

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 2:03 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Cc: Lawson, Jim; Quigley, Aaron C
Subject: State Route 85 Transit Guideway Study funding

VTA Board of Directors and SR 85 Policy Advisory Board Members,

On July 25, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved an agreement with VTA for the exchange of \$1.2 million in 2016 Measure B funds with federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funds and/or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (CMAQ) funds for the State Route 85 Transit Guideway Study.

This action allows VTA to use a different funding source to advance the Transit Guideway Study as the legal challenge to Measure B is resolved. In the coming months, VTA will work with MTC to secure these funds from the Federal Highway Administration.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact Aaron Quigley, Sr. Policy Analyst.

Jim Lawson

Director, Government Relations

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority
3331 North First Street, Building B
San Jose, CA 95134-1927



Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 5:25 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: July 30, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Monday, July 30, 2018

1. [Milpitas Police Chief prepares for new BART station \(Mercury News\)](#)
2. [Editorial: Good riddance to Bay Area's transportation czar \(Mercury News\)](#)
3. [Head of Bay Area's regional transportation agency to retire \(San Francisco Business Times\)](#)
4. [Muni suffering major citywide service gaps due to operator shortage](#)

Milpitas Police Chief prepares for new BART station (Mercury News)

For Milpitas Police Chief Armando Corpuz, inter-agency collaboration will be the key to keeping the city safe when BART opens its new station at Montague Expressway and Capitol Avenue next year.

At Monday's Milpitas Rotary Club meeting, the city's top cop presented how the department has been preparing for the station's opening. Slated to open in September 2019, the 27-acre site will have two underground side platforms and a 6-story parking garage, as well as a VTA bus transit center.

But in a week when safety on BART was top of mind with a crime spree at Bay Area stations making national news, the chief focused on that very topic.

To keep the area safe, the Milpitas Police Department will be working with the Santa Clara County Sherriff's Office and the BART Police Department. According to Corpuz, the BART Police Department will have jurisdiction within the station, while the Sherriff's Office will have jurisdiction on the surrounding VTA-owned property.

"When it comes to public safety, anytime anyone steps out of the jurisdiction of the Sherriff's Office or BART, they are coming into the city of Milpitas," Corpuz said.

To prepare for the new feet on the street, the Milpitas Police Department has been analyzing crime data from other cities for the year after a BART station opened. But in their research for

the cities of Pleasanton and San Bruno, they found that when BART came, so did an increase in crime.

“What we found was that in February 2011 the station opened, and in 2012 the city of Pleasanton and the areas surrounding the (adjacent) mall saw an immediate increase in theft, auto theft and assaults,” Corpuz said. “The following year, they saw an increase in robberies.”

The Pleasanton case, according to Corpuz, closely mirrors the layout of Milpitas’ new station as BART will open up down the street from the Great Mall. But it’s not all doom and gloom, he says – “It’s preparation.”

“I’m not suggesting or saying that’s going to happen in Milpitas,” he said. “But I would not be doing my job if I wasn’t considering this data, considering this information and asking myself what is the potential impact on the city of Milpitas for residents and people that are coming here to do business.”

Tamara Overacker, who runs an accounting business, T.O. Bookkeeping, doesn’t have her eye on potential increased crime when BART comes to the city.

“I (run) a small business and have lived in Milpitas my whole life,” she said. “I am not really concerned that there will be an increase in crime. I am hoping it will alleviate some traffic though.”

But while BART could help solve increasingly congested roads, it also could bring up to 25,000 new residents to Milpitas. In 2008, the city adopted the Transit Area Specific Plan to help redevelop the area surrounding the Great Mall and its new transportation hub. The plan is slated to add an additional 7,109 residential units, 993,843 square feet of office space and 340 hotel rooms all in the area surrounding the new station.

At the meeting, Corpuz said that he wasn’t even going to joke that the police department was doing nothing to prepare for the influx in population and possible rise in crime, that joke, he said, would be far from the truth.

Part of his preparations have been focused on staffing changes and upgrades. Corpuz said he’s planning on asking the city to fund more sworn officers during the next budget cycle and is looking at adding another group of officers to patrol near the BART station.

The department is also looking at installing stationary license plate readers to catch individuals coming into the city in stolen vehicles.

“When people are driving around in stolen cars, they’re committing other crimes,” Corpuz said. “Our goal is to stop them before they come into Milpitas and commit other crimes. With license plate readers, we want to place them in strategic locations around the Transit Area Specific Plan, potentially near the mall and other high crime areas.”

Besides the police departments preparation, Corpuz has been urging residents to do their own preparations by not being a suitable target for crime.

“I would say it’s a very safe guess, 90 percent of our car burglaries are because there was some item of values left in plain sight,” he said. “What you can do to minimize the likelihood of you being a victim is do not be a suitable target. Don’t leave valuable in your car. Don’t leave your garage door open and unattended. And lock your doors.”

To follow the progress of the station, visit: vta.org/bart/milpitas.

[Back to Top](#)

[Editorial: Good riddance to Bay Area’s transportation czar \(Mercury News\)](#)

Replacement for MTC’s Steve Heminger should bring vision for region’s transportation and housing

Steve Heminger, the executive director of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, announced Wednesday that he will end an 18-year reign by retiring early next year.

It can’t come soon enough.

The region’s freeways are gridlocked. Public transit systems are in disarray. Commute times continue to increase. Heminger touts his agency as “action-oriented and project-based,” but that has translated into piecemeal construction, pathetic planning and a lack of long-range vision. The agency merely hands out money for one politically popular project after another with little sense of where it will all lead.

Meanwhile, Heminger flew around the world on top-priced airline tickets at public expense; deceived the public and flouted the law to use bridge toll money to fund his badly overbudget quarter-billion dollar regional government building on prime downtown San Francisco real estate; and masterminded his agency’s hostile takeover of the staff of the Association of Bay Area Governments.

The Bay Area deserves better in what is arguably the most important job shaping the region’s transportation and housing. The time for a road project here, a rail extension there and tax increases wherever they can be found is over.

We should stop building on far-flung open land regardless of whether there’s public transportation to service it. We can’t keep counting on new freeway improvements to get the rapidly growing workforce to and from its jobs.

We must be smarter. We need a leader with vision, supported by empirical data, to ensure workers can afford to live in the Bay Area and get to their jobs in a reasonable time.

MTC board members will ultimately select Heminger's replacement. But, under the terms of the hostile takeover two years ago, the members of ABAG will have advisory input.

The person picked should be able to facilitate the still-to-be-completed merger of the transportation and housing-focused agencies and lead them toward a critical, symbiotic working relationship. For we can't solve the region's transportation problem without adequate, smartly located housing. And, conversely, smart housing depends on strong public transit.

The person selected should bring the experience and skills to unify residents and businesses behind a sustainable plan for the Bay Area's transportation and housing for decades to come.

That person should be recruited nationally, and bring a fresh, outside perspective. Heminger was an inside hire, promoted after his boss, Lawrence Dahms, retired in 2000. Between them, they have run MTC since 1977.

Which helps explain why Heminger treats the agency like his fiefdom. While he officially reports to the commission board, the roles are often flipped. The 18 voting board members, mostly city or county elected officials, worry first about securing money for their locales. That means remaining in Heminger's good graces.

He's leaving now. It's time for the commissioners to step up, to show leadership — to make one of the Bay Area's most critical government hires. For the sake of Bay Area residents and the region's economy, they need to get it right.

[Back to Top](#)

[Head of Bay Area's regional transportation agency to retire](#) (San Francisco Business Times)

Steve Heminger plans to retire as executive director of the Metropolitan Transportation, the Bay Area's main transportation agency, in February of next year.

[Heminger, who took on his current role in 2001](#), handles more than \$2 billion per year in funding for the Bay Area's network of roads, bridges and other connections and has about 300 employees. The agency also oversees the Association of Bay Area Governments, the official regional planning agency for the nine counties and 101 cities and towns of the Bay Area.

"While the agency has benefitted from that stability in leadership, there comes a time when new blood and fresh ideas are warranted," Heminger, 58, said in a memo to employees. "The commission will be searching for my successor over the next few months."

Heminger's total compensation was \$430,567 in 2016, according to [Transparent California](#), a site that lists state public employee compensation.

One of Heminger's major projects involved the construction of the new East Span of the Bay Bridge — the largest transportation project in California history, according to the MTC. He was also appointed to serve National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission and is also a senior fellow at the Institute for Transportation Studies at UC Berkeley.

During his tenure at the MTC, Heminger was also at the center of controversies, such as the agency's 2011 purchase of a new headquarters building at 375 Beale St. in San Francisco that ran way to more than \$256 million even as the agency raised bridge tolls, according to the San Jose Mercury News.

The building, a former post office, required significant renovations and was much larger than the agency needed, but officials justified the deal because it could make money leasing office space to tenants. That called to question whether a public agency should be in the landlord business.

Also, Bloomberg reported in 2014 that Heminger racked up about \$45,000 worth of travel in three years including a \$13,000 business-class flight to Sydney, Australia, even though the agency requires staffers to fly economy. That incident prompted board members to call for an audit of Heminger's travel and for local newspapers to demand his resignation. Still, Heminger remained in his job.

The agency has already assembled a seven-member selection committee with the goal of naming Heminger's successor by the end of the year, said MTC spokesperson John Goodwin.

Outgoing SPUR director explains what's wrong with the Bay Area today

Gabriel Metcalf loves cities.

He loves the diversity of people, and the organic ways they can find others like them, while at the same time, being constantly exposed to those who aren't. He loves walking or hopping on a bike to get where he needs to go. He loves the way cities buzz with energy.

It's why he's so disappointed in what he calls "exclusionary policies" that make it so expensive to live in the Bay Area. As president and CEO of SPUR, the region's preeminent urban planning think tank, Metcalf, a San Francisco condo owner, has been at the forefront of advocating for smarter housing and transportation policies. He was a co-founder of City CarShare, one of the first car-sharing organizations in North America, and a founding member of the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition, a nonprofit that advocates for more housing at all levels of affordability.

He's stepping down from SPUR after more than 20 years, including 13 as its president and CEO, to take a new job at The Committee for Sydney, another urban planning think tank. This news organization spoke with Metcalf about the ways in which the Bay Area has changed over his tenure at SPUR, what challenges lie ahead and what opportunities await. The conversation has been edited for clarity and length.

Q: How did you first become interested in cities and urban spaces?

A: One starting place is the experience of moving around as a young person, living in Denver, living in suburbs, living in a college town, and viscerally feeling how much place matters. Boulder provided a really wonderful experience of small college-town urbanism in the sense of a very walkable, compact place where you could get everywhere by bike. It has a very healthy public space culture, where people spend time on the street and in the parks. So, some of that interest in cities began as just a lived experience of the quality of life in different places. And, from early on, I knew I wanted to live in a bigger city and get into a bigger world than where I grew up.

Q: How did you end up in San Francisco?

A: My girlfriend and I went to Seattle for a couple of years, and then we moved to San Francisco in 1996 in maybe one of the last years when it was still possible to come here without a job and figure it out, before the city got so expensive that that became impossible. It was a dream to get to live in such a great city. There was so much happening, so many different kinds of people, and I really had the sense that it was a place where it was going to be possible to experiment politically to do things that wouldn't be possible in other parts of the country.

Q: What makes cities great places to live, in your mind?

A: Cities are a vessel for holding human difference. That's what a city is. And that essential purpose of holding human difference becomes a platform for a lot of other really interesting things. Cities end up fostering creativity of all kinds because they bring so many different kinds of people together. That shows up in political movements, it shows up in artistic movements, and it shows up in economic innovation, as well. And, it also turns out cities are incredibly ecologically efficient. The city with the smallest carbon footprint per capita in the United States is New York. The essence of the ecological genius of cities is, by concentrating people at high densities, we make it possible to get around by foot, by bike or by transit. So, cities do a lot of different things for us.

Q: How have the cities in the Bay Area changed in the past two decades you've been living here?

A: Physically, it has not changed very much. And I think that's de facto been the choice we've made. We've decided to keep most of the physical form intact, but at a price of losing a lot of the social fabric.

The most important mistake in the Bay Area is our decision that nothing should ever interfere with the comfort and convenience of people who currently own their homes, that they should not have to be troubled with taller buildings anywhere in their line of sight. If we were willing to make some very small sacrifices, essentially to allow tall buildings to be built, we could make this region less expensive.

Q: Why are people so resistant to seeing taller buildings, or physical change in general, in the Bay Area?

A: This is one of the great ironies of the Bay Area, that attitudes that are clearly exclusionary got labeled “progressive” by some people. The attitude that single family neighborhoods should be able to keep out higher density apartment buildings forever. It’s attitudes like that are clearly harmful to low-income people or immigrants. And, I don’t know why that happens.

Q: Is that the biggest challenge facing the Bay Area right now?

A: It’s one of the challenges. Another big challenge for the Bay Area is transportation. The generation after WWII did an extraordinary thing by planning and funding and building BART. This was in an era when much of the country was still building highways. The Bay Area looked so ahead of the game in the mid ’70s when BART opened, but since then, we’ve really rested on our laurels and have not kept up. We’ve skipped two generations of expanding our transit system, and so today we live with that legacy of under-investing in regional transit. At the same time, we built out so much of the region in the form of low-density sprawl, which means transit does not work there. So, we now face the twin challenges of retrofitting our low-density neighborhoods to become more compact and walkable, while at the same time playing catch up on transit investment.

Q: Is there any hope for us?

A: There is hope. We actually have everything we need to solve these problems. We have such high levels of education. We have such high levels of wealth. We have a very idealistic population. The greatest danger for us is a form of fatalism, where we start to believe these problems are permanent and there is nothing we can do. That is simply not true. We have the ability to solve them. But, we need to come together as a region to change course on housing and transportation.

Gabriel Metcalf

Age: 48

Position: CEO of SPUR

Education: Antioch College; Institute for Social Ecology; Department of City and Regional Planning, U.C. Berkeley

Residence: San Francisco

Family: Two boys; partner

Five things to know about Gabriel Metcalf

1. He thinks cities are the solution to almost every problem.
2. He goes on a solo backpacking trip in the Sierra every year.

3. He was one of the founders of City CarShare, one of the first car-sharing organizations in North America.
4. He wrote a book called Democratic by Design, which is a history of alternative institutions within American social movements.
5. Even though he's moving to Sydney, he still believes in the potential of the United States. He loves the quote from Richard Rorty, "The whole point of America was that it was going to be the world's first classless society."

[Back to Top](#)

[Muni suffering major citywide service gaps due to operator shortage](#)

Muni is suffering a major citywide slowdown.

An operator shortage has left scheduled buses sitting still at Muni yards, engines cold. Those "not outs," Muni operator-slang for a bus or train "not out in service," have caused drastically long wait times for service across San Francisco for months, public data obtained and analyzed by the San Francisco Examiner shows.

On any particular weekday almost a hundred buses — ones meant to run — sit unused due to a lack of operators. The usual lines for downtown buses have grown into crowds. Lucky riders find themselves packed ever-closer to their fellow passengers while unlucky riders see full-to-the-brim buses pass them up outright.

Riders have seen wait times lag on the most crucial commuter lines: 48 minute waits on the 1BX, 24 minute waits on the 38-Geary, 27 minute waits on the 1-California. Major slowdowns have hit all of San Francisco's neighborhoods, from rich to poor, cutting across all of the diverse populations that rely on Muni for work and school.

John Haley, who heads Muni operations at the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, said the problem started in late March and has only worsened.

"There's service being missed everywhere," Haley told the Examiner in mid-July.

A perfect storm of circumstances stressed Muni's training pipeline this summer, according to transit officials, public documents, and sources in Muni's ranks. This resulted in an operator shortage SFMTA officials struggled and failed to prevent.

The Twin Peaks Tunnel shutdown required additional buses and more operators to be trained to drive them, while at the same time newly purchased, technologically-advanced light rail vehicles required even more operator training. Further compounding this training backlog, a

union-mandated “general sign-up” — which occurs regularly — saw operators flocking to drive new routes within Muni. Some of those new assignments were paused, Haley said.

“It’s what I’d call a pipeline problem,” Haley said.

An internal email obtained by the Examiner show the transit department of SFMTA warned the training department of this potential training backlog in October last year.

That email states operator promotions and retirements also led to attrition. Burned-out Muni drivers angry over contracts that restrict new operators’ pay for five years, a bargaining change negotiated in 2014, have also led to a dearth of operators, according to the Transport Workers Union Local 250-A.

“The operators are trained, the majority are quitting,” said Roger Marengo, president of local TWU Local 250-A. “I was riding a bus with a woman who said she was a part-time operator for four months. Why doesn’t the agency make her full time? What is the agency waiting for?”

The resulting impact to riders is harder to see with the naked eye than, say, a BART tunnel shutdown that leaves riders visibly stranded on train platforms — but the slowdown has rocked the commute of thousands more riders, as Muni’s daily ridership is more than 700,000 trips, nearly double that of BART. Roughly 25 percent of all vehicle trips in San Francisco are on transit.

And, unlike a tunnel shutdown, this Muni slowdown has persisted for months.

The Examiner crunched Muni service data provided by SFMTA for weeks between May and July. An average of daily service data for the week July 2-6, for instance, shows a staggering 8 percent of service hours missed each day. That means Muni service was operating at 92 percent efficiency, 3 percent below city-mandated service levels and 6.5 percent below its optimum service levels.

For instance, the average weekday in early July had 863 hours of service missed on Muni citywide out of a total 9,700 hours of scheduled service. For context, one bus trip along its route can be measured at about an hour, and as a rule of thumb eight hours of service is one bus “run,” according to SFMTA.

Though that may be tough to translate into the real world, think of it this way: It takes a 38-Geary roughly an hour to cross from downtown to Ocean Beach. Eight hours less service is akin to removing one 38 bus shift from the ten 38 bus shifts that traverse The City at any one time, leading to a ripple effect of longer waits and more crowding on those remaining buses.

That problem has only grown.

About ten major Muni routes were missing more than ten hours worth of service daily in late April, according to SFMTA data. But by the week of June 25, more than 30 Muni routes citywide were missing more than ten hours worth of daily service, a trend that continued through July.

The 8-Bayshore, for instance, had an average 80 missed service hours every day in early July out of a total 460 scheduled service hours. The 38-Geary had an average 47 missed service hours for the same time period out of a total 186 scheduled service hours.

Both lines are among Muni's most heavily trafficked, the backbone of San Francisco transit. That's by design, Haley said.

Faced with dire bus-service choices without enough operators to drive, Muni has opted to short service on lines that run dozens of buses, because not running buses on routes with fewer buses would have a greater impact on timely service, Haley said.

Still, routes big and small have slowed down across The City: the F-Market & Wharves, 1-California, 2-Clement, 7-Haight, 8-Bayshore, 9-San Bruno, 10-Townsend, 12-Folsom/Pacific, 14-Mission, 19-Polk, 21-Hayes, 22-Fillmore, 27-Bryant, 28-19th Avenue, 29-Sunset, 31-Balboa, 38-Geary, 43-Masonic, 44-O'Shaughnessy, 45-Union, 47-Van Ness, 49-Van Ness/Mission, 54-Felton, all experienced double-digit missed service hours, leading to slowdowns on each line. The City's most heavily-trafficked commuter buses also experienced double-digit missed service hours, including the 1X Express, 5-Rapid, 9-Rapid, 14-Rapid, 28-Rapid, and 38-Rapid, according to SFMTA data.

Data on bus "not outs," meaning buses not out on the street for service, shared with the Examiner by irate Muni operators, show as many as 199 scheduled Muni on runs not out on one July weekday. Internal SFMTA communications show a deficit of 150 Muni operators late last year, a problem that has only worsened.

Muni riders have jumped on to social media to scorch SFMTA publicly.

"Why no inbound 1BX for 20 minutes? I rely on this to get to work and now I'm late," wrote Twitter user Maria Grimm on July 24. "Seventh straight week of bus-route service cutbacks that @sfmta_muni refuses to acknowledge or fix," wrote Twitter user Mike Murphy on July 23, as he tweeted a photo of a 27 minute wait for the 38-Geary. "Are there not enough drivers for the new buses @LondonBreed advocated for?," wrote Twitter user Ashley Moon on July 25. Moon added that a group of 10-15 people were passed by three different buses that morning, causing them to wait 48 minutes for a bus. Moon added, "I've been a loyal Muni rider for years and never experienced so much frustration as I have the last few months."

To those concerned with the slowdowns, Haley said riders should see some relief by August 25, when the Twin Peaks tunnel reopens and the need for bus operators lessens. And SFMTA said it is adding more training staff, recruiting retired operators, and adjusting shift policies to address the issue.

Still, the operator shortage may then shift to light rail service, Haley said, if needed training is not completed soon.

The number of missed runs, he said, is “not acceptable under any circumstances.”

[Back to Top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Wednesday, August 1, 2018 1:56 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: VTA Information: Ridership Memo for June 2018

VTA Board of Directors:

Attached is a memorandum from Chief Operating Officer Inez Evans regarding VTA ridership for June 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



From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Wednesday, August 1, 2018 4:59 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: August 1, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Wednesday, August 1, 2018

1. [Opinion: VTA must protect downtown San Jose during BART construction \(Mercury News\)](#)
2. [Apple head tax dies in Cupertino. Did the hyperloop kill it?](#)

Opinion: VTA must protect downtown San Jose during BART construction (Mercury News)

Downtown business and property owners understand and welcome the legal challenges to the current plans for extending Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) to San Jose filed by the San Jose Sharks in the past two months.

It would be wrong to mistake our concerns for opposition. We strongly support BART's extension to two downtown San Jose stations – one at Market and Santa Clara streets, and the other at Diridon Depot, across the street from SAP Center.

Get editorials, opinion columns, letters to the editor and more in your inbox weekday mornings. [Sign up](#) for the Opinion newsletter.

We applauded VTA's decision to construct the BART tunnel through downtown using less disruptive, "single-bore" technology. There is no question that this method of construction will be far less disruptive than the "cut-and-cover" option.

ADVERTISING

Single-bore, however, does not solve all of the construction issues related to this massive project, and it certainly does not address our overriding concerns regarding the access and safety of customers, clients, residents, visitors and patrons that is critical to the viability of our downtown businesses.

The Sharks' decision to file lawsuits is guided by the history of SAP Center and the area now known as Diridon. The arena was completed in 1993 and has generated economic activity

throughout downtown for 25 years. Having an NHL franchise helped put our city on the map – especially for people outside of Northern California – and the Sharks remain one of our city’s most popular and well-known businesses.

Each year, tens of thousands of people travel to downtown to take in Sharks games, major concerts, theatrical performances and other sporting events like March Madness and U.S. Olympic trials in skating and gymnastics.

It is vitally important to protect that experience as VTA builds out BART.

For example, scores of trucks will haul dirt through downtown during construction. Where will VTA stage those trucks, and how will they affect traffic and sidewalks? Will pedestrians be able to walk swiftly and safely from San Pedro Square to SAP Center?

The downtown community is keenly aware of how critical access to parking spaces are for special events as well as everyday business. As such, we strongly urge the VTA to reconsider its position on parking.

In its 2004, 2010 and 2011 plans for extending BART to San Jose, VTA relied on studies that showed an estimated 1,600 drivers would use the Diridon BART station daily. To mitigate this impact on the surrounding neighborhood and businesses, BART proposed building an eight-story, 1,300-space parking garage.

VTA, however, released a new BART-to-San Jose plan in 2016 without a formal parking study, nor offering to provide a single parking space for either the Diridon or downtown BART stations, while eliminating hundreds of spaces in these same locations.

VTA has said all these issues will be addressed later in a Construction Impact Mitigation Plan, but these matters are too important for downtown’s future to defer.

The lawsuits ensure these issues will be dealt with sooner, rather than later.

We strongly believe that downtown San Jose has sufficient room for a vibrant SAP Center, a spectacular, new urban mixed-use tech campus and a thriving, multi-modal transportation system – provided everyone plans properly, constructively and in unison.

No one wants to see protracted litigation or a delay in extending BART to San Jose. The downtown community urges VTA to produce detailed plans that address the concerns of the community living, working and operating businesses adjacent to what will be the largest – and lengthiest – construction project in Silicon Valley.

Transportation agencies across the country have been able to find cooperative solutions for the benefit of their cities, businesses and residents. We believe VTA will rise to a similar standard; in fact, we are banking the future of downtown San Jose on it.

Derrick Seaver is director of policy and operations for the San Jose Downtown Association.

[Back to Top](#)

[Apple head tax dies in Cupertino. Did the hyperloop kill it?](#)

Cupertino's [brief second flirtation](#) with putting an [Apple Inc.](#)-targeted business tax on the November ballot to pay for transportation improvements died a quick and unanimous death Tuesday night. It may have been killed by [Elon Musk](#)'s hyperloop idea as much as the four City Council members who voted it down.

"We are talking to hyperloop to have a line, hopefully, along Stevens Creek from Diridon Station to DeAnza College," [Councilmember Barry Chang](#) blurted out just before the postponement vote.

Mayor [Darcy Paul](#) said in an interview afterward with the Silicon Valley Business Journal that Chang's hyperloop revelation surprised him. It came immediately after a cryptic comment of his own intended to hint at the secret without revealing it.

But he said he believes there's a strong possibility that Silicon Valley tech companies like Apple would "heavily subsidize" construction of a cutting-edge transportation solution in their own back yard and that no new tax should be imposed until that possibility is fleshed out.

"There could be very significant amounts of private sector funds willing just to invest in an early line so that, you know, that particular sector or company can use it as a bit of a showcase," he said.

BUSINESS PULSE POLL

SPONSORED BY

Is a Diridon to DeAnza hyperloop line a good idea?

Top of Form

Yes. Hyperloop is the future and Stevens Creek is a great first route.

No. This is nothing but a disruptive plan to transport Apple employees.

Maybe. I'm intrigued by the hyperloop idea but need to know more about local impact before deciding.

Vote

Bottom of Form

This poll is not a scientific sampling. It offers a quick view of what readers are thinking.

'A very expensive solution'

Paul had just explained from the dais why he thought the council should give the city staff more time to come up with a transportation plan that might rely on a partnership with Apple, which sent its government liaison executive to publicly speak for the first time on the tax issue.

“We are looking at the potential for a very expensive solution,” Paul told the crowd in City Hall. “There are some transit companies out there that are so motivated they are thinking about delivering transit solutions around the world. And if, in Silicon Valley, they can start implementing them, that translates to a huge leveraged opportunity in the sense that if someone wants to say, ‘Look, we’re in Silicon Valley, we’re effective, it’s a relatively new technology that we’re trying to showcase to the world.’ That’s not a \$7 million opportunity, that’s not a \$10 million opportunity. It might be a hundreds of millions of dollars opportunity ...”

According to Paul, Chang met early this year with the CEO of a company attempting to develop Musk’s idea of magnetically levitated vehicles propelled through a nearly airless underground tube at hundreds of miles per hour.

Paul himself has met with Hyperloop Transportation Technologies, or HyperloopTT, a Culver City-based hyperloop developer. HyperloopTT announced a deal last month to build a commercial system in the Chinese province of Guizhou. In April it began building a test track in France.

At the same time — Musk, who is CEO of [Tesla](#) Inc. and SpaceX and has several other smaller technology ventures — has been pitching his tunnel-digging business, The Boring Co., as a way to build tunnels faster and cheaper. The company obtained Maryland’s permission last fall to tunnel from Washington to Baltimore for a hyperloop line and in June the company said it [was awarded a bid to tunnel from downtown Chicago to O’Hare Airport](#).

However, none of these announcements have said how much these projects would cost or committed anyone to pay for them.

In the worst case scenario in Cupertino, Apple would have faced a \$9.4 million annual tax bill if voters in November had approved the larger of two draft business taxes based on the number of people it employs there. Apple pays about \$17,000 now, according to a city staff report. It’s new tax bill would be 92 percent of the \$10.2 million total tax revenue that the November ballot measure was designed to raise.

Would Apple pay?

Would Apple really pony up what would likely be billions of dollars for a transportation technology that doesn’t even exist to avoid a tax bill of a measly few million?

“It’s a fine balance between — how do we make sure that everyone’s acting in good faith here?” Paul said.

Business organization leaders as well Cupertino residents lined up during the public hearing to talk about the danger to the city's economy if it raised taxes on the company that employs two-thirds of the city's workforce.

"Our region's largest employers have choices where they can locate or relocate their employees," said Matt Mahood, president of the Silicon Valley Organization, the region's largest chamber of commerce.

"In Apple's case, they can relocate in San Jose, where they own 87 acres and are entitled to build 4.4 million square feet of new office space. In San Jose they passed a recent modernized business tax. It's something they put together a nine-month period, got the business community's buy-in, went to the ballot without the opposition of the chamber of commerce and it's capped at \$150,000 a year."

[Back to Top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Thursday, August 2, 2018 1:45 PM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: August 2, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Thursday, August 2, 2018

1. [Express Train Board Vote \(NBC Bay Area\)](#)
2. [From Carr Fire to Big Sur, one takeaway from disaster is how much we need good roads \(Sacramento Bee\)](#)
3. [Uber, Lyft Agree To Citywide Ride Tax \(SFGate.com\)](#)
4. [Buildings Integrating With Public Transit Could Help Kick Our Car Habit \(Propmodo.com\)](#)

[Express Train Board Vote \(NBC Bay Area\)](#)

(Link to video)

[Back to Top](#)

[From Carr Fire to Big Sur, one takeaway from disaster is how much we need good roads \(Sacramento Bee\)](#)

California's main seasons – fire and rain – have long generated more than their share of disaster. Still, this past year has been instructive as climate change has increased their intensity.

Take transportation. If it wasn't already clear that maintaining asphalt is a life-and-death line item, last weekend's lethal megafires drove home the point for thousands of evacuees.

The Carr Fire alone created miles-long traffic jams as terrified Redding residents jammed rural blacktops. In a few months, those who return to the scorched hills will become reacquainted with the wildfire postscript: mudslides.

[inRead invented by Teads](#)

Last week, [Highway 1 near Big Sur finally reopened](#), 14 months after epic rain triggered the worst landslide in state history, to the tune of \$1 billion in damage. And that money was just a drop in the rain barrel compared to the statewide [cost of the 2017 winter downpours](#).

Top of Form

Latest news by email

The afternoon's latest local news

SIGN UP

Bottom of Form

[Global warming is here](#). Its impact won't be receding. Ever more volatile weather systems will be sink-holing roads, undermining bridges and sluicing boulder-filled mud down onto critical rail lines and transportation links.

That's something to keep in mind as the Nov. 6 election approaches, with its partisan debate over whether to repeal California's [recent tax increases](#) for roads and transportation. [Proposition 6](#), part of a strategy to drive up conservative turnout in the 2018 election, would put the kibosh on some \$52 billion worth of transportation funding over the next decade.

And as [The Sacramento Bee's Alexei Koseff reported on Tuesday](#), if the repeal succeeds, its backers are already planning a follow-up initiative to severely restrict the use of transportation revenue from fuel taxes, car sales taxes and truck weight fees.

Tempting as it may sound to save a few cents at the pump – or to aim a satisfying, anti-tax kick in the pants at spendthrift state lawmakers – voters should remember that there's a price for the short-term pleasure of jerking purse strings.

What's that price? For starters, about 6,500 bridge and road safety, transportation and transit projects if Proposition 6 passes, according to a recent estimate from the nonpartisan American Road & Transportation Builders Association. That and \$5 billion a year or more in cuts to other state obligations, such as courts and universities, if the follow-up ballot measure succeeds, according to a [Sacramento Bee analysis](#).

We reserve judgment on Proposition 6, though we supported the gas tax. The needs of Californians are a moving target, and public spending should follow those priorities.

But part of that responsiveness must be to the needs created by global warming, the defining threat of our lifetime. In the long term, that means doing all we can to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that are warming the planet. In the short term, it means spending what we must to prepare for the next disaster – and when it comes, to make it out in one piece.

[Back to Top](#)

[Uber, Lyft Agree To Citywide Ride Tax \(SFGate.com\)](#)

Ride-hailing companies Uber and Lyft have agreed to allow the city of San Francisco to tax a percentage of their net ride revenues, according to Supervisor Aaron Peskin.

The ride-hail tax will go toward paying for transportation infrastructure and operations throughout the city.

The agreement was announced this afternoon, just before supervisors were set to vote on Peskin's proposed general gross receipts business tax measure. In light of the agreement, Peskin withdrew the measure, which would have placed the decision to tax the ride-hailing companies in front of voters in the November elections.

"This is a win-win for everyone," Peskin said in a statement. "We have a \$100 million local funding obligation to meet the transportation demands of a growing city. Voters have made it clear that they want corporations to pay their fair share to meet that need, particularly when there is a nexus to issues like congestion and traffic. I'm optimistic that this concession on the part of the TNC's (transportation network companies) signals a shift in their corporate culture and willingness to work with - not fight with - local governments," he said.

Mayor London Breed said in a statement, "I am pleased that an agreement has been reached with rideshare companies to institute a per-ride charge and avoid a divisive ballot measure.

"This will create a dedicated source of revenue to alleviate congestion, improve the condition of our roads, and keep San Francisco moving. I look forward to working with our state representatives and the Board of Supervisors to pass legislation to implement this agreement," she said.

The agreement would apply a 3.25 percent tax rate to single-use rides and a 1.5 percent tax rate to shared carpool rides to all ride-hailing service companies. Autonomous vehicles would be included in the tax, once they are permitted to begin charging for rides.

The tax would end in 2045, Peskin's office said.

The tax is expected to bring in about \$30 million in the first few years. The tax revenue would be remitted to the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

"San Francisco streets are more congested and crowded than ever. As we build more housing

and add more jobs in San Francisco, we must invest in public transit and transportation infrastructure so we can move more people around our city in the fastest and safest way possible. We need the additional revenue to make these critical transportation investments and improvements," Assemblyman Phil Ting, D-San Francisco, said in a statement.

"These revenues can help build out our transit, biking and pedestrian networks and support vital Vision Zero safety initiatives. While there is still a ways to go, this is a critical first step and commitment on behalf of both the public and private sectors," Tilly Chang, executive director of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, said in a statement.

According to a study by Chang's agency, Uber and Lyft together average about 82 million trips yearly. In addition, between 80 and 90 percent of ride-hailing service drivers come from outside the city.

Furthermore, 26 percent of trips during peak hour commute times are made by ride-hailing service drivers in the city's most transit-rich areas.

"Uber is pleased to reach an agreement that will bring dedicated transportation funding to San Francisco," Alex Randolph, Uber's policy lead in Northern California, said in a statement.

"Lyft is focused on improving transportation in cities and we recognize the importance of reliable transportation in San Francisco," Lyft official Brian McGuigan said in a statement. "We are glad to have arrived at a solution that will help keep rideshare convenient and affordable."

Supervisor Peskin is co-chair of the city's Transportation Task Force 2045, which has identified a need for \$22 billion over the next 27 years for critical transit infrastructure and service, in addition to pedestrian and bicycle safety facilities.

[Back to Top](#)

[Buildings Integrating With Public Transit Could Help Kick Our Car Habit \(Propmodo.com\)](#)

Any city or neighborhood built in the last seventy years is likely car-centric. The newly acquired convenience of a fast, affordable and reliable car changed the way we live and thus transformed the places we live. Building out is easier and cheaper than building up, [except for the municipalities that have to foot the bill for the infrastructure](#), so the real estate community was all too happy to oblige in the world's new automophilia.

Now that the chrome has tarnished and the newness of living life out of a car seat has faded, we are seeing the downside of creating our towns around cars and not vice versa. Cities are more affordable, healthy and sustainable when they can be navigated without a car. When residents are able to forgo a car purchase they have more money for expenses that are more directly impactful to the local economy and cities can use less public space for parking. With fewer cars, cities infill with more residents and more activities to support them.

As technology has created efficient mass transit and new ways to get around it has also made cars, even more, a part of our local economies. Ridesharing companies empower some to be less dependant on cars but also make using them even more convenient. So convenient that it has many turning first to their favorite ridesharing app instead of finding viable public transportation options.

[A study came out recently that suggests that ridesharing actually increased traffic congestion in city centers.](#) Even shared ride services like UberPOOL and Lyft Shared Rides are blamed for adding mileage to city streets rather than reducing car usage. It cites that the main reasons for using a ridesharing service involve the expense or hassle of parking and that speed, comfort and convenience are rarely or never cited.

Uber, Lyft and all the others are quick to point out that they can be additive to a public transportation system by providing the “last mile” option that can get riders to transportation hubs. This is likely true, but in the world of one-click convenience, many would rather just use their crowdsourced cab to go directly to their destination when it is not cost prohibitive. Plus, now there are many great options like electric scooters and dockless bikes that can handle last mile logistics (as long as the hills are not too steep).

So if there really is no replacement for public transportation then how do we convince people to use it? It turns out that the property industry might have a role in that. Buildings and residences near transit centers are already benefiting from premium valuations but just being close to a bus or train line doesn't mean that people will use it. The key is in reducing friction. One example of how properties can help reduce the friction of uncertainty in public transit is a collaboration between [TransitScreen](#), a real-time data platform for urban mobility, and [Bixby](#), a property management tool and tenant portal. Now residents of buildings can understand all of their transportation options, including ride sharing, on the same app that they use to pay their rent and put in a service request.

Breaking our dependency on cars will take sacrifice. Nothing is easier than jumping in a car and going directly to your destination. But if the arteries of our cities get clogged with traffic, then driving can cease to feel like the best option. The power of technology comes from the information that it can disseminate. That power can transform our built environments if it helps to make better choices in how we go to and from the places where we live our lives.

[Back to Top](#)

From: VTA Board Secretary
Sent: Friday, August 3, 2018 8:51 AM
To: VTA Board of Directors
Subject: From VTA: UPDATED August 2, 2018 Media Clips



VTA Daily News Coverage for Thursday, August 2, 2018

1. [Express Train Board Vote \(NBC Bay Area\)](#)
2. [Record loan from Housing Trust funds land for more than 300 affordable housing units near Diridon](#)
3. [San Jose: Authorities identify one killed in light-rail crash](#)
4. [From Carr Fire to Big Sur, one takeaway from disaster is how much we need good roads \(Sacramento Bee\)](#)
5. [Uber, Lyft Agree To Citywide Ride Tax \(SFGate.com\)](#)
6. [Buildings Integrating With Public Transit Could Help Kick Our Car Habit \(Propmodo.com\)](#)

[Express Train Board Vote \(NBC Bay Area\)](#)

(Link to video)

[Back to Top](#)

[Record loan from Housing Trust funds land for more than 300 affordable housing units near Diridon](#)

First Community Housing plans a twin-tower affordable rental housing project near Diridon Station with more than 300 units. The land acquisition loan of \$15.85 million from Housing

A \$15.85 million loan for land acquisition near San Jose's Diridon Station for a 300-plus unit affordable housing project has been approved by [Housing Trust Silicon Valley](#), the nonprofit announced today.

It's the largest loan in the trust's history but, considering the rising land values in Silicon Valley, is likely to be eclipsed before the end of the year, said [Jim Mather](#), the chief lending officer for the organization. "We've got probably \$120 million in our loan pipeline right now," he said.

He called the acquisition cost for the project averaging about \$50,000 per unit “a pretty darn good deal these days.”

The project is planned by affordable housing developer First Community Housing as a twin tower at 280 McEvoy St. The first phase is planned as a mix of one-, two- and three-bedroom units ranging from about \$750 to \$2,100 per month. The second phase is slated to be studio apartments renting for \$700 to \$1,500 per month.

RentCafe estimates the average market rate for a San Jose studio apartment is \$1,948 and for a three bedroom \$3,407.

Construction could begin in two years after land-use approvals with a tentative first-phase opening in 2022. The land was purchased from the D’Arpino family, which originally operated S&S Welding on the site.

“A lot of what we’re going to do is supporting multifamily affordable housing and workforce affordable housing,” said [Geoffrey Morgan](#), First Community’s president and CEO. “We’re going to have a rich menu of bicycle amenities, of areas to learn and work and play.”

Although construction costs are still being revised, he said he expects them to be “north of \$500,000 per unit.”

Morgan said every unit will have bicycle storage and residents will receive free Valley Transportation Authority passes for public transit: “Wouldn’t that make the most sense since we’re going to be near what promises to be the greatest multimodal transit hub on the West Coast?” he said.

[Back to Top](#)

[San Jose: Authorities identify one killed in light-rail crash](#)

Authorities have identified one of two men [killed more than four weeks ago](#) when they drove onto the light-rail tracks in San Jose and were hit by a train.

David Holt, 60, of San Jose, was the driver of the car, according to the Santa Clara County Medical Examiner-Coroner’s Office. His passenger has yet to be positively identified.

The collision occurred on Lincoln Avenue near Auzerais Avenue on July 8. San Jose police said the men’s car, a gold Buick Regal, went through the railroad crossing arms and was struck by a Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority light-rail train.

The car was not reported stolen, and investigators estimate it was traveling about 50 mph at the time of the crash. The speed limit for trains on that section of track is 55 mph.

The crash knocked the train off the tracks, but no passengers were hurt, according to police. An update on the investigation into the collision was not immediately available.

[Back to Top](#)

From Carr Fire to Big Sur, one takeaway from disaster is how much we need good roads (Sacramento Bee)

California's main seasons – fire and rain – have long generated more than their share of disaster. Still, this past year has been instructive as climate change has increased their intensity.

Take transportation. If it wasn't already clear that maintaining asphalt is a life-and-death line item, last weekend's lethal megafires drove home the point for thousands of evacuees.

The Carr Fire alone created miles-long traffic jams as terrified Redding residents jammed rural blacktops. In a few months, those who return to the scorched hills will become reacquainted with the wildfire postscript: mudslides.

Bottom of Form

[Global warming is here](#). Its impact won't be receding. Ever more volatile weather systems will be sink-holing roads, undermining bridges and sluicing boulder-filled mud down onto critical rail lines and transportation links.

That's something to keep in mind as the Nov. 6 election approaches, with its partisan debate over whether to repeal California's [recent tax increases](#) for roads and transportation. [Proposition 6](#), part of a strategy to drive up conservative turnout in the 2018 election, would put the kibosh on some \$52 billion worth of transportation funding over the next decade.

And as [The Sacramento Bee's Alexei Koseff reported on Tuesday](#), if the repeal succeeds, its backers are already planning a follow-up initiative to severely restrict the use of transportation revenue from fuel taxes, car sales taxes and truck weight fees.

Tempting as it may sound to save a few cents at the pump – or to aim a satisfying, anti-tax kick in the pants at spendthrift state lawmakers – voters should remember that there's a price for the short-term pleasure of jerking purse strings.

What's that price? For starters, about 6,500 bridge and road safety, transportation and transit projects if Proposition 6 passes, according to a recent estimate from the nonpartisan American Road & Transportation Builders Association. That and \$5 billion a year or more in cuts to other

state obligations, such as courts and universities, if the follow-up ballot measure succeeds, according to a [Sacramento Bee analysis](#).

We reserve judgment on Proposition 6, though we supported the gas tax. The needs of Californians are a moving target, and public spending should follow those priorities.

But part of that responsiveness must be to the needs created by global warming, the defining threat of our lifetime. In the long term, that means doing all we can to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions that are warming the planet. In the short term, it means spending what we must to prepare for the next disaster – and when it comes, to make it out in one piece.

[Back to Top](#)

[Uber, Lyft Agree To Citywide Ride Tax \(SFGate.com\)](#)

Ride-hailing companies Uber and Lyft have agreed to allow the city of San Francisco to tax a percentage of their net ride revenues, according to Supervisor Aaron Peskin.

The ride-hail tax will go toward paying for transportation infrastructure and operations throughout the city.

The agreement was announced this afternoon, just before supervisors were set to vote on Peskin's proposed general gross receipts business tax measure. In light of the agreement, Peskin withdrew the measure, which would have placed the decision to tax the ride-hailing companies in front of voters in the November elections.

"This is a win-win for everyone," Peskin said in a statement. "We have a \$100 million local funding obligation to meet the transportation demands of a growing city. Voters have made it clear that they want corporations to pay their fair share to meet that need, particularly when there is a nexus to issues like congestion and traffic. I'm optimistic that this concession on the part of the TNC's (transportation network companies) signals a shift in their corporate culture and willingness to work with - not fight with - local governments," he said.

Mayor London Breed said in a statement, "I am pleased that an agreement has been reached with rideshare companies to institute a per-ride charge and avoid a divisive ballot measure.

"This will create a dedicated source of revenue to alleviate congestion, improve the condition of our roads, and keep San Francisco moving. I look forward to working with our state representatives and the Board of Supervisors to pass legislation to implement this agreement," she said.

The agreement would apply a 3.25 percent tax rate to single-use rides and a 1.5 percent tax rate to shared carpool rides to all ride-hailing service companies. Autonomous vehicles would be included in the tax, once they are permitted to begin charging for rides.

The tax would end in 2045, Peskin's office said.

The tax is expected to bring in about \$30 million in the first few years. The tax revenue would be remitted to the San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

"San Francisco streets are more congested and crowded than ever. As we build more housing and add more jobs in San Francisco, we must invest in public transit and transportation infrastructure so we can move more people around our city in the fastest and safest way possible. We need the additional revenue to make these critical transportation investments and improvements," Assemblyman Phil Ting, D-San Francisco, said in a statement.

"These revenues can help build out our transit, biking and pedestrian networks and support vital Vision Zero safety initiatives. While there is still a ways to go, this is a critical first step and commitment on behalf of both the public and private sectors," Tilly Chang, executive director of the San Francisco County Transportation Authority, said in a statement.

According to a study by Chang's agency, Uber and Lyft together average about 82 million trips yearly. In addition, between 80 and 90 percent of ride-hailing service drivers come from outside the city.

Furthermore, 26 percent of trips during peak hour commute times are made by ride-hailing service drivers in the city's most transit-rich areas.

"Uber is pleased to reach an agreement that will bring dedicated transportation funding to San Francisco," Alex Randolph, Uber's policy lead in Northern California, said in a statement.

"Lyft is focused on improving transportation in cities and we recognize the importance of reliable transportation in San Francisco," Lyft official Brian McGuigan said in a statement. "We are glad to have arrived at a solution that will help keep rideshare convenient and affordable."

Supervisor Peskin is co-chair of the city's Transportation Task Force 2045, which has identified a need for \$22 billion over the next 27 years for critical transit infrastructure and service, in addition to pedestrian and bicycle safety facilities.

[Back to Top](#)

[Buildings Integrating With Public Transit Could Help Kick Our Car Habit](#) (Propmodo.com)

Any city or neighborhood built in the last seventy years is likely car-centric. The newly acquired convenience of a fast, affordable and reliable car changed the way we live and thus transformed the places we live. Building out is easier and cheaper than building up, [except for the municipalities that have to foot the bill for the infrastructure](#), so the real estate community was all too happy to oblige in the world's new automophilia.

Now that the chrome has tarnished and the newness of living life out of a car seat has faded, we are seeing the downside of creating our towns around cars and not vice versa. Cities are more affordable, healthy and sustainable when they can be navigated without a car. When residents are able to forgo a car purchase they have more money for expenses that are more directly impactful to the local economy and cities can use less public space for parking. With fewer cars, cities infill with more residents and more activities to support them.

As technology has created efficient mass transit and new ways to get around it has also made cars, even more, a part of our local economies. Ridesharing companies empower some to be less dependant on cars but also make using them even more convenient. So convenient that it has many turning first to their favorite ridesharing app instead of finding viable public transportation options.

[A study came out recently that suggests that ridesharing actually increased traffic congestion in city centers](#). Even shared ride services like UberPOOL and Lyft Shared Rides are blamed for adding mileage to city streets rather than reducing car usage. It cites that the main reasons for using a ridesharing service involve the expense or hassle of parking and that speed, comfort and convenience are rarely or never cited.

Uber, Lyft and all the others are quick to point out that they can be additive to a public transportation system by providing the "last mile" option that can get riders to transportation hubs. This is likely true, but in the world of one-click convenience, many would rather just use their crowdsourced cab to go directly to their destination when it is not cost prohibitive. Plus, now there are many great options like electric scooters and dockless bikes that can handle last mile logistics (as long as the hills are not too steep).

So if there really is no replacement for public transportation then how do we convince people to use it? It turns out that the property industry might have a role in that. Buildings and residences near transit centers are already benefiting from premium valuations but just being close to a bus or train line doesn't mean that people will use it. The key is in reducing friction. One example of how properties can help reduce the friction of uncertainty in public transit is a collaboration between [TransitScreen](#), a real-time data platform for urban mobility, and [Bixby](#), a property management tool and tenant portal. Now residents of buildings can understand all of

their transportation options, including ride sharing, on the same app that they use to pay their rent and put in a service request.

Breaking our dependency on cars will take sacrifice. Nothing is easier than jumping in a car and going directly to your destination. But if the arteries of our cities get clogged with traffic, then driving can cease to feel like the best option. The power of technology comes from the information that it can disseminate. That power can transform our built environments if it helps to make better choices in how we go to and from the places where we live our lives.

[Back to Top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

From: VTA Board Secretary

Sent: Friday, August 3, 2018 5:30 PM

To: VTA Board of Directors

Subject: VTA Correspondence: Government Affairs Report; BART Board and Caltrain JPB Meeting Summaries; Change Order for Installation of Insulated Joints; Warm Springs BART Station; BART Director Blalock Not Running for Re-election

VTA Board of Directors:

We are forwarding you the following:

From	Topic
VTA	Items provided at the August 2, 2018 VTA Board Meeting: 1) Agenda Item #8.1.A – Government Affairs Report; 2) Agenda Item #8.4 – BART Board Meeting Summary 3) Agenda Item #8.4.D – Caltrain JPB Meeting Summary
Roland Lebrun	Caltrain Joint Powers Board Agenda Item #7.d – Change Order for Installation of Insulated Joints
Member of the Public	Video clip regarding delays in opening the Warm Springs BART station and projections for VTA’s opening dates
Member of the Public	Article/video clip regarding BART Director Thomas Blalock not running for re-election

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.

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS REPORT

August 2, 2018

Transportation Infrastructure Funding Threats: As we move into the fall of 2018, critical sources of funding face difficult challenges at local, regional, state and federal levels of government. These challenges threaten VTA’s ability to deliver major infrastructure maintenance and expansion projects promised to the taxpayers and voters.

2016 Measure B: When more than 70 percent of Santa Clara County voters approved Measure B in 2016, they signaled widespread support for nine program areas totaling \$6.3 billion in investments in our county’s infrastructure. These include:

- | | |
|---|---------------|
| • Local Street and Roads | \$1.2 billion |
| • BART Silicon Valley Phase II | \$1.5 billion |
| • Bicycle/Pedestrian Program | \$250 million |
| • Caltrain Corridor Capacity Improvements | \$314 million |
| • Caltrain Grade Separations | \$700 million |
| • County Expressways | \$750 million |
| • Highway Interchanges | \$750 million |
| • State Route 85 Corridor | \$350 million |
| • Transit Operations | \$500 million |

Subsequently, this measure was challenged in court, and the original complaint was dismissed. That ruling has been appealed, and VTA is waiting for the court to issue a date for oral arguments. While we wait, more than \$220 million dollars has been collected and kept in an escrow account until the suit is resolved. Program guidelines for each category and agreements with each city for Local Streets and Roads funds have been approved in order to expedite the distribution of Measure B funds once the lawsuit is resolved.

Regional Measure 3: On June 5, the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association filed a complaint in the Superior Court in San Francisco against the Bay Area Toll Authority and the California State Legislature, seeking to invalidate the bridge toll increase approved by 54 percent of the Bay Area voters on June 5. The Taxpayers Association’s main argument is that the toll increase should be considered a tax and subject to a higher voter-approval threshold of 66 percent. Under state law, fees on the use of a state facilities are exempt from this threshold and must be approved by a simple majority.

Commonly referred to as Regional Measure 3 (RM 3), the bridge toll provides funding for projects throughout the Bay Area designed to reduce congestion impacting the seven state-owned bridge corridors. 61 percent of voters in Santa Clara County approved the measure which would fund VTA’s BART Extension to Silicon Valley, Phase 2; the Diridon Station Area expansion, and the Eastridge to BART Regional Connector. The Silicon Valley Express Lanes network is also eligible for a portion of this funding.

Senate Bill 1 (Beall), the “Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017”: On June 25, the California Secretary of State announced that proponents of a repeal of Senate Bill 1 (Beall) the “Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017” (SB 1) had garnered enough valid signatures to place their measure before California voters in the general election on November 6, 2018. Designated by the Secretary of State as Proposition 6, this measure would have two significant impacts on the maintenance and expansion of surface transportation infrastructure in California for decades to come.

First, the measure would repeal SB 1. Secondly, it will require voter approval for transportation fuel tax and vehicle fee increases moving forward, marking a significantly higher threshold to approve these investments in future years. By delaying and deferring maintenance projects, the state’s overall maintenance needs and their costs will only increase dramatically.

The State of California and local jurisdictions face growing backlogs of maintenance projects totaling more than \$59 billion and \$78 billion, respectively. In broad terms, SB 1 restores the state’s capacity to address the state’s “aging pains” by adjusting the gasoline excise tax to account for inflation and addressing the loss of potential transportation fuels revenues as Californians purchase more hybrid and zero-emission vehicles. In June, 2018, voters approved Proposition 69 by more than 80 percent, which protects all new SB 1 revenues from being diverted or borrowed for non-transportation purposes.

FEDERAL

Fiscal Year 2019 (FY 2019) Appropriations: The House Appropriations Committee approved the Transportation Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Appropriations on May 23. The Senate Appropriations Committee approved their version of the spending bill on June 7 with a vote of 31-0. Both House and Senate versions of the bill would appropriate \$2.6 billion for the Capital Investment Grant (CIG) Program, through which VTA will seek a multi-year, \$1.5 billion Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) for Phase II of the BART to Silicon Valley Extension. President Trump’s budget request for FY 2019 only requests \$1 billion for the program. This is part of a pattern under this Administration to seek significant cuts or elimination of key transportation programs, and it contrasts with much higher funding levels that have been included in congressional THUD appropriations.

On July 31, the full Senate adopted two transit-related amendments to H.R. 6147, the FY 2019 spending bill, or “minibus”, which packages four appropriations bills together: Transportation, Housing and Urban Affairs (THUD); Agriculture; Interior and Environment; and Financial Services. On August 1, The Senate approved the bill on a 92-6 vote.

One of these amendments, submitted by Senator Reed (D- RI) would restrict transportation funds from being used to implement or further new policies outlined in a letter from Acting Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Administrator K. Jane Williams on June 29. These policy changes would challenge the funding plan for one significant national project, the Gateway Tunnel in New York, by redefining certain loan programs as counting toward the federal share of project budgets within the Capital Investment Grant Program (CIG). For agencies around the country,

the letter also raised questions about what criteria the FTA intended to use in evaluating future applications in this program. Historically, these projects have been rated on their ability to demonstrate mobility enhancements, environmental benefits, congestion relief, economic development and land use benefits, and cost effectiveness. The FTA also required that applicants had to show an acceptable degree of local financial commitment including evidence of stable and dependable financing sources. The letter urged project sponsors to include innovative funding strategies including value capture and private investment. Official CIG policy guidance has not yet been issued for public comment, making any potential program changes problematic for project sponsors who have project funding plans determined years in advance.

The House is not expected to take its version of the THUD bill to the floor. Instead, House and Senate committee staff have been instructed to work through August to reconcile differences between the House Appropriations Committee and Senate versions of the bill. Because the House has not passed a bill, they really will not have an official conference committee. This work will be conducted by the chairs and ranking Democrats on the THUD subcommittees in the House and Senate and their respective staffs. It is anticipated that they will leave the big decisions for the full committee chairs and leadership while the White House will have a seat at the table as well.

The key subcommittee members are:

- Rep. Mario Diaz Balart (R-FL) chair of the House Subcommittee
- Rep. David Price, (D-NC) Ranking Democrat
- Senator Susan Collins (R-ME), Subcommittee chair
- Senator Jack Reed (D-RI), Ranking Democrat.

Despite the Trump Administration's stated desire to eliminate the CIG program, and the apparent reluctance on the part of the FTA to sign new multi-year Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGA), the program continues to enjoy strong bipartisan congressional support. The FY 2018 appropriations bill included direction to the FTA to obligate approximately 80 percent of that year's funds by December 31, 2019. This year's appropriations bill similarly directs the FTA to provide Congress with updates on projects in this program.

August Recess: While the House of Representatives is in recess until September 4, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell canceled three of the four-week August recess to focus on passing FY 2019 appropriations bills and approving presidential nominations to the judiciary. Senator McConnell partially canceled August recess in 2017. This cancellation keeps the 10 vulnerable Senate Democratic incumbents in Washington, D.C., over the summer while their Republican rivals campaign against them at home.

Shuster Infrastructure Proposal: On July 23, House Transportation and Infrastructure and Committee Chair, Republican Bill Shuster of Pennsylvania, released a proposal to shore up the Highway Trust Fund and streamline the funding, approval and delivery of infrastructure projects. The author's proposal is intended to spur discussion on policy reforms and potential new funding sources designed to keep the Highway Trust Fund solvent past FY 2020. Chief among these suggested revenue increases would be an increase of the federal gas tax by fifteen

cents, phased in over three years and indexed to inflation. 4.3 cent diesel taxes previously paid by public transit agencies would be reinstated, and ten percent taxes on electric vehicle batteries and bicycle tires would be imposed to diversify to funding sources that support the Highway Trust Fund. This proposal would establish a commission to explore ways to maintain the fund's solvency without recommending additional fuel tax increases. Finally, the proposal outlines changes to expedite project delivery including time limits on environmental review of transportation projects.

While members of Congress and the Trump Administration have repeatedly indicated an interest in the adoption of an infrastructure initiative, no movement on this proposal is expected in 2018. The combination of mid-term elections, other legislative priorities, and the reluctance of conservatives to consider fuel tax increases combine to push this topic into future years. Congressman Shuster has also stated his intention to retire at the end of this year.

STATE

Governor Brown Signs the FY 2018-19 State Budget: On June 27, Governor Brown signed the FY 2018-19 State Budget, the final budget of his term. The final adopted budget emphasized fiscal prudence in the face of uncertain impacts to California from the recently-enacted federal tax reforms and the unprecedented length of the current economic expansion. The budget fully funds the Rainy Day Fund at the constitutionally-mandated level of \$13.8 billion. The budget funds a number of one-time investments in infrastructure and avoids creating new ongoing expenses that would impact future budgets. The \$1.4 billion cap-and-trade program budget for next year includes including \$210 million for forest improvement and wildfire prevention projects and \$334.5 million for the California Energy Commission and the California Air Resources Board to accelerate sales of zero-emission vehicles through vehicle rebates and infrastructure investments. The budget also provides the first full year of funding derived from gasoline and diesel excise tax adjustments and part of the transportation improvement fee under SB 1. This amounts to \$4.6 billion in new transportation funding in 2018-19. The funding will repair neighborhood roads, state highways and bridges, fill potholes, ease congestion in busy trade and commute corridors and improve public transit. Of this amount, local streets and roads and highway maintenance make up the largest portions of these funds, with a combined \$2.4 billion. The legislature is in recess and will return August 6.

REGIONAL

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC): On July 25, MTC approved an agreement with VTA to allow for the exchange of \$1.2 million in 2016 Measure B funds with federal Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funds or Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (CMAQ) funds for the State Route 85 Transit Guideway Study. This action allows VTA to use a different funding source to advance the Transit Guideway Study as the legal challenge to Measure B is resolved. In the coming months, VTA will work with MTC to secure these funds from the Federal Highway Administration.

The Commission also approved the repurposing of \$3,278,275 in unused federal earmarks for

the US 101 Express Lanes Project, Phase 5. These funds will support the design of the express lanes segment on US 101 between SR 237 and I-880.

Also at this Commission meeting, MTC Chair Jake McKenzie announced the retirement of MTC Executive Director, Steve Heminger. Mr. Heminger has served as the head of the organization for seventeen years, having started with MTC 1993 as the Manager of Legislation and Public Affairs.

BART Board Meeting Summary for July 2018

BART Board Meeting Summary

At its July 12, 2018 meeting, the BART Board:

- Approved an amendment to BART Police Citizen Review Board membership requirements.
- Approved the BART Accessibility Task Force membership appointments. Two members were appointed; Christina Lasson and Mussie Gebre.
- Received an update on the Transbay Tube Earthquake Safety Service Plan.

The BART Board will next meet on
August 9, 2018, at 9:00 a.m.
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
300 Lakeside Drive, P. O. Box 12688, Oakland, CA 94604-2688

Caltrain JPB Meeting Summary

Caltrain JPB Meeting Summary

At its August 2, 2018 meeting, the Caltrain JPB:

- Received the monthly report from the Executive Director on Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Quarterly Report. The monthly progress report on the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) provided an overview of the PCEP and provided funding partners, stakeholders, and the public an overall update on the progress of the project.
- Approved the resolution expressing its strenuous opposition to Proposition 6, which would repeal Senate Bill 1, also known as the “Road Repair and Accountability Act”.
- Received and update on the Caltrain Fare Study. The draft fare study phase 1 report and the means-based program was shared with the board.
- Approved the adoption of the appointment of Citizens Advisory Committee Representatives (CAC):
 - Cat Chang, Representing San Francisco County, to a term ending June 30, 2021
 - Kevin Burke, Representing San Mateo County, to a term ending June 30, 2021
 - Larry Klein, Representing Santa Clara County, to a term ending June 30, 2021
- Approved the addendum #4 to the 2015 Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Final Environmental Impact Report. Additionally approved the inclusion of new potential site for Paralleling Station 2 for the PCEP.
- Approved the addendum #5 to the 2015 Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project Final Environmental Impact Report. Additionally approved the inclusion of new potential site for Paralleling Station 3 for the PCEP.
- Approved the execution program supplemental agreements for receipt of \$3 million in transit and intercity rail capital program funding for network integration planning, and amend to increase fiscal year 2019 capital budget from \$42,748,255 to \$45,748,255.
- Approved the development of a financing plan, debt policy, and declaration of official intent to reimburse expenditures from the proceeds of indebtedness. Authorized staff to proceed to work with the City and County of San Francisco, the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, and the San Mateo County Transit District, each a member agency (Member Agency) of the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB), with respect to the public hearings required to be conducted and the resolutions required to be adopted in connection with the proposed debt.
- Received an information presentation by the City and County of San Francisco on their Rail Alignment and Benefits (RAB) Study.

The Caltrain JPB will next meet on
September 6, 2018, at 10 a.m.

San Mateo County Transit District Administrative Building
Bacciocco Auditorium, 2nd Floor, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, CA 94070

From: smulligan **On Behalf Of** Sean Mulligan

Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 12:07 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary; Bertalan, Richard

Subject: Richard, VTA Board Secretary / video clip for item 3, 8/2/2018 VTA Board meeting

I sent this separately from Dropbox, but here it is again.

https://www.dropbox.com/s/iikgt8m84I7eevc/vta_bod_20180802_item_3_blalock.mp4?dl=0

Please confirm that you successfully downloaded this video and that it will play on item 3.

--Sean

From: smulligan **On Behalf Of** Sean Mulligan

Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 5:12 PM

To: VTA Board Secretary

Cc: General Manager; Liccardo, Sam; Ratcliffe, Dennis; Gonot, Carolyn

Subject: VTA Board Correspondence re BART Director Tom Blalock, not running again

Hi VTA Board Secretary,

Could you forward the following to the VTA Board.

<https://ebcitizen.com/2018/07/12/bart-director-blalock-will-not-run-for-re-election/>

It includes a YouTube clip from a BART Board meeting where BART Director Thomas Blalock states that he will not run for re-election. His term will end in December 2018.

--Sean