

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Monday, June 18, 2018 11:45 AM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: VTA Notice of Cancellation - June 22, 2018 Board of Director's Meeting
Importance: High

VTA Board of Directors:

The Board of Director's meeting scheduled for Friday, June 22, 2018, at 9:00 a.m. has been **CANCELLED**.

Please click on this [Link](#) to view the Notice of Cancellation.

The next regular meeting of the Board of Directors is scheduled for August 2, 2018, at 5:30 p.m.

Thank you.

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

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2018 3:38 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: June 20, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Wednesday, June 20, 2018

1. [Big changes eyed near Five Wounds church, San Jose BART site \(Mercury News\)](#)
2. [Borenstein: MTC considers risky scheme to reduce pension debt \(Mercury News\)](#)
3. [Are dockless scooters and bikesharing the future of transit? \(Silicon Valley Business journal\)](#)

Big changes eyed near Five Wounds church, San Jose BART site (Mercury News)

A transit village may sprout near a future BART station east of downtown San Jose at a site that would be just two train stops away from a big development being fashioned by tech titan Google.

The proposal calls for hundreds of new residential units as well as retail at the 2.8-acre site, within walking distance of the BART stop planned near the intersection of North 28th and East Santa Clara streets.

“This sort of project is exactly what is being planned when people talk about a transit-oriented development,” said Scott Knies, executive director of the downtown San Jose Association.

“Look at what is happening around the Berryessa BART station. The next station up the line is the 28th Street Five Wounds BART stop.”

ADVERTISING

An estimated 332 residential units and slightly more than 13,000 square feet of retail would be built as part of the project near the 28th Street and Santa Clara BART station, according to plans on file with city staffers.

“This is a great infill site,” said Bob Staedler, principal executive with Silicon Valley Synergy, a land-use and planning consultancy. “The people in this community are YIMBYs.” YIMBY stands for “yes in my backyard,” a development-friendly stance that differs from a slow- or no-growth NIMBY, or “not in my backyard,” philosophy.

The location, via BART, would be less than an hour away from downtown Oakland, slightly more than an hour from San Francisco's busy Financial District, and just one stop away from a proposed downtown San Jose BART station and two stops from a future BART stop at the Diridon train station.

Diridon Station is also next to a transit-oriented community on the western edges of downtown San Jose that's been proposed by Google, which plans a mixed-use village of offices, homes, retail, restaurants and open spaces that would eventually accommodate 15,000 to 20,000 of the search giant's employees.

"You will see more proposals coming in like what is planned for the Five Wounds village location," Knies said. "This is exactly what is expected to happen with this kind of transit infrastructure."

When the BART station near 28th and Santa Clara streets is complete, riders will walk through a town square that would be part of the transit stop.

The 1325 E. Julian property, at present, is owned by a San Jose-based partnership, according to Santa Clara County assessment records. The city planning files, though, didn't indicate whether the current owners also intend to develop the proposed transit village. The proposal could be revised, since the plans are in very preliminary stage.

"The challenge is to develop this in a thoughtful manner and get community support," Knies said. "The Five Wounds Church area is a great neighborhood."

[Back to Top](#)

[Borenstein: MTC considers risky scheme to reduce pension debt \(Mercury News\)](#)

To pay CalPERS, "What you're suggesting is that we take out a loan on our credit card and invest in the stock market."

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission will be asked soon to consider a risky borrowing-and-investment scheme to try to reduce its employee pension debt.

The problem is that there are no magic bullets for covering the ever-increasing retirement payments. And, unfortunately, some government officials never learn from the mistakes of the past.

Brian Mayhew, the transportation agency's chief financial officer, told the commission last week that he's working on a plan to issue bonds and turn the proceeds over to CalPERS to invest.

Fortunately, at least one commissioner, Nick Josefowitz, who is also a BART director, understands exactly how bad an idea this is.

“To me, this is like if you get behind on your mortgage,” he told Mayhew. “What you’re suggesting is that we take out a loan on our credit card and invest in the stock market.”

Although the borrowing would not be at credit-card interest rates, Josefowitz’s analogy is otherwise spot on. The commission would borrow money so it could gamble on stock, real estate and other investments.

The profit would then be used to reduce the transportation agency’s pension debt, which at last count is about \$43.6 million. Because of payments on that liability and other rising costs, MTC’s annual payments to the California Public Employees’ Retirement System are projected to increase 43 percent over the next four years.

The transportation agency is not unique. Most local government agencies whose pensions are also administered by CalPERS, the nation’s largest retirement system, are badly underfunded and face similar payment increases.

What makes MTC’s proposed response especially egregious is that the commission should be leading by fiscally prudent example. After all, MTC administers most of the transportation funding for the Bay Area, including the tolls that voters just agreed to increase for the region’s state-owned toll bridges.

However, the scheme Mayhew floated last week would be a gamble with public money. Mayhew is still working out the details, but the basic concept has been tried elsewhere — often unsuccessfully.

He proposes that the agency borrow money over a 10- to 15-year period, and envisions that the interest rate on the bonds would be roughly half what CalPERS could earn investing the money.

But the spread depends on the cost of the bonds and how successful CalPERS is with its investments. The pension system is notorious for its overly rosy investment forecasts, which is one of the big reasons local governments face large pension debts.

CalPERS continues to insist it will earn 7 percent returns on investments even though its chief investment officer and outside investment advisers forecast only 6.1 percent annual returns for the next decade.

If CalPERS could guarantee the 7 percent return, Mayhew’s plan would make sense. But it can’t — and it won’t. And if the pension system investment returns fail to cover the cost of the MTC-issued bonds, the transportation commission would be stuck holding the bag.

The success of the scheme depends greatly on timing, whether the commission invests the bond proceeds as the economy is going up or as it’s on the decline.

The problem, of course, is that we don’t know when the next recession will hit. What we do know is that the economy is in the ninth year of one of the longest expansions in modern

history. We are overdue for a downturn. This is probably not the best time to invest large sums of public funds.

The sort of borrowing Mayhew proposes is commonly referred to as a pension obligation bond — although he insists, incorrectly, that that's not what he's pushing.

John Bartel, an actuary who advises local governments in California, has analyzed pension obligation bond proposals for three agencies in the past two years.

"Every time we've done an analysis," he said, "our clients have come to the conclusion that the risk is not worth the potential reward."

According to academics at the Center for Retirement Research at Boston College, agencies that borrowed and invested before the Great Recession found themselves deeply underwater in 2009 and had only barely broken even by 2014.

That's in large part why Josefowitz last week urged his transportation commission colleagues to reject pension obligation bonds even before Mayhew formally proposed them.

"Sometimes if you get behind on your mortgage, you just need to put more money aside," he said. "There's no fancy financial footwork which is going to get you out of a large obligation."

[Back to Top](#)

[Are dockless scooters and bikesharing the future of transit? \(Silicon Valley Business journal\)](#)

Dockless electric scooters and bicycles seem to be everywhere now, zooming along the streets, bike lines and sidewalks of San Jose and other big cities. One of the startups, Bird, broke startup records when it came to reaching unicorn status, earning the distinction in just six months. But a rapid ascent to a billion-dollar valuation is no guarantee of success, especially as some cities are already banning or cracking down on the scooters, which some critics say can be dangerous and clutter up public areas.

Top of Form

Are dockless scooters and bikesharing the future of transit?

Yes — Dockless scooters and sharable personal transit are the next big things and a great way to get around cities.

No — They're dangerous, clutter up sidewalks, or are otherwise not a viable mode of transit for most people

Maybe — It's still early, so we'll need to wait and see

I don't know.

Vote **Bottom of Form**

[Back to Top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Thursday, June 21, 2018 4:07 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: June 21, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Thursday, June 21, 2018

1. [Bay Area: What happens if the gas tax is repealed? \(Mercury News\)](#)
2. [Letter: San Jose pedestrians have too much freedom already \(The Mercury News\)](#)
3. [A solution to Silicon Valley traffic jams — a 24-hour workweek \(San Francisco Chronicle\)](#)

Bay Area: What happens if the gas tax is repealed? (Mercury News)

From Oakland to San Jose, pavement crews are already at work repairing roads and tackling long-deferred maintenance of city streets. Caltrans contractors earlier this month started grinding and repaving a [104-mile swath of Interstate 880](#) in the East Bay, a freeway one commuter called “the crappiest in all of California.”

All that work is partially funded from the state’s [new gas taxes and registration fees](#), which will generate more than \$3.1 billion for Bay Area highway repairs and public transit upgrades over the next several years, along with nearly \$496 million cities and counties are slated to receive this year to repair local streets.

But now, with the release of a *Los Angeles Times* and USC [poll](#) last month showing more than half of California voters would repeal those taxes and fees, it’s looking more likely that many of the newly funded projects are at risk of being delayed or eliminated.

Crews from O’Grady Paving, Inc. contractors with the city of San Jose repair patches on Willow Street west of Lincoln Avenue in the Willow Glen area of San Jose, Calif., on Wednesday, May 30, 2018. There are over \$3 billion in transportation projects like this one in the Bay Area alone that were funded the new state gas tax and registration fees — half of which could be eliminated, deferred or delayed if voters decide to repeal the measure. (Laura A. Oda/Bay Area News Group)

One state senator, Josh Newman, D-Fullerton, has already felt the wrath of constituents who voted this month to boot him out of office over his support for the measure, called [Senate Bill 1](#) (SB1), electing Republican Ling Ling Chang in his place.

The same coalition that led the charge against Newman submitted [963,905 signatures](#) in April to put the SB1 repeal on the November ballot and amend the state constitution to ensure any future gas or diesel taxes, along with certain transportation fee increases, must first come before voters. The measure is expected to be certified for the ballot next week.

If it's successful, roughly half of the recently-approved highway improvements and public transit projects in California could lose funding in a battle that's shaping up as [major statewide campaign](#) issue. Cities and counties would also see their newly-approved funding for road repairs slashed by half. Republican gubernatorial candidate John Cox has already [sparred with Democrats](#) who support the measure.

Media and BART officials board the new BART train car at the unveiling on Wednesday, April 6, 2016 at BART's testing facility in Hayward, Calif. Money from the new gas taxes and fees will help the transit agency purchase more new cars so it can add passenger capacity. It'll also help the agency reconstruct its train control system, that will enable BART to increase the frequency of trains through the Transbay Tube. (File photo by Laura A. Oda/Bay Area News Group)

Among the Bay Area projects at risk are \$730 million to help extend BART to San Jose, \$318.6 million for BART to buy new train cars and carry more passengers by running longer trains, \$233 million for toll lanes on Highway 101, \$164 million to help electrify Caltrain, \$150 million for more AC Transit buses, and \$67.5 million in pedestrian and bicycle improvements. Just which projects will continue and which will be delayed depends in part on how far along they are if and when the new taxes and fees are repealed, said Melissa Figueroa, a spokeswoman for the California State Transportation Agency, or CalSTA.

"Projects that are already well into construction would most likely be funded through completion – Caltrans would not leave projects under way half done, for safety reasons," she said. "However, future projects would be delayed or deleted."

Senate Bill 1, which was enacted last November, added 12 cents to the [price of a gallon of gasoline](#) and 18 cents to a gallon of diesel fuel. It also raised registration fees, starting last January, by \$25 for vehicles valued at under \$5,000, \$50 for vehicles between \$5,000 and \$25,000 and up to \$175 more for the highest-end luxury cars. Starting in 2020, the state will also add \$100 to the cost of registering electric vehicles. Together, the new taxes and fees are expected to generate \$5.2 billion annually, money that would disappear if supporters of the repeal effort have their way.

[Carl DeMaio](#), a San Diego talk show host and former city councilmember who launched the repeal effort, says waste and inefficiency are to blame for the rough shape of California's roads. He cited a disputed [statistic](#) generated by Republican state Senator John Moorlach that, prior to SB1, only 20 percent of the existing gas tax and other transportation revenues, such as registration fees, went into state road repair and new construction.

“We could fix all of our roads if we simply allocated 100 percent of gas tax revenues to roads, but the politicians will never do that because this has never been about fixing roads, but rather getting more of your money,” DeMaio said.

Work continues on the 23rd Avenue overpass at Highway 880 in Oakland, Calif., on Tuesday, Oct. 31, 2017. The freeway will undergo \$70 million in repaving thanks to SB1 revenues. (File photo by Laura A. Oda/Bay Area News Group)

It’s true that not all of the money generated by the gas tax prior to SB1 went into state roads. But, that doesn’t mean the money didn’t support transportation throughout the state. Moorlach only counted roads owned by the state, such as highways, in his tally, omitting streets owned by cities or counties, which make up the majority of California’s roadways, public transit assistance, bike paths and pedestrian amenities, ports and waterways, the California Highway Patrol, DMV and airports — all of which also receive funding from the existing gas taxes and registration fees.

According to the proposed state budget, which estimates \$16 billion in transportation revenue from all diesel and gas taxes, along with registration and license fees, about 57 percent of the funds will be dedicated to highway maintenance, road repairs and public transit. Of the remainder, roughly 9.5 percent is dedicated to paying off debt related to transportation construction projects, just over 1 percent supports reducing the environmental impacts of vehicle emissions and public transit expansions, and 29 percent funds the DMV, CHP and other state agencies involved in the administration or regulation of the state’s transportation network.

Just over 3 percent is transferred to the general fund, to the Department of Agriculture and to the Department of Parks and Recreation to return revenues for gas consumed in vehicles that are used off-road, such as tractors, ATVs or jet skis.

Moorlach wasn’t available for an interview, but in a statement, he slammed Caltrans for its [inefficiency](#): “There’s no question that Caltrans is bloated and mismanaged and is not held accountable. And a mismanaged Caltrans is doing its best to prove its critics right.”

Oakland resident Katie Sleeth shrugged off the criticism. That’s no reason to stall needed bridge, road, highway and transit improvements, she said.

“All governments are inefficient,” Sleeth said. “That’s just the system we have.”

But other residents shook their heads. Lynn Hall, of Oakland, is skeptical the extra money will actually go to roads — whether it’s highways or city and county streets.

“The roads are going to be bad anyway,” Hall said. “I don’t trust them to do a good job with that money.”

Motorists fill up their gas tanks at a gas station in Fremont, on Dec. 19, 2017. A petition to repeal the newly enacted 12-cent increase in the gas tax, is expected to be certified for the ballot later this month. (File photo by Dai Sugano/Bay Area News Group)

Showing the money is going to road repairs and transit projects will be a major strategy in the campaign to keep the new taxes and fees in place, said Michael Quigley, executive director for the [California Alliance for Jobs](#), a coalition of construction unions and the companies that employ them. The lobbying group is trying to stop the repeal effort, along with the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, Bay Area Council and chambers of commerce in major cities throughout the state, unions, local governments and others.

“The needs of California’s transportation system are great,” Quigley said. “Repealing the gas tax is only going to take away projects from communities and cost jobs statewide, resulting in more unsafe roads for all Californians.”

He’ll have his work cut out for him if recent poll results hold steady. The [LA Times/USC poll](#) released last month showed 51 percent of registered voters throughout the state supported the repeal, compared to 38 percent who favor of keeping the taxes and fees in place. Support for the new gas tax and registration fees was [heavily skewed in the Bay Area](#), where 72 percent of voters supported it.

But, that approval drops in rural and inland areas of the state, leading Jill Darling, the poll’s survey director, to believe the repeal effort has a good chance of succeeding.

“It’s definitely not popular,” Darling said of SB1. “Even among Democrats and groups that would in general support this kind of work, it’s pretty muted.”

That’s bad news for cities like Oakland and San Jose, which have road repair backlogs of \$443 million and \$453.4 million, respectively.

Over the years, lack of funding has led to deferred maintenance, which makes the roads much more costly to repair, sometimes quadrupling the price to completely redo a street when preventative maintenance could have extended its life for years more, said Jim Ortbal, San Jose’s director of transportation. The last time the gas tax was increased was in 1994. And, for years, the city’s been stuck in a vicious cycle of under-funding maintenance and then overpaying for repairs, a cycle Ortbal is hoping SB1 can reverse.

“It’s essential,” he said. “It will stave off a crisis in terms of our ability to maintain the condition of our city streets.”

[Back to Top](#)

[Letter: San Jose pedestrians have too much freedom already \(The Mercury News\)](#)

Letters to the Editor: Color me unsympathetic when pedestrians complain about minor inconveniences.

Re: "San Jose must protect pedestrian's freedom" (Letters to the Editor, June 19):

San Jose pedestrians get too much freedom already. They are allowed to cross streets when the crosswalk timer is counting down. This prevents cars that have a green light from making right turns.

Color me unsympathetic when pedestrians complain about minor inconveniences. We have bigger problems than dockless scooters and bikes.

Let's tackle the homeless problems and the litter first instead of making San Jose more business unfriendly.

Jim Wissick

San Jose

[Back to Top](#)

[A solution to Silicon Valley traffic jams — a 24-hour workweek](#) (San Francisco Chronicle)

Did you know that the continued [boom in Silicon Valley](#) is predicted to add more than 100,000 jobs over the next three years? How do we meet the increased traffic demand? Here is my idea, inspired by a Metropolitan Transportation Commission [study](#).

In 2014, the MTC, our regional transportation agency, published a study called "Make Every Day Columbus Day in the Bay Area." The study found traffic demand is 3 to 5 percent lower on that October holiday, resulting in 70 percent less traffic delays. Drivers experience the same "Columbus Day effect" during the spring and summer school breaks. So, how do we make every day a holiday on our highways?

The secret lies in recreating our workweek. Simply put, we need a minimum of 5 percent of our workforce to work nights and weekends. With such scheduling, traffic would be minimized during peak hours.

What company could not accommodate 5 percent? Potentially, some companies would redeploy more than 5 percent of their workforce. The more, the better!

My solution would require that a minimum of 5 percent of the Silicon Valley workforce work weekend, evening or night assignments, for all major companies. We need to change the standard workweek from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday, to 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

An alternate workweek might be Friday thru Tuesday.

Alternate work hours could be noon to 9 p.m. Indeed, the alternatives are endless.

This is not flex time or four-10-hour-day weeks. This new schedule must be structured and its effects measurable.

Businesses would be modeling their work patterns after our police, fire and many other respected institutions that consider the 24/7 work schedule standard practice. Employees are looking for alternative work hours, rather than suffer through daily two- to three- hour nonproductive commutes.

In Silicon Valley's current work culture, many employees pay their dues for a few years, then search for jobs elsewhere, seeking more affordable homes and a better quality of life. Businesses are having difficulty hiring first-choice recruits. Retention is an issue.

Just picture all those empty office buildings when driving at night: A 24-hour workday would be a better use of existing facilities, parking and resources. Work desks could be managed like hotel spaces, as for most workers, everything is in their laptop computer. The need to invest in additional buildings could be re-evaluated, based on optimum use of existing structures.

Land resources limit our ability to add more traffic lanes. Redistributing the workforce is the only solution left.

In addition, everyone is aware of our region's severe housing shortage. Yet efforts to address this shortage are met with resistance — in large part due to our inability to solve the traffic crisis.

Every measure on the ballot, every traffic survey and every new idea under discussion requires that taxpayers carry the financial burden. The best part of my idea is taxpayers would not have to open their wallets.

There is no silver bullet to solving our traffic crisis. Driverless cars, additional bridges and Elon Musk's Hyperloop System are 10 or more years away. We need a solution that will carry us through this decade. Non-traditional solutions, in concert with many other conventional measures, are the key to success.

The continued growth and economic prosperity of California effectively hinges on our ability to solve this transportation dilemma.

I welcome your comments on how to perfect this idea!

[Back to Top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2018 10:35 AM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: June 22, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Friday, June 22, 2018

1. [Scooters Behaving Badly \(KRON 4\)](#)
2. [San Jose unveils proposed scooter regulations \(Mercury News\)](#)
3. [Facebook explores \\$2.4B commuter railway and roads to link its Fremont and Menlo Park campuses \(Silicon Valley Business Journal/San Francisco Business Times\)](#)
4. [Demand, holiday, likely to push gas prices up \(Solano County Daily Republic\)](#)

[Scooters Behaving Badly \(KRON 4\)](#)

(Link to video)

[San Jose unveils proposed scooter regulations \(Mercury News\)](#)

Like other cities, San Jose is considering limiting the number of scooter companies that can operate within its borders.

Several months after shared scooters from companies like Lime and Bird began flooding the downtown area, San Jose has unveiled a series of proposed regulations targeting their use.

“This has garnered a lot of interest,” Ryan Smith, a transportation specialist for the city, acknowledged at a community meeting Thursday evening at City Hall.

San Jose is considering a number of possible restrictions, including issuing revocable permits to a limited number of scooter companies, requiring the companies to pay a deposit to cover potential scooter-involved damage to city property, and charging annual fees to operate in the city.

In recent weeks, the city has fielded complaints about people zooming down crowded sidewalks instead of riding in the street and parking scooters inappropriately. But the city currently doesn't have any rules governing the relatively new scooter-sharing industry, enabling both the companies and users to operate freely.

San Jose resident Doug Smith said he fell and hurt his shoulder after being hit by a scooter outside Martin Luther King Jr. Library in March.

“I would like to see some enforcement out of concern for pedestrians,” he said.

To respond to the surge in scooter ridership, San Jose has reached out to a number of different entities for advice, including cities such as Seattle and Washington, D.C., which have also grappled with scooter regulations. The city is also working with the San Jose Police Department on a plan to, among other things, curb riding on sidewalks.

“Many other cities are facing the same challenges,” Ryan Smith said.

In addition to paying operating fees, Smith said the city wants the companies to provide multilingual customer service at all times, and to commit to addressing problems quickly. And like Ford GoBike — which currently has an [exclusive contract](#) with San Jose to operate a docked bike sharing program in the city — the city says scooter companies should be required to offer discounts to low-income residents and operate in what it calls “communities of concern.”

To understand how and where people are riding scooters, the city says it also wants the companies to share their data, something they so far have been reluctant to part with, at least publicly.

Most residents at the meeting seemed supportive of having scooters in San Jose, calling them an easy and environmentally friendly way to commute or run errands quickly.

Warren Ahner, who works in Japantown and was one of two dozen people to speak at the meeting, said scooters have made it easy to zip downtown for lunch. Other people seem to be using the scooters to head toward his area, he said, noting the coffee shop Roy’s Station is now teeming with scooter riders.

But several people expressed reservations about limiting the number of scooters in the city, as San Francisco has done, and urged officials to instead let market forces play out.

Others called for bike lanes to be improved before any rule against riding on the sidewalk is enforced, saying they don’t feel safe in the street. And a couple of people who appreciate the affordability of scooters said they fear imposing fees on companies would ultimately mean more expensive rides for scooter users.

For now, the proposals are just a loose possible framework for handling the scooters. This summer, Smith and other city officials will gather feedback from residents and then refine their suggestions before presenting them to the City Council in September for actual implementation the following month.

Nanci Solomon uses the scooters to get from her home near San Pedro Square to her job at San Jose State University. And while she supports some regulation, she says the city should ultimately welcome innovation.

"I think we should embrace these things," Solomon said. "Look how popular they are."

[Back to Top](#)

[Facebook explores \\$2.4B commuter railway and roads to link its Fremont and Menlo Park campuses](#) (Silicon Valley Business Journal/San Francisco Business Times)

[Facebook](#) is exploring what it would take to finally build a commuter rail across the Dumbarton corridor — a move that would help cut the region's traffic congestion and more easily connect its Fremont and Menlo Park campuses.

Earlier this month, the social media giant (NASDAQ: FB) entered into an agreement with Los Angeles-based infrastructure developer Plenary Group, as well as the San Mateo County Transit District, to evaluate just how feasible funding this project — estimated at \$2.4 billion — would be.

The public-private partnership will also investigate environmental impacts, with the exploration taking about 18 months, according to [Anthony Harrison](#), a spokesperson for Facebook. At this point it's too early to tell how financially possible the construction is, Harrison said.

"Over the years our employee base has grown to the East Bay," John Tenanes, Facebook's vice president of global facilities and real estate, recently told the San Francisco Business Times. "But as you know, the infrastructure connecting the East Bay to Silicon Valley is pretty tough."

"That's why we are working on this Dumbarton Rail project," added Tenanes, also noting that their campuses in Fremont and Menlo Park "are bookends" of the Dumbarton Bridge.

Facebook is rapidly expanding its Fremont footprint, [recently leasing 700,000 square feet of space](#) adjacent to the 300,000 square feet of offices it already has there.

The region's rampant traffic prompted the tech company last year to [finance a \\$1.2 million transportation study](#) to identify how to improve mobility between the Santa Clara, San Mateo and Alameda Counties. The report recommended creating a new rail service to replace the current Dumbarton Rail Bridge, which was damaged in the 1990s and remains unused. It also suggested expansion of commuter lanes and bike paths.

"We want to be a good neighbor here in the Valley, and everyone knows that transportation is a huge issue for the people that live here and work here," said Harrison. "It's in our best interest as a good corporate citizen to figure out a solution to the transportation problem."

The development project would be broken up into two phases, according to SamTrans spokesperson [Dan Lieberman](#). Phase one would include an express lane for buses and carpoolers, as well as a flyover lane to enter directly onto Highway 101. Then, phase two would be building the Dumbarton Rail Bridge to shuttle riders across the bay from Newark to Menlo Park, eventually expanding to connect with Caltrain on the Peninsula and the ACE and Capitol Corridor tracks in the East Bay. All that work together is estimated at \$2.4 billion.

Securing funding is a necessary first step, but Lieberman said that SamTrans originally hoped to finish phase one by 2020 and construct the railway by sometime between 2025 and 2030.

So far, the only money officially allocated to improvements along the Dumbarton corridor is \$130 million thanks to Regional Measure 3, which was approved by Bay Area voters this June.

The Dumbarton revamp would be more expensive than nearly any Bay Area public construction project underway at the moment. For comparison, the soon-to-open Salesforce Transit Center will total \$1.4 billion in construction costs and the Central SoMa subway will hit \$1.38 billion in construction costs.

But the costs aren't dampening enthusiasm for the idea of the Dumbarton project.

Rosanne Foust, president and CEO of the San Mateo County Economic Development Association, said that more specifics regarding the Dumbarton project's potential would surface in the coming months, though praised the public-private partnership.

"Hopefully it will encourage other companies to look at regional infrastructure needs and ask how they can be part of innovative solutions, especially regarding the housing and transportation challenges our region is facing," Foust wrote in an email.

[Back to Top](#)

[Demand, holiday, likely to push gas prices up \(Solano County Daily Republic\)](#)

Motorists felt the holiday pinch of gas prices during the Memorial Day weekend, got a bit of a reprieve recently, but can expect to see prices climb again for the Fourth of July.

That news comes after California prices had fallen 3 cents since a high of \$3.73 for an average gallon of unleaded gasoline during the Memorial Day holiday, AAA reports.

"If demand continues to strengthen and inventories decrease in the weeks ahead, motorists can expect gas prices (to) do a reversal and start to increase again," Michael Blasky, spokesman for AAA Northern California, said in a statement released this week.

Gasoline demand set an all-time record at 9.88 million barrels per day for the week ending June 8, according to the latest Energy Information Administration's report. U.S. inventories, in turn, plummeted 2.27 million barrels to total inventories of 237 million barrels.

That is 5.7 million barrels below inventories last year at this time, AAA reports.

As of Wednesday, the average price in the Vallejo-Fairfield survey area was \$3.63, according to the online AAA gas price report. The state average price was \$3.69, while the national average was \$2.88.

Mono County's average price was reported at \$4.46 per gallon, while the cheapest gas in California was found in Yuba County at an average of \$3.47 per gallon of unleaded gas, AAA reports.

The highest average price was reported in Hawaii, where a gallon of unleaded gas was \$3.73. The lowest average price was reported in South Carolina at \$2.54, AAA reports.

[Back to Top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.