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PROJECT DESCRIPTION

● Five major corridors

1. De Anza Branch - 8.56 miles/6.74 miles
2. Blossom Hill Branch - 9.30 miles
3. Vasona Branch - 6.12 miles
4. Monterey/Lick - 7.55 miles/7.78 miles
5. Guadalupe - 6.09 miles

● All corridors eventually connect to existing Southern Pacific commuter railroad in downtown San Jose to enhance patronage and to effectively increase extent of rail service in Santa Clara County, both through new construction and better utilization of existing facilities.

● Project objectives primarily directed at furnishing essential technical information to permit informed public policy decisions on light rail transit service or alternatives thereto in an area of the county which is not likely to have transportation facilities constructed in accordance with previous highway-only concepts. Objectives included:

   - Determination of feasibility of light rail transit service implementation in county
   - Identification of starter segment
   - Fulfillment of federal requirements for project-level alternatives analysis
PROJECT DESCRIPTION (CON'T)

- Light rail transit (sometimes referred to as a modern trolley) is for high speed, high capacity, electrically operated fixed guideway travel. Vehicles can be coupled together in trains and operated in a variety of conditions, including:
  - Regular street
  - Arterial median strips
  - Fully grade-separated

- Transit alternatives to light rail were considered and include various bus alternatives which would increase the speed, capacity and reliability of conventional bus service by:
  - Increasing the number of buses beyond the 516 now planned
  - Bus pre-emption of traffic signals
  - Reservation of special lanes for buses
  - Construction of special bus facilities, called "busways"
TRANSIT PLANNING CONTEXT

- BART EXISTS IN SUBSTANTIALLY POPULATED AREAS OF THE REGION EXCEPT FOR SAN MATEO AND SANTA CLARA COUNTIES.

- ENOUGH STUDIES HAVE BEEN DONE TO SHOW THAT THE LOOPING OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY WITH A BART TYPE OF FACILITY FROM DALY CITY TO FREMONT THROUGH SAN JOSE WILL COST SOMEWHERE BETWEEN $2- TO $3 BILLION AT TODAY'S COSTS. PLANNING FOR BART HAS STOPPED.

- ALTERNATIVE RAIL TRANSIT STRATEGIES, INCLUDING TRANSITIONAL STRATEGIES, ARE REQUIRED IF FISCAL PRACTICALITY IS TO BE RECOGNIZED.

- ANY RAIL NETWORK, WHETHER TRANSITIONAL OR ULTIMATE, SHOULD RECOGNIZE THE NEED FOR RAIL CONNECTIONS TO THE REST OF THE SAN FRANCISCO BAY REGION.

- THE LIGHT RAIL PROJECT IS THE INEVITABLE OUTGROWTH OF CONTINUOUS TRANSIT PLANNING EFFORTS SINCE 1964.

- COMPREHENSIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANNING STUDY, APRIL 1969, FUNDED JOINTLY WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, BASICALLY RECOMMENDED A TWO-PRONGED APPROACH OF BUSES AND RAIL RAPID TRANSIT.

- WILBUR SMITH REPORT, SEPTEMBER 1969, FUNDED JOINTLY WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, CONCERNED THE BUS ELEMENT OF TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT.
TRANSPORTATION CONTEXT (cont.)

- Rapid Transit Development Project Phase I, December 1974, funded locally, concerned an overview for the rail element of transit development.

- The Light Rail Feasibility and Alternatives Analysis Report is the outgrowth of the previous work and the discussions relating thereto. It is consistent with the requirements of the General Transit Plan adopted in 1972, and the short-range Transit Expansion Program adopted in 1975 and funded by voters March 2, 1976. The short-range Transit Expansion Program was a part of the overall Transportation Improvement Program also adopted in 1975.

- Other rail transit studies now ongoing in Santa Clara County address regional travel corridors and transit facilities with which any light rail system must be coordinated and integrated. Studies include:
  - Southern Pacific Railroad and the Peninsula Corridor (PENTAP)
  - Commuter Railroad Feasibility on Existing Rails in Santa Clara County (SB 283)
  - Rail Service Re-establishment to Santa Cruz and Monterey (SB 283)
  - Santa Clara Valley Corridor Evaluation Study Needed to Fulfill Federal Requirements for Systems-Level Alternatives Analysis (ABAG/MTC)
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

RTDP Phase I has already exposed the fundamental problem.

Given current dispersed trip-making patterns and current trip-making tendencies, 6 million person trips will be taken each day in 1990, compared to 4 million person trips per day now. This projected 50% increase assumes very conservative growth rates for Santa Clara County.

Three choices are available to avoid future intolerable conditions in the essential circulatory system. (Roughly doubled peak-hour travel times.)

- Essentially rebuild and expand the major highway network. About 250 lane miles will be required, plus an extensive bus system probably consisting of roughly 1,500 buses to achieve only a 15% market penetration.

- Buy the non-urbanized land in the county to forestall trip-making. About 65- to 70,000 acres would have to be purchased.

- Build a transit system to accommodate future transportation demand and build it on an evolutionary basis consistent with transport demand pressures (Transit Market).
PROJECT JUSTIFICATION (Cont')

• SEVERAL EXISTING TRANSIT ROUTES NOW HAVE REASONABLY HIGH VOLUME PATRONAGE.

• LARGE INCREASES IN VOLUME CANNOT BE REASONABLY PROVIDED UNLESS DEVICES OTHER THAN BUSES ARE USED.

• SOPHISTICATED DEVICES REQUIRE LONG LEAD TIMES FOR ADEQUATE COMMUNITY AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL DECISION-MAKING.

• CORRIDORS STUDIED AS A PART OF THIS PROJECT WERE SELECTED ON THE BASIS OF:
  • AVAILABLE RIGHTS OF WAY
  • UNMET TRANSPORT NEEDS
  • LITTLE LIKELIHOOD OF MEETING THOSE NEEDS IN FORESEEABLE FUTURE BY TRADITIONAL MEANS
  • ABILITY TO CONNECT TO EXISTING REGIONAL RAIL SERVICES
ESSENTIAL MAJOR FINDINGS

• All of the alternatives have positive features which recommend them in one or more evaluation areas.

• Light rail, together with the baseline (516) bus system, appears to be the preferred alternative.
  • Higher capital costs but significantly lower operating costs
  • Highest patronage estimates and highest percent recovery from fare box
  • Lowest subsidy
  • Highest benefit-cost ratio = "best buy"
  • Best able to accommodate additional riders for negligible additional costs
  • Coordinated urban development and transit planning could produce even greater patronage and benefits
ESSENTIAL MAJOR FINDINGS (CON’T)

- Guadalupe/Monterey Highway/Lick Branch Corridor (12.25 miles) is consultant’s recommended place to start.
  - Highest patronage estimates
  - Supports San Jose’s newly adopted general plan
  - Provides connection to regional service (Southern Pacific)
  - Can be coordinated with other short-range transit improvements

- West Valley Transportation Corridor should be preserved and provides a basis for planning future extensions.
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

- Data bank now exists:
  - Presentation hand-out including summary section of final report
  - The final report (all public libraries and city halls)
  - The seven working papers (all public libraries and city halls)
    1. Functional Design Criteria
    2. Travel Market Potential
    3. Alignment Definition
    4. Land Use, Socio-Economic & Environmental
    5. Patronage Forecasts
    6. Capital and Operating Costs
    7. Alternatives Analysis
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS (CON'T)
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS (con't)

• **There are at least five alternatives.**

• **There are at least seven sets of factors which affect any comprehensive decision.**

• **It is possible, as a result, to achieve an infinite array of possibilities for an ultimate trade-off analysis and decision.**

• **In the last analysis an informed decision depends on being familiar with the factors and simply choosing a course of action based upon goals for transit.**

• **Decisions are tough but essential to continued rapid development of transit in Santa Clara County.**
POLICY ISSUES

• Which transit alternative should receive top priority for commencement in concert with the 516-Bus Plan?

• Where should the first usable segment of any approved transit alternative be located?

• What is the role of light rail transit in Santa Clara County in solving transportation needs now and in the foreseeable future?

• Is there a willingness to consider modifications to current general plans and zoning laws which would reinforce transit in selected and mutually agreed upon areas?

• Should innovative financing mechanisms, such as value capture, tax increment, or other techniques, be pursued so that new property values, at selected locations, can be partially assigned to help pay for the local share of the system?

• Should the west valley and Guadalupe transportation corridors be preserved for future transportation options?
## NEXT STEPS

### SCHEDULE FOR CITY AND PUBLIC REVIEW OF LIGHT FEASIBILITY AND ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 25, 1976</td>
<td>Joint meeting of the Board of Supervisors and the Transportation Commission to discuss the key findings and the final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September-November 1976</td>
<td>Distribute study summaries. Cities hold public discussions and conduct public meetings. Cities complete review and formulation of recommendations relative to the study findings and conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1976</td>
<td>Distribution of a Draft EIR on Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 1976</td>
<td>Submission of recommendations by each City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 3, 1977</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors Public Hearing on Draft EIR on Alternatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 1977</td>
<td>Complete preparation of a Final EIR, Summary and recommended Action Plan incorporating the Consultant's findings and the recommendations submitted by each City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 1977</td>
<td>Approval by the Board of Supervisors of Final EIR on Alternatives and a Final Summary and Action Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28, 1977</td>
<td>Incorporate the Final EIR, Summary and Action Plan in the Transportation Improvement Program for transmittal to MTC for current regional TIP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>