CITY OF SAN JOSE
CAPITAL OF SILICON VALLEY

Consistent with the California Governor's Executive Order No. N-29-20, Resolution No. 79450 from the City of San José and the Santa Clara County Health Officer's March 16, 2020 Shelter in Place Order, the Committee meeting was not physically open to the public. Public comments were accepted via eComment, email, by phone and webinar

The Committee meeting was teleconferenced from remote locations.

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE STEVENS CREEK CORRIDOR TRANSIT STEERING COMMITTEE

SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA **MONDAY, JULY 20, 2020**

The Stevens Creek Corridor Transit Steering Committee of the City of San José convened 2 p.m. via Zoom on Monday, July 20, 2020.

PRESENT:	Vice Mayor Chappie Jones, City of San Jose Council Member Darcy Paul, City of Cupertino Council Member Teresa O'Neill, City of Santa Clara
ABSENT:	Supervisor Susan Ellenberg, Santa Clara County
STAFF:	Raania Mohsen, Ramses Madou
OTHERS PRESENT:	Council Member Dev Davis (San Jose), Council Member Rod Sinks (Cupertino), John Ristow, Tamiko Percell, Scott Haywood, Deborah Dagang, Paul Murphy, Hope Cahan, Ellen Talbo, Michael Liw, Roger Lee, Ben Aghegnehu, Noora Fawzi

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS (VICE MAYOR CHAPPIE JONES, SAN JOSE)

Vice Mayor Chappie Jones convened the zoom meeting.

PRESENTATION ON PROPOSED STEVENS CREEK CORRIDOR VISION STUDY (TAMIKO PERCELL, VTA)

Tamiko reviewed collaboration of the four jurisdictions on the Stevens Creek Corridor (Cupertino, Santa Clara, San Jose, and the County of Santa Clara) and presented vision study options for considering high capacity transit along Stevens Creek Boulevard. VTA was tasked with proposing a scope and three alternatives for the study, as well as finding the fastest way to

fund and carry out the study. The Study Area will be Stevens Creek/ West San Carlos between Diridon Station to SR 85 in Cupertino. The two frequent network routes in operation are Rapid 523 and Route 23.

1. **History & Overview of High Capacity Transit Along Stevens Creek Corridor**
    A. In 2009, the VTA Board of Directors adopted the BRT Strategic Plan, which identifies potential corridors for bus rapid transit, and Stevens Creek was one of those corridors.
    B. In 2012, the Stevens Creek BRT study began and looked at designing BRT with 30% engineering and environmentally clearing it for construction.
    C. In 2014, the study was completed and the BRT study was downgraded to a rapid improvement of passenger amenities along the route due to changing opinions in the community.
    D. In 2015, the Rapid 523 Improvement project began with the purpose of upgrading passenger facilities, such as bus stops, bus pads, garbage cans, and implement transit signal priority on Stevens Creek.
    E. In 2018, both the study and construction were completed and VTA initiated the fast transit program, which was a new approach for speeding up transit for VTA system wide. This program aims to reap the benefits of smaller, easier to implement projects with low cost improvements.
    F. In 2019, the City of San Jose released the Request For Information (RFI) for new technology, connecting San Jose International Airport, Diridon Station, and Stevens Creek Corridor. In addition, jurisdictions adopted resolutions to study Stevens Creek. Finally, the Strategic Plan for Advancing High Capacity Transit Corridors began.

2. **Options of Stevens Creek Corridor Vision and Design**

The Strategic Plan for Advancing High Capacity Transit Corridors, also known as the Corridor Study, determines if high capacity transit investment is suitable and warranted in the Corridor based on the goals and objectives of the VTA's adopted strategic plan and transit supportiveness of the corridor. It will also inform VTA's long range plan with a fiscally responsible high capacity transit strategy. The Corridor Study is currently in progress and is evaluating 24 corridors for their potential for high capacity transit. The study will also make a recommendation for land use changes, phasing, and implementation in the corridor. Studying Stevens Creek needs to be closely tied to the High Capacity Transit study. Therefore, the VTA has identified two options for Stevens Creek that involve an amendment to the contract to carry out the work by the current consultant

A. Option A: Formal design (5%), for four sample sections of three quarters of a

mile each, and three alternatives. The alternatives are necessary because the recommendations from the High Capacity Corridor study are still undecided. The assumption is that there is at least one grade separated alternative. Sample sections act as typologies, one in each jurisdiction, to figure out how they will work in other areas.

i. Latest start date: April 2021, about 12-month duration for completion
ii. $960k
iii. Implementation plan for funding full design of corridor

B. Option B: Removing all formal design and replacing it with illustrative concepts to support engagement process and discussions for corridor. The most efficient way to make this work is to choose one narrow section and one wide section in the corridor. The illustration will simulate what the improvements will be like and determine where it will be applied along the corridor. However, because it is just conceptual, a design will be needed later.
    i. 700-750k, less contributions from each of the jurisdictions.
    ii. Latest start date: April 2021, about 12-month duration for completion
    iii. Implementation plan for funding full design of corridor, including phasing.
C. Option C: Formal design at least 10% length of corridor
    i. Latest start date is 2023
    ii. Duration is more than 24 months
    iii. Requires about $3-4 M

3. Financial Model/ Contributions

VTA contribution: Up to $450k (requires approval from VTA board of directors)
San Jose committed contribution $100k (adopted into budget)
VTA prefers option B, because both options A and B require further design, but B is lower risk and is more fiscally conservative.

DISCUSSION/QUESTIONS FROM PARTICIPATING JURISDICTIONS

Elected Representatives and staff members of the jurisdictions discussed the differences between the three presented options.

It was noted that Option B differs from Option A in that it provides illustration and no design element; regardless, it will provide an opportunity for jurisdictions to further come to consensus on a unified vision for the corridor. Also, regardless of whether Option A or Option B is pursued, the next step forward will be a formal design. Option C is the only option that provides

a complete design of the corridor.

VTA noted its recommendation for option B because of its lower cost. Option A includes spending $200k + without significantly more value. Option A helps with outreach moving forward. In addition, it provides additional visual for each city, which will be helpful in identifying where the wide and narrow corridors will be. Option B will include two illustrations that show what the narrower part of corridor will look like and what the wider part of corridor will look like. Visuals would capture the combined results of the High Capacity Transit Corridor study and the efforts of the vision planning.

Representatives from City of Cupertino noted interest in including 280 as part of the Vision study per their resolution. VTA noted that expanding the scope and including 280 is possible but it would not allow for an amendment to the current High Capacity Transit Corridor Study contracts. It would be significantly more expensive and would require having to go out for bid. It would also extend the start date to end of 2021. Option B has the most flexibility because it does not include design and is ultimately a higher level of vision. It was noted that additional information regarding the high-level cost, impact on timeline, and prior work/study of the 280 corridor that has been completed can be provided.

Interest was also noted on connecting the results of the RFI with the High Capacity Corridor Study/Stevens Creek Corridor Vision. The High Capacity Transit includes categories and subcategories of technologies that are feasible. If the goal is to deliver on what is in the RFI, VTA will need guidance to narrow down what some of the preferred modes are.

Members of the Stevens Creek Corridor work group (staff level) are also members of the High Capacity Transit Corridor work group and thus there is an intersection of work and opportunity for input.

PREFERENCES COMMUNICATED BY JURISDICTION REPRESENTATIVES

1. Council Member Teresa O'Neill: Option B.
2. Council Member Darcy Paul: Option B and provide information on inclusion of 280 (high-level cost, impact to timeline, and prior work/study that has been completed), and RFI possibilities.
3. Representative from County (Ellen Talbo): Option B; the County has two intersections in the corridor. Option A or B define the type of high capacity modes that provide enough information to test and observe signal operations of two intersections and how they best serve the corridor and benefit the preferred modes running through. Because the County is not as reliant on graphics at this stage, Option B makes more sense.
4. Vice Mayor Chappie Jones: Option A but is supportive of option B.

VTA noted that if they vote to recommend Option B, they would need to secure funding, amend contract, then go to VTA Board for approval, estimated to be in March of 2021.

Vice Mayor Jones noted that each jurisdiction has one vote to be casted by an elected representative.

Action: Upon motion by Council Member Teresa O'Neill, seconded by Vice Mayor Chappie Jones and carried unanimously, jurisdictions supported Option B for the Vision Study, additionally, for VTA to provide information about the impact of including Hwy 280 (high-level cost, timeline, results of prior work/study) in the Vision Study, and the results of the RFI. (3-0-1. Absent: Supervisor Susan Ellenberg).

Next Steps include jurisdictions to secure funding from their agencies, enter into funding agreements with VTA, and VTA Board approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

Vice Mayor Chappie Jones adjourned the meeting at 3:22 pm.

_____

Vice Mayor Chappie Jones
Stevens Creek Corridor Transit Steering Committee