

**From:** VTA Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Monday, January 7, 2019 4:25 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors  
**Subject:** VTA Information: January 10, 2019, Revised Agenda to the VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting  
**Importance:** High

**VTA Board of Directors:**

You may now access the updated **VTA Board of Directors Regular Meeting Agenda Packet**, with a revised agenda, scheduled for January 10, 2019, [on our website here](#).

Please note the additional language for **Agenda Item #9.1.D** - Conference with Labor Negotiators, [in blue](#) as follows:

**9.1D.** Conference with Labor Negotiators  
[Government Code Section 54957.6]

VTA Designated Representatives

Alberto Lara, Director of Business Services

Bob Escobar, Negotiator

Raj Srinath, Chief Financial Officer

Inez Evans, Chief Operating Officer

[Sylvester Fadal, Deputy Director of Business Services](#)

Employee Organizations

Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 265

Service Employees International Union, Local 521

[American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees Local 101 \(AFSCME\)](#)

[Transportation Authority Engineers & Architects Association Local 21 \(TAEA\)](#)

Thank you.

Office of the Board Secretary  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
3331 North First Street, Building B  
San Jose, CA 95134-1927  
Phone [408-321-5680](tel:408-321-5680)



**From:** VTA Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 8, 2019 8:43 AM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors  
**Subject:** From VTA: January 5-7, 2019 Media Clips



## ***VTA Daily News Coverage for Saturday, January 5 – Monday, January 7, 2019***

1. [VTA Service to College Football Championship \(KCBS-AM\)](#)
2. [VTA Service Impacts on January 7 \(multiple outlets\)](#)
3. [Update: Levi's Stadium To Bus Fans From Bart To College Football Championship \(SF Gate\)](#)
4. [Kurtenbach: Don't blame the Bay Area for college football's mistakes \(Mercury News\)](#)
5. [Bay Area's low-income transit riders, after long wait, to receive discounts \(SF Gate\)](#)
6. [Soon-to-be-retired BART cars could become Airbnb hotels, homeless shelters or housing \(SF Examiner\)](#)

### **VTA Service to College Football Championship (KCBS-AM)**

(click link above for radio segment)

[Back to Top](#)

### **VTA Service Impacts on January 7 (multiple outlets)**

[KNTV](#)

[KPIX](#)

[Back to Top](#)

### **Update: Levi's Stadium To Bus Fans From Bart To College Football Championship (SF Gate)**

Levi's Stadium will provide charter bus service from Warm Springs BART in Fremont to the College Football Playoff National Championship after the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority canceled service Monday due to unscheduled operator absences.

The stadium in Santa Clara and its official transportation partner Corinthian Transportation will replace VTA's Line 251 to bus fans to the 5 p.m. championship game, where the Alabama Crimson Tide will face the Clemson Tigers.

Shuttle buses will go back and forth between the BART station and the stadium every 30 minutes between 1 p.m. and 5 p.m. Buses will drop fans off outside of the Santa Clara Convention Center.

Alternative service is available via light rail at the Great Mall and I-880/Milpitas stations. VTA officials said direct trains to and from Levi's Stadium will be available before and after the game.

The agency has not yet released the number of operator absences that resulted in the canceled service.

[Back to Top](#)

### [Kurtenbach: Don't blame the Bay Area for college football's mistakes](#) (Mercury News)

We've seen the Bay Area and Levi's Stadium successfully host big sporting events in recent years — the Super Bowl and Wrestlemania come to mind.

So why is this the College Football Playoff National Championship not getting the game amount of buzz? Why are ticket prices cratering? Why is there the threat of empty seats? And why is the game already being written off as a failure?

The answer, of course, is simple:

This game — like any big sporting event — is supposed to be a party.

But who the hell schedules a party for 5 p.m. on a weeknight in the most expensive suburbs in America?

And who would want to go to a party where the guests are a bunch of people you don't know, who live 2,200 miles away? (But don't worry, they all know each other... all too well.)

No one who would consider themselves "casually interested," that's for sure.

Even rabid fans — who likely live thousands of miles away — would need a bit more convincing before flying in for that one. (4K TVs are pretty awesome.)

As a result, anyone can get into the title game for a 75 percent discount off the (ridiculous) face value of a ticket.

It makes perfect sense to me.

But what doesn't make sense is how this disastrous idea of an event has turned into a referendum on the Bay Area.

“Behold Santa Clara, the worst National Championship venue available” opined college football’s self-appointed ombudsman, Spencer Hall, in a column last week that was then re-created dozens of times over by college football’s insular media.

But I would argue that Santa Clara is the perfect venue for the National Championship Game — so long as we’re talking about the one college football’s power brokers, the Power 5 conference commissioners and the College Football Playoff board of managers, envisioned when they created the contest out of thin air.

They could have placed their much-ballyhooed end-of-season showdown anywhere. They chose a soulless stadium amid a sea of corporate campuses. Isn’t that telling?

They did that, without remorse because they think they created a product that is multitudes better than it actually is. They think that they have a truly national event, like the Super Bowl.

They don’t. They never did. And I doubt they ever will.

The Bay Area has told them exactly that in the buildup to Monday’s game, just as the Phoenix suburb of Glendale did two years ago.

Will the National Championship game be a washout? – here’s the weather forecast

College football is a massive sport in large part because of the pomp and circumstance. Go to Tuscaloosa, Alabama, Clemson, South Carolina, or hundreds of college towns across the nation on a Saturday and it’s an all-day party.

And bowl games, believe it or not, can recreate that atmosphere.

Timing has a lot to do with that. It’s no accident that the best bowl games — the ones people really care about — come in that incredible no man’s land between Christmas and New Year’s Day.

You know, the period where no one is really working and everyone is traveling. It’s anarchy in corporate America — the year’s longest weekend.

It’s a great time to skip town. After all, you have a few sick days you need to use before the end of the year — why not go to a game in Pasadena or Miami (or even Santa Clara)?

Get some sun, let loose, have a few beers — revel in the school pride and watch some good football.

And if you have a bowl game in your backyard, why not stop by and see what all the fuss is about? It’s a holiday, after all.

But Monday starts the first full week back at work for just about everyone in a 9-to-5 job. The party is officially over.

But that’s when the college football power brokers decided to host their “Super Bowl”.

In a corporate park stadium.

Thousands of miles away from the fanbases of the teams playing in the game.

Say what you will about the overwhelming corporatism of the Super Bowl — at least you can spend all day Sunday drinking \$19 beers.

ESPN — the real power broker who is paying those other, lesser power brokers' salaries — doesn't care that it makes no sense to play this game outside of driving range for the two teams competing, though. After all, they have tremendous television for the gloomiest night of the year. Don't forget: this is a company that creates bowl games and places them in football-crazy areas like the Bahamas so they can fill programming hours in December.

And I doubt the conference commissioners and playoff committee members really care, either. They created a billion-dollar revenue stream — the largest revenue stream in their sport — out of nothing, made it their own image (expense-report chic), and then were paid to spend the week in the Bay Area. It doesn't matter if 500 people and half the team rosters show up, this is a win for them. I bet some even took a trip to Napa over the weekend.

But when you see empty seats Monday, remember that the blame lies with those parties, not the Bay Area.

It's not the Bay Area's fault that these power brokers have no idea what makes their sport great and are delusional about what makes them successful. That they created a game so sanitized, so artificial, and so anti-collegial that it could pique no curiosity from a casual bystander whatsoever.

It's not the Bay Area's fault that the sport has become increasingly regionalized to the South in recent years (thanks, in no small part, to wicked mismanagement from the "hosting" conference, the Pac-12), and that those in charge either don't see it or refuse to accept that fact.

It's not the Bay Area's fault (well, not entirely the Bay Area's fault) that they created a game so inaccessible and inconsiderate that the free market has handed them a dose of serious reality.

And it's certainly not the Bay Area's fault for not being interested in Alabama playing Clemson again.

These are college football's problem, through and through, and making the Bay Area the boogeyman won't fix them.

[Back to Top](#)

## **[Bay Area's low-income transit riders, after long wait, to receive discounts \(SF Gate\)](#)**

Low-income riders of BART and other Bay Area transit agencies will get a 20 percent discount in an effort to lift an economic barrier for passengers who don't live near where they work.

Ten BART stations and a 15-minute bus ride separate Krea Gomez's home in North Oakland from her parents' apartment in San Francisco's Bernal Heights. But for a mother of six with no car, the cost to get there is crushing.

"It's \$4 to \$5 a head, which is a significant amount of money," said Gomez, who works at a social justice nonprofit. As fares inched up, she cut back family visits, shopping trips and outings to the Exploratorium. These days she often joins casual carpools to commute to her office in San Francisco's South of Market.

Bay Area transportation officials have a plan to help: a 20 percent discount for low-income people to use BART, Caltrain, [Muni buses and light rail](#) or [Golden Gate ferries and buses](#) in the North Bay. Supporters hope to lift a steep, if little noticed, economic barrier for people who don't live near their workplaces.

The move comes as transit agencies around the country struggle to ease costs for their neediest riders, only to find that their good intentions get hobbled by political wrangling and sparse funding. New York City began a program Friday that immediately hit criticism: It offered half-price fares, but only to about 30,000 people who already receive cash assistance.

The Bay Area's version caused similar frustrations. Some riders say the assistance is insufficient, and it's coming late. The discounts were approved in May but might not take effect until November, after years of study and an intricate bureaucratic process.

"The question people should be asking is: Why aren't these services half off for poor people?" asked William Walker, a UC Berkeley student and former BART board candidate. He said some of his friends flinch at taking mass transit because they can [cross the bay with Uber's carpool service for about the same price](#).

BART Board Director Lateefah Simon, who pressed for the fare reduction, agreed that it should be greater. "It's not nearly enough, but it's something," she said. "If you live out in Contra Costa and you clean hotel rooms, BART gets really expensive."

Housing tends to be cheaper far away from job centers, which raises the price of commuting. For many people, it means more transfers, more complexity and more fares tacked on. And BART's fare system, unlike that of some other metro rail lines, charges more for longer trips.

"There's a structural economic injustice to our transit system," said [Karen Heisler, co-owner of Mission Pie, a bakery at 25th and Mission streets](#) that employs people from as far away as Vallejo and Pleasant Hill.

"If you live far away, it's because you're less affluent," Heisler said. "But the people who live far out pay more."

Members of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission conceived of the fare reduction as a salve for this problem, with limitations. The program would run for up to 18 months — enough time for the commission to evaluate it and make revisions. It would apply to people earning 200

percent of the federal poverty level, or less: \$24,280 annually for a single taxpayer, or \$50,200 for a family of four. To qualify, people would submit income tax returns or eligibility cards from other social service providers. They would use Clipper cards to pay the reduced fare.

Roughly a quarter of BART riders fit this definition of low income, as do nearly 60 percent of Muni passengers, 14 percent of people riding the Golden Gate ferry and fewer than a tenth of Caltrain riders. Many of them are adults toiling at minimum wage jobs; the others are young students whom transit agencies hope to attract and keep.

“The agencies are trying to do this to get at a social equity issue that is front and center in our society,” said Randy Rentschler, legislative director at the MTC. And, he added, “there’s a bit of public transit conspiracy in the sense that we want young people to use the system and become comfortable with it.”

Still, when it comes to solving a problem as big as transit inequality, a 20 percent discount is just a start, Rentschler conceded. And even that required three years of discussion and a painful calculus. At \$20.7 million a year, the program hits the limit of what four transit operators can provide without cutting service. MTC would pay \$11 million a year, mostly from state gas taxes, and individual agencies would cover the rest. If the gas tax had been repealed in November, the plan would have fallen apart.

Some officials are skeptical.

“We have to figure out financially whether this is sustainable,” said BART board Director Debora Allen. She and others pointed out that transit systems lack a permanent funding source to cover their portion. Most of them rely heavily on taxpayer subsidies. BART, the outlier, also receives tax money but leans on fares to cover two-thirds of its operating costs; it’s [among the most expensive metro rail systems in the country](#).

Others hope the discounts will have ancillary benefits, such as [curbing fare evasion](#) or staving off competition from Uber and Lyft. But Rentschler said the payoff is intangible because it’s about fairness.

“Public transit already offers a maze of different discounts — to high-volume users, senior citizens and youth,” he said. “The people sitting on the sidelines are the ones who need it most.”

Many riders would prefer a regional pass that applies to every system, bringing coherence to a balkanized Bay Area. Others don’t mind a piecemeal approach but say the fares should be lower and that more people should be eligible for a special rate.

Joshua Davis, a member of the pro-housing group East Bay for Everyone, noted that a family of four making up to \$117,000 a year could qualify for a low-income apartment in San Francisco. That’s more than twice the income threshold set for the transit discounts.

“I realize that BART and other agencies have budgets to balance,” said Davis, who nonetheless urged officials to set a more realistic baseline. Davis knows firsthand how much the cost of transportation can eat into a person’s earnings: He used to spend \$400 a month commuting by BART and Caltrain from Oakland to Palo Alto.

For people like Kisha Jackson, who quit her job as an executive assistant to care for her ailing father, anything helps. Jackson and her father take BART to get from his home in Oakland’s Lakeside neighborhood to doctor appointments in San Francisco. They use Uber and Zipcars to travel shorter distances.

“I’ll take any type of discount,” Jackson said.

Gomez also welcomes the program. Having never owned a car, she’s spent her whole life crisscrossing the Bay Area on mass transit. Then the price shot up, and she had to carefully consider each trip.

“For a family as big as mine, transportation is a big-ticket item,” Gomez said. Lightening that burden means more money for groceries or school supplies — and more visits to Bernal Heights.

[Back to Top](#)

## [Soon-to-be-retired BART cars could become Airbnb hotels, homeless shelters or housing \(SF Examiner\)](#)

Will Bay Area transit enthusiasts one day book BART trains as Airbnb hotel rooms?

That’s one possible future as BART considers outside-the-box ways to retire its aging rail cars when the long-delayed Fleet of the Future is slowly phased into service.

“What I really love about these options is we asked people in government to be creative. So guess what? Our staff is being creative,” said BART Board Director Lateefah Simon, who represents San Francisco, among other counties.

While no decisions have yet been made, the BART Board of Directors will get an early look at retirement options for its fleet at a meeting Thursday.

There will be some 670 rail cars eligible for retirement by BART between last year and 2022, when about 775 Fleet of the Future railcars are expected to have been delivered, according to agency documents. BART estimates it will complete its fleet retirement process by the end of 2023.

Most of the options can be divided into one of two categories: selling the old cars, or donating them.

BART is considering selling vehicles to another transit operator for use, for recycling or scrap “to the highest bidder,” for re-use for housing or as a restaurant, or as memorabilia, according to



agency documents. One party has even reached out to the agency about buying BART cars to use for Airbnb listings,

On the donation side, BART is considering giving rail cars to museums, keeping some for “special service,” or donating them for use in art projects, to the U.S. Army for exercises and drills or to technical schools to encourage trade students to learn engineering skills.

Another particularly outlandish idea, burying the carbon steel subway fleet in the ocean to use as an artificial reef, is something the agency said in documentation is infeasible because of the rail cars’ aluminum composition.

But Simon, one of the BART board directors, particularly liked the idea of donating the cars for use as homeless shelters, or temporary shelters. Redwood Valley Fire Recovery asked for old BART cars for that very purpose, according to BART documents.

“How do we house the houseless?” she told the San Francisco Examiner. “The last thing you’d think about is a BART car. But I tell you we’re about to put hundreds of new cars on the rails, and we have old cars we’re getting rid of.”

“It gets cold at night,” she said.

BART staff also plans to “harvest” usable parts from the retired vehicles, which may influence where they are ultimately sold or donated. They will also hang onto as many older cars that operate well as fleet yard capacity will allow.

One major concern is the federal government: When deciding whether to donate train cars or sell them, agency staff warned in a presentation to the board that BART may owe the Federal Transit Administration about 70 percent of the rail cars’ worth, since the administration paid the lion’s share to purchase them decades ago.

So every railcar BART donates could take some money out of BART’s pocket and send it straight to the federal government.

BART isn’t the only agency to consider creative afterlives for their vehicles. Muni buses have been repurposed as emergency vehicles for the San Francisco Fire Department, San Francisco International Airport shuttles, book-mobiles for school children courtesy of former NFL running back Marshawn Lynch. Some retired Muni buses have even seen second lives as mobile showers for the homeless.

[Back to Top](#)

Conserve paper. Think before you print.

**From:** VTA Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 8, 2019 4:52 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors  
**Subject:** From VTA: January 8, 2019 Media Clips



## ***VTA Daily News Coverage for Tuesday, January 8, 2019***

1. [Google transformed Mountain View, is San Jose next? \(SFGate.com\)](#)
2. [A THIRD OF AMERICANS USE RIDE-HAIL. UBER AND LYFT NEED MORE \(Wired.com\)](#)
3. [After taking on taxis, ride-share services now challenging public transit in U.S. \(UPI.com\)](#)

### **[Google transformed Mountain View, is San Jose next? \(SFGate.com\)](#)**

For decades, canneries around San Jose's Diridon Station processed the fruits of the fertile "Valley of Heart's Delight," now known as Silicon Valley. Opened in 1935, what was then called Cahill Depot was a rail depot for the Southern Pacific Railroad.

The canneries were demolished, as fruit orchards faded away and were replaced by low-slung tech offices. Parking lots now dot quiet streets on the western edge of downtown.

Transportation could once again usher in San Jose's future, this time in partnership with a 21st century corporate giant. Google, Silicon Valley's [biggest tech tenant](#), wants to build a mammoth campus in the area over the next two decades, coinciding with the BART extension to Diridon Station planned for 2026 and future high-speed rail. The station already has Amtrak, Caltrain and light rail.

With 6 million to 8 million square feet of commercial space planned, 20,000 employees from Google and other companies could work in the area. That would boost downtown San Jose's job base of 43,000 by almost 50 percent, according to city data. Google could become the city's largest private employer, surpassing Cisco Systems' 9,800 current workers.

Diridon Station plans will differ from many existing tech campuses that are isolated from the public and steer workers to private cafeterias, shops and gyms. Google plans to include housing, parks and shops open to everyone — though neighbors fear the company's arrival will push them out.

Google has positioned the expansion as having broad community benefits.

“We’ve heard first and foremost that we need to prioritize housing at varying levels of affordability, and we’re committed to doing so,” said Mark Golan, Google vice president of real estate, at a City Council hearing last month.

San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo supports the expansion. He said Google will bring “a tech corporate campus that’s not built with guarded walls and a moat with alligators with it, but actually a campus that’s integrated with a public urban village.”

Liccardo said it would also help reverse decades of suburban sprawl, fueled by congested highways that slice through downtown San Jose.

Diridon Station’s ridership is expected to grow eightfold — from 17,600 daily passengers in 2016 to 140,000 passengers in 2040 — according to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority.

“San Jose, of course, sprawled during the age of the automobile. Our development pattern was really something resembling a doughnut” — growing outskirts and an overlooked downtown, Liccardo said. “This is an opportunity for us to really retrofit a city really built for the automobile for a city built for people.”

Flight traffic from Mineta San Jose International Airport has capped building heights to around a dozen stories. Liccardo said the city plans to propose height increases this month.

Google is not seeking tax subsidies for the expansion and plans to pay for unspecified community benefits around affordable housing, homeless aid, education and job training. That compares favorably with other tech deals, said Liccardo, citing Amazon expansions that call for billions of dollars in public subsidies from New York and Virginia.

A poll last year by the Silicon Valley Leadership Group, a business-backed nonprofit whose members include Google, found that 68 percent of likely voters support the expansion.

But critics fear Google will make San Jose, which already has some of the highest housing costs in the country, more of a place that only the rich can afford.

About 50 local activists have organized against the project. “The impacts will negatively affect our neighborhood,” said Liz Gonzalez, 38, a lifelong San Jose resident who works near Diridon Station. “A tech company’s only going to drive up prices.”

She would rather see no tech offices and a community-driven land trust plan with parks and affordable housing.

Gonzalez was one of [eight people arrested at a 10-hour City Council meeting](#) last month after they chained themselves to chairs and chanted against the project.

Despite the opposition, the council voted unanimously to sell public land to Google for \$110 million, citing the long-term boost of millions of dollars in expected tax benefits.

Liccardo says the housing crisis goes beyond Google. In 2017, he called for 25,000 new homes by 2022 — before the first new Google office is expected to open.

Within the Diridon Station area, about 5,000 housing units could be built, a city study found. The city has a goal of 25 percent affordable housing there.

Aggressive land annexation has made San Jose the Bay Area's largest and most populated city, sprawling across 180 square miles. It's the 10th largest by population in the United States, with more than 1 million residents.

Despite being the headquarters to a number of household tech names, including PayPal, eBay and Adobe, it's more of a bedroom community than a jobs center, city officials say.

More than 60 percent of employed residents leave San Jose for smaller jobs-rich cities like Mountain View and Palo Alto, worsening commutes and depriving San Jose of tax revenue.

The region's three largest tech companies — Apple, Facebook and Google — have headquarters elsewhere. And the next crop of major employers — including Twitter, Uber and Airbnb — chose San Francisco for their headquarters.

"It's a different generation of tech companies. They want to be in an exciting, urban place. San Jose hasn't gotten there yet," said Terry Christensen, professor emeritus of political science at San Jose State University. "The population here has really been focused on work and family."

No new office buildings are under construction downtown because asking rents aren't high enough to justify the cost of construction, said Erik Hallgrimson, a broker with Cushman and Wakefield. That in turn limits job growth.

Final approval of Google's expansion isn't expected until 2021 at the earliest, and the next two years will be a marathon of public hearings, City Council votes, environmental studies — and continued opposition.

Martha Nieves, a lifelong San Jose resident, lives in Cinnabar Commons, an affordable housing complex two blocks away from the Google site. She makes \$15.75 per hour at Hope Services working with autistic children.

As a single mom raising two kids, the city's high living costs are already a challenge. She fears Google's arrival will make it even harder.

"I do not want to move to the east side. I'm going to try my best to stay," she said. "I feel that a lot of people are scared."

Nieves thinks Google has been too vague about its community benefits plans and thinks future jobs will largely benefit people who don't currently live in San Jose.

Golan, the Google executive leading the project, said at last month's public hearing that the company chose to get community feedback before proposing a project. He said the company

has held over 30 meetings with neighbors and will continue to talk with them. (A Google spokeswoman did not make Golan available for comment, referring instead to his past public comments.)

Nieves hopes to see more commitment to blue-collar jobs and a large amount of affordable housing. “I think there’s an agreement we can all come to,” she said. “There’s always a middle ground for everything.”

Other critics have said San Jose’s talks with Google have been too secretive, and two nonprofits [sued the city in November](#) claiming the city entered into illegal nondisclosure agreements. City officials have said the nondisclosure agreements are typical when land deals are being discussed, and they no longer apply.

Liccardo said that rejecting Google would be the wrong choice, because the company would expand instead in neighboring cities. That would still increase housing demand in San Jose and deny the city any fiscal upside, he said.

“We get all the pain and none of the benefit,” he said.

## [A THIRD OF AMERICANS USE RIDE-HAIL. UBER AND LYFT NEED MORE](#) (Wired.com)

HAVE YOU BEEN inside an [Uber](#)? How about a [Lyft](#), or another ride-hailing service? If the answer is duh, rethink your sense of superiority. Because you’re in the minority. According to a [new poll conducted by the Pew Research Center](#), just 36 percent of American adults say they have used ride-hailing services. Sixty-one percent say they have heard of the services but hadn’t taken a ride. The remaining 3 percent said they hadn’t heard of them at all.

That comports, mostly, [with other surveys conducted](#) in the past year about Uber and Lyft ridership, which have found that between 24.4 and 43 percent of the US population has used apps to summon rides.

Though those numbers may seem underwhelming, they actually mark a substantial jump in ridership and name recognition for the ride-hailing services. When Pew, a nonpartisan research organization, ran an identical survey in 2015 of Americans 18 and older, it found just 15 percent had used the services. And a third—33 percent—had no idea what Uber and Lyft were. But this new survey also found that few riders aren’t making ride-hail services part of their daily routines, which is less great news for the long-term growth of these companies, both set for initial public offerings this year.

Americans’ interactions with the ride-hailing services depend, unsurprisingly, on who they are, where they live, how old they are, and how much they make. More than half of 18- to 29-year-olds have used Uber, Lyft, and their like, but just 24 percent of those over 50 have. Fifty-five

percent of college grads have hailed an Uber or Lyft, but 20 percent of those with high school degrees or less have gotten into the services. While 53 percent of those with household incomes over \$75,000 have hitched ride-hail rides, less than a quarter of those making less than \$30,000 have done the same. And high-income urban dwellers are way more likely to have hopped aboard than high-income people living in rural areas—71 percent compared to 32 percent.

All of this makes sense. Uber and Lyft undercut the prices of many taxi services, expanding the market of those taking one-off rides but remaining too pricey for some low-income households. Young people are early adopters, meaning it has taken a while for Uber use to trickle down to the olds. And the services are still far from available everywhere. The business model is hard to work in far-flung rural areas, where riders might have to wait tens of minutes for a pickup and drivers get fewer fares. That part's OK for the ride-hail giants: There are still riders and markets to capture (and fight over).

Lyft would not confirm the Pew survey's figures, but a company spokesperson wrote in a statement that Lyft is "excited to see an increase in usage of services like ours. We're looking toward a future where car ownership is entirely optional." Uber did not respond to a request for comment.

Still, the number of habitual riders is small. Only one in 10 users of ride-hailing services say they use these apps at least weekly, including just 2 percent who say they use them every day or almost every day. That's actually down from 3 percent in 2015. Which means there aren't that many folks who see ride-hail as an everyday commuting option. Another 22 percent are monthly users, while a majority of riders (67 percent) say they use these services less than once a month.

Uber and Lyft surely know this. It's why you've seen both companies experiment with new kinds of services in the past few years: [subscriptions](#), [in-app integrations with public transit](#), shared ["shuttle" services](#) and [cheaper \(but slower\) carpool options](#). In 2018, both companies poured money into bike- and scooter-share services: Uber with its [acquisition of electric bike operator Jump](#) and Lyft with its [purchase of Motivate](#), the major bike-share operator behind New York's Citi Bike, DC's Capital Bike Share, and the Bay Area's Ford Go Bike. The ultimate goal: These companies want you to open their app anytime you want to get somewhere, no matter the distance or mode of choice. That means the services need to become less an occasional treat and more an unkickable habit.

[Back to Top](#)

## [After taking on taxis, ride-share services now challenging public transit in U.S.](#) (UPI.com)

While taxi companies have long complained about ride-share services like Uber and Lyft cutting into their business, ride-hailing may be eating away at a new victim -- public transit.

In some of the largest cities in the United States and around the world, public ridership is falling in areas where ride-sharing services are on the rise. In cities like New York City, which just landed a future location for [Amazon](#) new East Coast headquarters, there's been a noticeable drop in subway and bus riders -- while ride-sharing picked up nearly 15 percent in one year.

NYC Transit officials, in fact, said last summer the ridership dip is already affecting its 2019 budget.

NYC Transit Executive Vice President Tim Mulligan said his agency first noticed drops in late night travel in 2014, and by 2017 they covered all time periods throughout the day. Meanwhile, he said, rides for-hire saw a 13.1 percent increase. New York subway ridership fell 0.3 percent in 2016, 1.7 percent in 2017 and another 2.1 percent midway through 2018.

"The actual amounts of riders added to for-hire vehicle-taxi market is strikingly similar to the same number of riders we see [declining] in subways and buses," Mulligan [told the NYC Transit board](#) recently. "This is the best analysis and evidence that we have to date, of not just a correlation between for-hire-vehicle growth and subway ridership decline, but causation."

Mulligan said when NYC Transit examined public transportation in other large cities -- like Los Angeles, Chicago, Philadelphia and Houston -- it found they'd experienced similar tips. Same goes for international cities like London, Mexico City and Sao Paulo, Brazil.

Bay Area Rapid Transit, which serves the San Francisco and Oakland areas, reported last month it's losing millions to the ride-share industry. Like NYC Transit, BART saw record-high ridership in 2013, only to see those numbers tumble with the arrival of Uber and Lyft.

In the past five years, in fact, BART officials estimated the agency has lost about 10 percent of its ridership to and from San Francisco International Airport, [or about \\$4 million](#). Connector trips to and from Oakland International Airport have fallen 6 percent in the past two years. Ride-sharing firms, though, have seen nearly 10 million pickups and drop-offs at both airports combined.

"When these connectors were built, we didn't see that something like ride-shares was going to happen," BART spokeswoman Alicia Trost said.

What about the impact in other major cities? Los Angeles Metro said it doesn't yet have any data on the amount of business going to Uber and Lyft -- but it's significant enough that the agency is will launch its own ride-share program this month.

"I would like to point you to our own ride-sharing programs, the first of which will launch as a pilot program in January called Mobility on Demand, which will offer shared rides to and from three transit stations in a defined area," L.A. Metro Brian Haas told UPI. "Later next year, we will be readying to launch a MicroTransit pilot, which will offer shared rides on short trips, similar to Uber and Lyft."

BART, meanwhile, has started a year-long trial with an app that offers a 25 percent discount for groups of two or more using the service, in a move to better compete with ride-sharing companies in cost.

NJ Transit, which offers service to and from the largest metro area in the United States, said it hasn't yet noticed a significant impact from the uptick in ride-share customers. It admitted, however, it's just beginning to take a look at the numbers and is eyeing ways to partner with Uber and Lyft.

"We are in the early stages of investigating ways we could work with ride-sharing programs to expand our customers' travel options, by providing, for example, last mile transportation connections and additional choices to bring our customers to and from our stations and stops," NJ Transit spokesman [Jim Smith](#) told UPI.

Some say NYC Transit's ridership dip has more to do with poor service and ill-timed construction rather than the ride-hailing trend. In such cases, commuters are merely choosing a for-hire vehicle over the headache of complicated subway and bus routes.

"I think there is a definite link between all of the [construction] and the rise in Uber and Lyft and other for-hire services," NYC Transit board member Andrew Albert said last year. "I can't tell you how many people walk down into a station, see a wall of diversion notices and say, 'I'm not dealing with this,' go up and hire a car.

"We have to do a better job at outlining what diversions are taking place. ... It's off-putting and it's affecting ridership with people would have normally taken the system."

Another NYC board member, union representative Peter Ward, echoed Albert's sentiments, saying riders in less affluent New York City neighborhoods like Far Rockaway appear to be choosing the convenience of ride-share services than less-expensive public transportation.

Ward pointed to his work with hotel unions, where workers have long complained about negative service during their early morning subway and bus commutes.

"We are not alone," Mulligan said. "This is a part of a national and international trend where the U.S. and other international agencies, on average, are experiencing declines."

[Back to Top](#)



**From:** VTA Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 9, 2019 3:56 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors; VTA Advisory Committee Members  
**Subject:** VTA January/February 2019 Take-One is now available

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

The January/February 2019 Take-One is now available. Please click on the link below:

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

Thank you.

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



Conserve paper. Think before you print.

**From:** VTA Board Secretary

**Sent:** Friday, January 11, 2019 10:18 AM

**To:** VTA Board of Directors

**Subject:** VTA Information: Approved 2019 Appointments to Board Standing Committees, Joint Powers Boards, Policy Advisory Boards, and Ad Hoc Committees

**Importance:** High

**VTA Board of Directors:**

Please see attached 2019 Appointments to Board Standing Committees, Joint Powers Boards, Policy Advisory Boards, and Ad Hoc Committees that were approved at the January 10, 2019, VTA Board of Directors meeting.

Thank you.

VTA Office of the Board Secretary

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

3331 North First Street, Building B-1

San Jose, CA 95134-1927

Phone: 408-321-5680

E-mail: [board.secretary@vta.org](mailto:board.secretary@vta.org)



Conserve paper. Think before you print.



Date: January 10, 2019  
Current Meeting: January 10, 2019  
Board Meeting: January 10, 2019

**BOARD MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
Board of Directors

**FROM:** Board Chairperson, Teresa O'Neill

**SUBJECT:** 2019 Appointments to Board Standing Committees, Joint Powers Boards,  
Policy Advisory Boards, and Ad Hoc Committees

APPROVED ACCEPTED ADOPTED AMENDED DEFERRED REVIEWED  
Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority  
Board of Directors  
Elaine F. Ballao, Board Secretary

BY: [Signature]  
DATE: 1/10/19

Policy-Related Action: No Government Code Section 84308 Applies: No

**ACTION ITEM**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Approve appointments to Board Standing Committees, Joint Powers Boards, Policy Advisory Boards, and Ad Hoc Committees for 2019.

**BACKGROUND:**

The VTA Administrative Code specifies five Board standing committees:

- 1) Administration and Finance (A&F)
- 2) Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP)
- 3) Safety, Security, and Transit Planning and Operations (SSTPO)
- 4) Capital Program Committee (CPC)
- 5) Governance and Audit (G&A)

The Administrative Code further specifies that at its first meeting in January, the Board of Directors approves the members and chairpersons of all Board standing committees based on recommendations for these positions provided by the Board Chairperson. The term of appointment is one year, coinciding with the calendar year. Only directors, not alternates or ex-officio members, are eligible for appointment to standing committees. However, Board alternate members are eligible for VTA appointment to joint powers boards (JPBs), policy advisory boards (PABs), and ad hoc committees.

PABs are established by the Board of Directors for each major transit and highway corridor under study by VTA. They provide input, perspective and recommendations to the VTA Board of Directors and administration. The purpose of the PABs is to ensure that the local jurisdictions most affected by major transportation capital improvement projects are involved and have a voice in guiding the planning, development and design of those projects. The Board establishes each PAB with a defined purpose, and once that purpose has been fulfilled it is the Board's purview to retire the PAB from service.

**DISCUSSION:**

Submitted for consideration are recommended appointments to the indicated committees:

- ***Board Standing Committees***

- Administration and Finance (A&F)

- Larry Carr, Chair
  - Sam Liccardo
  - Teresa O'Neill
  - TBD

- Congestion Management Program and Planning (CMPP)

- Raul Peralez, Chair
  - Johnny Khamis
  - John McAlister
  - Rob Rennie

- Safety, Security, and Transit Planning and Operations (SSTPO)

- Bob Nuñez, Chair
  - Cindy Chavez
  - Lan Diep
  - Charles "Chappie" Jones

- Capital Program Committee (CPC)

- Larry Carr, Chair
  - Cindy Chavez
  - Charles "Chappie" Jones
  - Sam Liccardo
  - Bob Nunez
  - Rob Rennie

- Governance & Audit (G&A)

- Teresa O'Neill                      Chair
  - Cindy Chavez                      Vice Chair
  - Larry Carr                              A&F
  - Bob Nuñez                              SSTPO
  - Raul Peralez                              CMPP

- ***Joint Powers Boards (JPBs)***

- Peninsula Corridor (Caltrain) Joint Powers Board

- Jeannie Bruins  
Cindy Chavez  
Dev Davis

- Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board

- Teresa O'Neill  
Raul Peralez

- I-680 Sunol SMART Carpool Lane Joint Powers Board

- Lan Diep

- Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan Joint Powers Board

- Ann Calnan  
Lani Lee Ho, Alternate

- ***Policy Advisory Boards (PABs)***

- County Expressways Policy Advisory Committee

- Johnny Khamis  
Teresa O'Neill

- Diridon Station Policy Advisory Board

- Cindy Chavez

- Eastridge to BART Regional Connector Policy Advisory Board

- David Cortese  
Sylvia Arenas

- Mobility Partnership

- Larry Carr  
Peter Leroe-Muñoz  
San Jose, Vacant

- Silicon Valley Regional Interoperability Authority (SVRIA)

- Larry Carr

- ***Other***

- SVRT/WSX Policy Advisory Board

- Sam Liccardo  
TBD

- VTA Committee for Transportation Mobility & Accessibility (ex-officio member)

- Cindy Chavez (Board chairperson or his/her designee serves as representative)

- Ad Hoc Committees

- \*will be appointed by the Board Chair as needed

The appointments will take effect immediately following Board approval.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

There is no fiscal impact as a result of this approval.

Prepared by: Jim Lawson, Director of Government Affairs & Executive Policy Advisor  
Memo No. 6845

**From:** VTA Board Secretary  
**Sent:** Friday, January 11, 2019 2:19 PM  
**To:** VTA Board of Directors  
**Subject:** From VTA: January 11, 2019 Media Clips



### ***VTA Daily News Coverage for Friday, January 11, 2019***

1. [Engineering contract awarded for Bart Silicon Valley Phase 2 extension \(IRJ\)](#)
2. [BART Phase II Awards General Engineering Services Contract \(Tunnelling Journal\)](#)
3. [VTA awards general engineering contract for BART subway in San Jose \(Business Journal\)](#)
4. [Carpool changes appear to help at 237-880: Roadshow \(Mercury News\)](#)
5. [San Mateo officials look at Managed Lanes \(Daily Journal\)](#)
6. [APTA: Transit ridership fell, commuter-rail ridership rose in Q3 \(Progressive Railroading\)](#)
7. [Mayor Sam Liccardo Nominates Councilman Chappie Jones For Vice Mayor \(San Francisco Chronicle/Bay City News\)](#)
8. [Knight Foundation Names Chris Thompson as San Jose Director \(San Jose Inside\)](#)

#### [Engineering contract awarded for Bart Silicon Valley Phase 2 extension \(IRJ\)](#)

CALIFORNIA's Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) announced on January 10 that it has awarded a joint venture of Mott McDonald and PGH Wong a contract worth up to \$US 125m to provide general engineering services for the Bay Area Rapid Transit (Bart) Silicon Valley Phase 2 Extension.

The consortium will be responsible for taking the project to the 30% engineering level, supporting cost and scheduling estimates required to demonstrate the integrity of VTA's management, financial and implementation plans. This will feed into VTA's application to participate in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Expedited Project Delivery pilot programme.

VTA is seeking a \$US 1.5bn FTA contribution for the \$US 4.7bn project, which is due to be completed in 2026

From the Phase 1 terminus at Berryessa, the extension will run for 9.6km beneath the centre of San Jose before reaching an interchange with Amtrak, Altamont Rail Express, Caltrain and VTA light rail services at Diridon station. The line then continues northwest to a terminus at Santa Clara Caltrain station.

The project involves the construction of an 8km single-bore double-deck tunnel, which will accommodate the two running lines.

[Back to Top](#)

### [BART Phase II Awards General Engineering Services Contract \(Tunnelling Journal\)](#)

In an important milestone for the Valley Transportation Authority's (VTA) BART Silicon Valley Phase II Extension, the VTA Board of Directors has awarded a US\$125M contract to Mott McDonald/PGH Wong Engineering Joint Venture (MMW) to provide General Engineering services for the Phase II Project.

The effort to find a General Engineering Contractor (GEC) began in May 2018 with an industry forum held in downtown San Jose where over 350 interested parties attended. A competitive bid process followed, resulting in the final contract award to MMW who will perform design and engineering work on the 5-mile tunnel, four station areas, two ventilation structures, and system-wide work – advancing the design in preparation for the federal funding request in spring 2019.

More specifically, the GEC will be tasked with getting the BART Phase II Project to a 30% engineering level to inform costs and schedule estimates needed to demonstrate the adequacy of VTA's management, financial, and implementation plans to participate in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Expedited Project Delivery (EPD) Pilot Program. The submittal, done in November 2018, demonstrates VTA's qualifications to participate in the pilot program; and showcases, through innovation, planned transit-oriented joint development, public-private partnerships, value capture, and local funding commitments, why the Phase II Extension is such a good fit for EPD.

The approved contract for General Engineering services supports VTA's efforts to fulfill these requirements as well as ready the project for construction and provide technical support during construction.

VTA's Phase II Project is a six-mile extension of BART into downtown San Jose and Santa Clara, utilizing an innovative single-bore tunneling methodology that minimizes construction



disruptions. BART will be responsible to operate and maintain the extension after its completion.

[Back to Top](#)

### [VTA awards general engineering contract for BART subway in San Jose](#) **(Business Journal)**

A joint venture between San Francisco-based PGH Wong Engineering and British engineering firm Mott MacDonald was awarded a general engineering contract Thursday for the BART subway beneath San Jose.

The contract is worth up to \$125 million, according to [Brandi Childress](#), spokeswoman for the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, which is building BART's extension from Warm Springs into Santa Clara County.

Both firms, which bid together as Mott MacDonald/PGH Wong Engineering Joint Venture, have experience on Bay Area transportation projects.

PGH Wong did work on Phase I of the BART extension to the Berryessa station, the 10-mile light rail BART extension from Pittsburg to Antioch and the improvements to United Airlines' concourse at San Francisco International Airport. Mott MacDonald worked on the new Stockton maintenance facility for the Altamont Corridor Express (ACE) commuter railroad, the new eastern span of the Bay Bridge and the New Irvington Tunnel project from Sunol to Fremont to provide redundancy to the earthquake-vulnerable Hetch Hetchy Aqueduct.

For the BART project, the joint venture will do design and engineering work on the 5-mile single-bore tunnel beneath Santa Clara Street, four station areas, two ventilation structures and other work to bring the design up to the 30 percent level in preparation for a federal funding request later this spring.

VTA hopes to complete construction by 2024 and begin service in 2026.

[Back to Top](#)

### [Carpool changes appear to help at 237-880: Roadshow](#) **(Mercury News)**

**Q:** The carpool lanes are flowing smoothly at Highway 237 and Interstate 880. Taking 220,000 electric vehicles out of the carpool lanes was the right decision. Carpooling means as a driver and rider you are helping eliminate one additional car from the roads. Thanks for restoring the true purpose of the carpool lane. Let the state reward the owners of electric vehicles by other means.

### **Srikant Ramabadrn, Fremont**

**A:** Folks, is traffic flowing better in the diamond lanes since Jan. 1? And how about in the other lanes?

EV owners still have significant perks with rebates or tax credits up to \$2,500 to \$7,500 for the purchase or lease of new, eligible zero-emission vehicles, including electric, plug-in hybrid electric and fuel cell vehicles. But if get a rebate, you cannot get red carpool lane stickers.

**Q:** We might see some changes in carpool use in the near term but long term it seems that Tesla's ramp up in production might well replace most of those ejected cars in little more than a year. Unfortunately, I don't think we're going to see much of a change.

And explain how this could possibly reduce congestion? All it would do is give those willing to pay the option to join the mess. Though now if you really want to get picky, it could allow those willing to pay at earlier hours to make it through before or after the peak congestion and slightly lower the number of cars in the regular lanes.

### **Alan Arndt, San Jose**

**A:** If traffic speeds in express lanes fall lower than 45 mph, tolls will rise and more drivers are likely to move into the turtle lanes.

**Q:** Parking is a real pain at all BART stations. But there is a very large empty dirt field at the Antioch station. I swear it would not take much money to turn it into a parking lot and get cars off Highway 4.

### **Therese Konz, Antioch**

**A:** Your wish will be granted. BART will add 800 spaces at Antioch, east of the current lot. Construction will begin this fall with the new lot opening in late 2020.

**Q:** I took BART from the North Concord/Martinez station and printed out a map to get there. It's good that I did because there were no signs whatsoever to indicate the station. To make matters worse, the station is below street level, so you can't see it from the street. I feel sorry for first-time BART riders.

**A:** Look again. Alicia-a-BART-Spokesperson uses this station "and I can confirm there are signs on Highway 4 and at the off-ramp and split so you know to curve right. There is also a big white tall station sign where you turn left on Panoramic Drive into the station."

[Back to Top](#)

[San Mateo officials look at Managed Lanes \(Daily Journal\)](#)

**Sound barriers, neighborhood impact shape discussion of tolled express lanes**

Whether sound barriers along stretches of Highway 101 in San Mateo will be raised to mitigate freeway noise as proposed tolled express lanes move ahead was a focus for city officials and residents receiving an update on the project Monday.

Though councilmembers opted to make decisions on the aesthetics and height of the sound barriers along the city's stretch of Highway 101 at their Jan. 22 meeting, they weighed the cost of increasing the wall height on either side of the freeway as well as concerns from residents about a study of the noise expected to emanate from the project.

Expected to extend from Whipple Avenue to Interstate 380 on the San Mateo County stretch of Highway 101, the Managed Lanes project entails the construction of an additional lane in each direction on the stretch of Highway 101. The project will also extend south of Whipple Avenue to San Antonio Road in Santa Clara County, a segment of the project Leo Scott, a consultant with the firm Gray-Bowen-Scott, said would take shape in February when construction begins.

[Back to Top](#)

### [APTA: Transit ridership fell, commuter-rail ridership rose in Q3 \(Progressive Railroading\)](#)

Americans took 2.5 billion trips on public transportation systems in third-quarter 2018, down 1.75 percent compared with ridership in third-quarter 2017, according to the [American Public Transportation Association](#) (APTA).

Year over year, rail ridership was down on heavy- and light-rail systems, but up — 0.7 percent — on commuter-rail systems. More than half of commuter railroads posted ridership increases in the third quarter, APTA officials said in a press release.

"In order to increase mobility options, public transit systems are increasing frequency, improving routing, experimenting with fare changes, and engaging in partnerships to offer the best service possible to meet customers' needs," said APTA President and Chief Executive Officer Paul Skoutelas.

Nationally, commuter railroads logged a combined ridership of 126.6 million trips during the third quarter, with 18 of 31 them reporting increases. Commuter-rail systems that logged double-digit ridership increases in the quarter included Orlando, Florida, (70 percent); San Rafael, California, (65.8 percent); and Stockton, California, (10.5 percent).

Ridership on heavy-rail systems (subways and elevated trains) fell 2.4 percent to about 916.3 million trips in the quarter compared with a year ago. Increases were registered in Philadelphia (7.8 percent); San Juan, Puerto Rico (6.4 percent); Miami (5.9 percent); Atlanta, (1.4 percent);

and Lindenwold, New Jersey (0.1 percent).

On light-rail systems (modern streetcars, trolleys and heritage trolleys), ridership in the quarter dipped 3.6 percent to 133.2 million trips compared with the year-ago period. However, ridership grew in only eight out of 27 systems. Agencies that reported double-digit light-rail ridership gains were Charlotte, North Carolina, (55.3 percent); Seattle-King County Metro (21.6 percent); Hampton, Virginia, (11.5 percent); and Houston (10.8 percent).

[Back to Top](#)

### [Mayor Sam Liccardo Nominates Councilman Chappie Jones For Vice Mayor \(San Francisco Chronicle/Bay City News\)](#)

San Jose Mayor Sam Liccardo has nominated Councilman Chappie Jones to serve as vice mayor, the mayor's office announced Thursday.

If elected by the City Council next week, Jones will replace current Vice Mayor Magdalena Carrasco, who is at the end of a two year-term. Jones is currently serving his second term as councilman for District 1 in West San Jose.

"I greatly admire and fully share the progressive vision the Mayor has for San Jose," Jones said in a news release. "I am humbled and proud to be given this new opportunity to continue to serve the City of San Jose and its extraordinary residents."

Jones was born in Sacramento and moved to San Jose in 1990. He serves on the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority board of directors and lives in the Murdock neighborhood of West San Jose with his wife, Kelli, and two children.

Carrasco congratulated Jones and said she was looking forward to continuing her work in the city's East Side. As vice mayor, she was charged with overseeing the City Council in Liccardo's absence.

"It has been an honor to serve for the past few years," she wrote on Twitter. "CM Jones's demeanor and collaborative presence is instrumental for his residents & our City."

Liccardo thanked Carrasco for leading the City Council while he recovers from a bike collision on New Year's Day that left him with a fractured sternum and vertebrae.

"She has been a great partner and I look forward to continue working with her to broaden prosperity and educational opportunity in our city," Liccardo said in a statement.

[Back to Top](#)

## [Knight Foundation Names Chris Thompson as San Jose Director](#) (San Jose Inside)

The [Knight Foundation](#) of San Jose, a nonprofit that promotes arts and culture, welcomed Chris Thompson to succeed Danny Harris as director.

Thompson most recently served as vice president of product marketing at communications technology company Plantronics. Thompson—who can be found on Twitter [@Thompson\\_KF](#)—has also held executive positions in business strategy and marketing for Cisco, Network Associates, Nortel and Gartner Group.

“[Knight](#) works to bring positive transformation to all the cities where it invests,” said Sam Gill, an executive vice president at Knight. “Chris has the leadership skills and the innovative mindset needed to do just that in San Jose. He’s a longtime resident who understands the city and region, and his strong business expertise will help the city tackle new demands during a period of change and growth.”

The Knight Foundation was founded by newspaper publishers John S. and James L. Knight in 1950. The foundation funded social programs, cultural organizations, education and journalism-related causes. Knight merged with Ridder Publications in 1974 to form Knight-Ridder, the parent company to many national newspapers, including, for a time, the *Mercury News*.

As director of the San Jose Knight Foundation, Thompson will be in charge of Knight’s arts and community initiatives in San Jose.

“I’m good at stitching things together and showing that one plus one plus one is a lot more than three,” Thompson said in a phone interview. “And I thought that was something I could bring to the organization with such incredible likability and gravitas.”

In the past, Knight invested over \$25 million in San Jose projects, including support of the [Better Bikeways network](#), expanding the [San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association](#) and launching [Viva CalleSJ](#), an annual event that closes blocks in downtown San Jose for people to walk, bike and skate freely.

All of that is part of their initiative to bring more sustainable transit to San Jose neighborhoods, reimagine public spaces and help promote community engagement among residents. “Bringing together the concept of how to make a vibrant place for people to live, for them to work, for them to learn—that excites me,” Thompson said.

Thompson will join Knight’s [advisory board of directors](#): San Jose Councilman Lan Diep, [Valley Transportation Authority Director Nuria Fernandez](#), Google executive Michael Flynn, Deloitte exec Garrett Herbert, San Jose State President Mary Papazian and Pinger exec Greg Woock.

“There are people from everywhere in the world here,” Thompson said. “When we get people—even with different opinions—to solve a problem, they can do something great. I feel that way about San Jose.”

[Back to Top](#)

**From:** VTA Board Secretary

**Sent:** Friday, January 11, 2019 6:14 PM

**To:** VTA Board of Directors

**Subject:** VTA Correspondence: Responses to VTA Board Members' Referrals; Response to Comments on Tamien Station Development; Comments from Members of the Public-1/10/19 Board Meeting Agenda Items #3 and #7.2

**VTA Board of Directors:**

We are forwarding you the following:

<b>From</b>	<b>Topic</b>
VTA	Staff response to Board Member Khamis's Referral from 12/6/18 Board of Directors Meeting Agenda Item 6.10 – SR Technology Corridor Study Memorandum
VTA	Staff response to Board Member McAlister's Inquiries from 12/6/18 Board of Directors Meeting regarding SR 237/US 101 On-Ramp and SR 85
VTA	Staff response to member of the public's comments regarding Tamien Station Development
Member of the Public	Comments provided at 1/10/19 Board of Directors Meeting - Agenda Item #3
Member of the Public	Comments regarding 1/10/19 Board of Directors Meeting Agenda Item #7.2


Thank you.

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



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Johnny Khamis  
Board Member

**FROM:** Carolyn Gonot   
Chief Engineering & Program Delivery Officer

**DATE:** January 9, 2019

**SUBJECT:** Response to Referral to Administration – Pertaining to Agenda Item 6.10 – SR  
Technology Corridor Study Memorandum dated December 6, 2018

---

This is in response to your memorandum dated December 6, 2018 requesting staff to identify funding options for implementation of part-time lanes on SR 87.

VTA will seek local, state and federal grant opportunities to continue the development of part time lanes on SR 87 building upon the work on part time lanes from the SR 87 Technology Corridor Study per your direction. 2016 Measure B funds, when available, may be used to initiate project development work for a part-time lane use implementation on SR 87; however, taking such an implementation through construction will likely require funding from sources beyond 2016 Measure B. This project development work is included in the VTA Highway Program's work plan.

cc: Board Office



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** John McAlister  
Board Member

**FROM:** Carolyn Gonot   
Chief Engineering & Program Delivery Officer

Chris Augenstein   
Director – Planning & Programming

**DATE:** January 9, 2019

**SUBJECT:** Responses to Inquiries from December 6, 2018 Board of Directors Meeting

---

Below are staff's responses to your inquiries at the December 6, 2018 Board of Directors meeting:

1. Study and determine possible solutions to mitigate congestion at SR 237/US 101 on-ramp
  - Funding from voluntary local contributions is proposed to be used to study this area of SR 237/US 101 to determine solutions to address the westbound peak congestion on SR 237 approaching US 101 and overall mainline SR 237 operations in both directions of the freeway. We may need to get funding from other sources such as 2016 Measure B and SB 1 to augment the voluntary local contributions to get to the needed funds for the study.
2. Funding for implementation of solutions for SR 85
  - VTA anticipates reallocation of \$1.2 million in regional funds via MTC budget amendment in the first quarter of 2019. Those funds would allow for the resumption of work on the SR 85 Transit Guideway Study. Upon completion of the Transit Guideway Study, Board action would be needed to commit further funding (presumably 2016 Measure B) to the project to initiate subsequent project development activities.

cc: Board Office

**From:** Golem, Ron [<mailto:Ron.Golem@vta.org>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 08, 2019 11:27 AM  
**To:** VTA Board Secretary  
**Subject:** RE: Comments about Tamien Station Development

Dear VTA Board Members,

Staff would like to provide some additional context regarding the issues raised by Ms. Carol Frost in her January 3<sup>rd</sup> email regarding parking and Joint Development at the Tamien Station.

Caltrain riders who use modes other than driving to get to the station, such as Ms. Frost, enhance the effectiveness of transit. Based on current ridership, more Caltrain riders at Tamien walk, bike, take transit, or are dropped off than choose to drive to the station and park in the VTA lot. Nearly all the parking at the Tamien station is used by Caltrain riders. Staff believes that some of this demand arises because there is no charge for parking, compared to other Caltrain lots such as the nearby Diridon Station Caltrain parking lot that currently charges \$5.50 per day. The Tamien station is the origin station for Caltrain “Baby Bullet” trains and boarding there gives riders more seating choices. Finally, there is other commuter parking at Tamien that cannot be controlled in a free parking lot.

Since the 2016 Tamien Station Joint Development RFP, the planning for parking has been to preserve the existing 560 spaces at the multiple Tamien Station parking lots (this figure does not include parking on the unpaved joint development site). The focus for staff, based on Board direction, has been to increase the number of affordable housing units. The cost of older VTA plans for a new Tamien parking structure to provide more than 560 parking spaces, at \$30 million or more, would require a reallocation of funds already committed to other transit capital improvements. Otherwise, it would preclude more affordable housing or even the feasibility of any joint development project at Tamien Station.

The Station Access and TOD Parking Policy recently adopted by the VTA Board of Directors outlines a range of techniques to manage parking demand and priorities for VTA station investments. Even with preservation of the current 560 spaces, staff anticipates that a wide-ranging transportation demand management program will need to be developed in collaboration with the City of San Jose and the neighborhood for the Tamien Station. As this program is developed, staff will present it to the VTA Board of Directors for approval, currently projected to be by early 2020.

Very truly yours,

Ron Golem  
Deputy Director, Real Estate & Joint Development

**Ron**

[ron.golem@vta.org](mailto:ron.golem@vta.org)

Phone [408-321-5791](tel:408-321-5791) Mobile XXXXXXXXXX

**From:** Carol Frost [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 03, 2019 12:45 PM  
**To:** VTA Board Secretary <[Board.Secretary@vta.org](mailto:Board.Secretary@vta.org)>; [District1@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District1@sanjoseca.gov);  
[District4@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District4@sanjoseca.gov); [District10@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District10@sanjoseca.gov); [District3@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:District3@sanjoseca.gov); [district6@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:district6@sanjoseca.gov);  
[mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov](mailto:mayoremail@sanjoseca.gov)  
**Subject:** Comments about Tamien Station Development

Dear VTA Board Members,

My name is Carol Frost and I attended the recent community meeting on December 17, 2018 regarding the Tamien Station Development. I was told at that meeting that at the upcoming VTA meeting, further discussion would ensue regarding this project. I wanted to take a moment to provide you with some of my observations.

First, I am very pleased to hear of the housing development. This is sorely needed not only in San Jose but throughout the Bay Area, and I appreciate all the thought that has gone into this project. I am in full support of this.

I would like to offer an observation about the proposed parking for the Tamien development. I live a little over a mile from the station. I catch Caltrain there to San Mateo. I am not a high tech worker, nor are a lot of people who take the train from there - I am a librarian. Many days I am fortunate enough to have my husband drop me at the station on his way to work, but on other days, I park at the station. The free parking is a huge draw for me as well as others. Please allow me a moment to explain this. It costs me about \$15.50 per day to take Caltrain to San Mateo. I have friends who take BART, and they pay half that to get to Oakland. So I am already paying twice as much as other commuters. If I leave from Diridon, it is \$5.50 to park, if I can get a spot in the sanctioned parking lot, or else \$6 to park in the adjacent lot. That can really add up quickly. My work does not subsidize my transportation - this is all out of pocket. When I get to San Mateo, I walk the last mile to my work.

At the community meeting, we were told that VTA has adopted a policy which gives priority to people who walk to the station or are able to get there without a car. We were also told that the parking that was included in the official count of number of existing spaces does not include the dirt parking lot, where approximately 200 people park daily. We were told that it was not being counted because it is not an official parking lot. I understand that big companies use the VTA parking lot for ridesharing, and it was expressed that this activity can be moved to the Curtner station. That makes sense, and it would certainly free up some of the parking. However, I think it is negligent to not include the current actual use of parking spaces at Tamien.

Many people use public transit like Light Rail and Caltrain to do our part in reducing traffic. It seems short-sighted to not acknowledge the actual current number of cars currently parking. It is penalizing the commuters, and will result in a lack of parking in the future. That is not solving the problem. It was mentioned at the meeting that there is some preliminary talk about adding a parking garage, and that paid parking would be considered and most likely implemented. I would suggest that this would quickly become an equity issue, which would financially prevent people from taking public transit.

In summary, I am in support of the changes coming to Tamien station. I would ask that you please consider two things regarding parking: that the 200 spaces currently being used daily be included in the official count of parking, and that future parking continue to be free.

Thank you for considering this.

Regards,  
Carol Frost

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

- Good Evening Chairperson O’Niell, Directors-
- I want you to know me.
- My name is Kathleen Podrasky.
- I’m a Public Communications Specialist II in VTA’s Community Outreach and Public Engagement Group.
- I am an SEIU Member and your constituent.
- August 29, 2011 was my first day at VTA.
- I’m a former Executive Director of a local nonprofit.
- I came to VTA to be part of a team and lead change of the perception of government entities, and actively engage the community in projects and programs that VTA delivers.
- I value the power that public transportation has in creating healthy communities.
- I give my all and I am good at what I do!
- I know my colleagues share my passion.
- I do not have family in Santa Clara County.
- I’m trying to build one, and I’m an applicant in the County’s Resource Family Program.
- I’m scrambling to find housing that will qualify me to be matched with a child (or children) that needs me.
- One paycheck, after taxes is \$2340.
- My rent on a 1 bedroom is \$2517. I haven’t found an acceptable 2 bedroom in this range yet.
- Since our last salary adjustment my rent has increased twice, a total of 7%.
- I have a Master’s in Public Administration, and a student loan to pay for it.
- My story isn’t unique.
- I share the month to month struggle with many of my colleagues.
- The 1.5% salary increase on the table is far below any acceptable cost of living increase we are deserving of.
- For me, it equates to a \$20.00 increase per paycheck.
- The love expressed for us at the last board meeting is nice, but it doesn’t pay the bills.
- VTA has amazing and committed talent.
- I, and my colleagues, deserve to be recognized, and awarded salaries that allow us to live in the very communities we serve and to live where we feel safe.
- We deserve salaries and benefits that are on par with our colleagues at other special districts, cities, and counties in the Bay Area.

- We are losing talent to those agencies because they provide salaries that better meet the needs to live here.
- We deserve a true cost of living increase, like the ones our managers, officers and directors have been receiving.
- We are asking you to see us, hear us, respect us, and know us as the people we are, not a number on a balance sheet.
- We should not have to beg for this!
- I urge you to consider our request to provide a true cost of living increase.
- Value us.
- If you have listened to me this far and not on your phone, Thank you! I appreciate that very much.
- You are welcome to meet with me – I'm upstairs in building B.
- I hope you will do the same with my colleagues.
- Good Night.

**From:** Jim Stallman [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 10, 2019 2:21 PM  
**To:** Peter Hertan <[phertan@alum.mit.edu](mailto:phertan@alum.mit.edu)>; Eugene Bradley <[ebradley@svtransitusers.org](mailto:ebradley@svtransitusers.org)>;  
Augenstein, Chris <[Chris.Augenstein@vta.org](mailto:Chris.Augenstein@vta.org)>  
**Subject:** Tonight's VTA BOD mtg.

I likely won't make it to the BOD mtg tonight but someone should probably acquaint/remind/alert the BOD (Agenda Item 7.2) of this:

"Discontinuing High School tripper bus service in NN 2.0 insures that we lose the next generation of potential choice transit riders."

School trips are the biggest contributor to overwhelming our roadways as can be observed when congestion is way down during the summer when school is out.