge toll increase says that voters are so sick of traffic congestion they're willing to pay more -- maybe a lot more -- to fix it.

The Bay Area Council poll on transportation issues reported, unsurprisingly, that nearly two-thirds of the 1,000 registered voters surveyed thought it had gotten harder to travel around the region in the past year.

Pollsters presented voters with a scenario and a question: "Imagine that you could pay to eliminate traffic from your daily commute or daily routine. How much, if anything, would you pay per day to eliminate traffic entirely?"

"Eliminate traffic entirely"? Huh. That seems like a fantasy. But what did the people say?

The poll found that 73 percent would pay something to make traffic -- and I'm assuming here that most people mean "other drivers" or "anyone who slows down in front of me" -- go away.

Some 34 percent of respondents suggested they'd pay \$6 or more to get congestion out of their lives. Some 4 percent of respondents -- probably the people in my East Bay flatlands neighborhood spending \$1.5 million and up for two-bedroom bungalows -- expressed a willingness to pay \$51 or more for a traffic-free existence.

Jim Wunderman, president and CEO of the Bay Area Council, said that given the Bay Area's long history of passing "self-help" tax measures to fund the region's large-scale transportation needs, he didn't find the readiness to pay something to ease the pain of gridlock too surprising.

"People in the Bay Area -- they know a problem when they see it, and they're willing to pay more in order to fix that problem," Wunderman said in an interview Monday.

That's a belief that will be put to the test as voters cast ballots on Regional Measure 3, [the bridge toll proposal](#) that voters have been casting ballots on for the past month. The measure would increase tolls on the region's seven state-owned bridges to raise \$4.5 billion over the next 25 years for three dozen major transit and highway investment. Tolls would go up in three \$1 steps, with automotive tolls on most bridges reaching \$8 on Jan. 1, 2025; the top toll on the Bay Bridge would be \$9, charged during weekday commute hours.

The Bay Area Council -- a business and development policy group that includes most of the region's major companies as well as some transit agencies, local utilities, universities and media companies (though not KQED) -- is an architect and major backer of the proposal.

Wunderman said that although Regional Measure 3 has drawn support from hundreds of local elected officials, from major newspapers and transportation advocates, the vote could be close.

"I think the measure passes muster with the people who think about transportation policy," Wunderman said. "The voters are another question. As I voted, you get to this thing on the ballot called Regional Measure 3. If you're not prepared for it and you haven't heard much about it, what you see is that it's an increase in the bridge tolls, and people are reluctant. So I don't think it's a big winner. ... How will people vote? I hope wisdom proves in our favor. We'll see."

Among the poll's other findings:

- 68 percent of those surveyed said their primary mode of transportation was driving alone. The next two highest modes: 8 percent said they carpool, and 7 percent said they take BART.
- 66 percent of respondents said they believe government and public agencies should play the lead role in improving traffic and transportation in the Bay Area.
- 42 percent said housing, including cost and affordability issues, was their top concern. Traffic and congestion came in second, with 18 percent.

[Back to Top](#)

RM3 Broadcast Coverage

[KTVU Ch.2](#)

[KPIX Ch. 5](#)

[ABC 7](#)