

City Council: Support Diridon-Airport Connector (Item 5.2)

Brett Garrett <[REDACTED]>

Sat 4/15/2023 12:53 PM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear Mayor Mahan and Councilmembers,

I urge your support for Agenda Item 5.2, a significant step toward implementing a truly innovative transit system in the City of San Jose.

I am a long-time advocate for the proposed transportation method, using small automated electric vehicles on a dedicated guideway to provide fast, efficient, direct transportation between any two stations in the system.

The system provides on-demand access, making it much more convenient for passengers than a typical fixed-schedule bus or train. The system offers a very high capacity despite using small vehicles. It achieves stellar energy efficiency with no greenhouse gas emissions.

After this system is built, it can easily be expanded to serve additional parts of the city, including the Stevens Creek corridor as described sections G and H of the original Plenary / Glydways [proposal](#). Just imagine, a direct connection to the airport and Diridon from many parts of the city, accessible to all with little or no wait time.

For additional context regarding how the proposed system will operate, I recommend viewing the following materials in addition to the Memorandum that was included in the agenda.

Plenary / Glydways proposal in response to San Jose RFI
<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/home/showpublisheddocument/49781/637140710557730000>

"Dynamic Personal Mass Transit" presentation by Glydways CEO Mark Seeger
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s8DOWPyVnCI> (49 minutes)

Glydways presentation to City of Pittsburg
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=e37wWuOgSpc> (30 minutes)

Thank you for giving serious consideration to this groundbreaking proposal which will dramatically improve transportation and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing the need for personal vehicles. The proposed system will provide inspiration for other cities throughout the world.

Sincerely,


Brett Garrett

FW: Public comment for City Council April 18, item 5.2: Pre-Development Agreement for the Diridon Station to Airport Connector Project

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 4/18/2023 7:45 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

 1 attachments (427 KB)

Airport Connector Public Comment.pdf;

From: Louise Auerhahn [REDACTED] >

Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 9:46 PM

To: District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; Jimenez, Sergio <sergio.jimenez@sanjoseca.gov>; Torres, Omar <Omar.Torres@sanjoseca.gov>; Cohen, David <David.Cohen@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; Foley, Pam <Pam.Foley@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; The Office of Mayor Matt Mahan <mayor@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Public comment for City Council April 18, item 5.2: Pre-Development Agreement for the Diridon Station to Airport Connector Project

[External Email]

Dear Mayor and City Councilmembers,

Attached please see a joint letter from the South Bay Labor Council, the Santa Clara Building Trades Council, and Working Partnerships USA regarding the proposed Pre-Development Agreement for the Airport Connector. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on this matter.

Sincerely,

Louise Auerhahn
Director of Economic & Workforce Policy
Working Partnerships USA
www.wpusa.org

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.



April 17, 2023

Honorable Mayor and City Council
City of San José
200 E. Santa Clara Street
San Jose, CA 95113

RE: April 18, 2023 City Council, item 5.2: Pre-Development Agreement for the Diridon Station to Airport Connector Project

Dear Mayor Mahan, Vice Mayor Kamei, and Councilmembers Jimenez, Torres, Cohen, Ortiz, Davis, Doan, Candelas, Foley, and Batra:

As the City focuses its resources and efforts on a privately operated model for the Diridon Airport Connector, it is critical to design agreements with strong protections to ensure that the needs of San Jose workers, residents and communities come first.

To this end, we ask that as the Pre-Development Agreement moves forward, the City center a framework that ensures this project will create good jobs for our communities in construction jobs, permanent jobs, and manufacturing jobs, and will benefit, not undermine, the transit needs of our city's underserved neighborhoods.

In each of these four areas respectively, the City should abide by the following standards:

Construction Jobs: Maintain Standards in the Citywide Project Labor Agreement

We support the proposed Pre-Development Agreement which affirms that the Citywide Project Labor Agreement will cover all construction work, and thank the City Council for your work to include this vital provision to protect workers safety and rights on the jobsite and help ensure a future pipeline of local skilled trades workers.

Permanent Jobs: Apply Labor Peace and Living Wage as Minimum Standards

Permanent jobs associated with the Airport Connector may include operations, maintenance, engineering, customer service, or other types of jobs, and may be located locally or remotely and/or performed by subcontractors. While different approaches or technologies may change the particulars of the work, it is critical that all jobs created and supported by this project provide a good, family-supporting career, a voice at work, and opportunity to our community members.



To that end, any City contract or agreement for the Diridon Station to Airport Connector, or any similar public/private transit partnerships, should:

1. Require that all operations, maintenance, or other permanent jobs, whether performed directly or by subcontractors, and regardless of location or outsourcing, adhere to the City of San José Living Wage Policy; and

2. Require the project operator to demonstrate how they will ensure that no labor dispute or unrest will occur during the term of the agreement, including the following:

- a) Proposer shall not interfere with employees in the exercise of rights to form, join, or assist a labor organization for collective bargaining;
- b) Proposer will respect the right of employees to bargain over wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment;
- c) Proposer shall not interfere with employees in working together to improve terms and conditions of employment, or in refraining from any such activity; and
- d) Proposer shall require that any other system operator, subcontractor, or outsourced employer make the same commitments, and shall ensure that those commitments are upheld.

Manufacturing Jobs: Apply and Monitor High Road Job Standards and Promote Local Employment

The manufacture of vehicles for the Airport Connector, much like manufacture of Light Rail cars or VTA buses, will be a critical component of the jobs created by this project, both at initial startup, and on an ongoing basis as cars need replacement. Transit agencies throughout the country have recognized the importance of ensuring that vehicle manufacturing jobs are beneficial to the community by adopting policies to promote a high road employment model. VTA itself procures most of its buses from Gillig, a high road employer that manufactures locally in the Bay Area.

While the project is still in Phase 1, the City and the contractor should commit to study the [U.S Employment Plan](#), a federally-approved, customizable policy tool that builds good jobs and equity into the public purchasing process, and **work with stakeholders to develop language to apply this model to manufacturing jobs and contracts for the Airport Connector.**



Community Benefits: Connect and Strengthen Public Transit

A strong public transit system is an urgent need for our region, and many working people in San Jose depend on VTA, CalTrain, BART, ACE and other public transit systems to get to work and other essential activities. These same public transit systems also provide good, family-supporting union jobs. If San Jose proceeds with the Airport Connector and/or similar projects, it should prioritize project designs that puts community benefits first by collaborating with VTA to **meet the transportation needs of under-served neighborhoods and strengthen the public transit system throughout our city**, not undercut public transit service nor remove funding from it.

Sincerely,

Jean Cohen
South Bay AFL-CIO Labor Council

David Bini
Santa Clara & San Benito Building & Construction Trades Council

Maria Noel Fernandez
Working Partnerships USA

FW: Item 5.2 Oppose awarding PDA to Plenary

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 4/18/2023 7:45 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Jake Wilde <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 10:23 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Item 5.2 Oppose awarding PDA to Plenary

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers,

Please do not award the PDA to Plenary. While their chosen technology may fit the needs of an airport connector, it is not fit for the San Carlos/Stevens Creek corridor extension. To extend this project down the San Carlos/Stevens Creek corridor, the technology must be high capacity, low frequency, and fast. A \$500,000 PDA to assess the feasibility of this specific PRT technology seems unnecessary. Observing existing PRT systems elsewhere should highlight that PRT is ill-suited for the transportation needs of the Stevens Creek/San Carlos corridor. As this is just the first leg of a larger system, the selected technology must go beyond the requirements of an airport connector.

Please further explore technologies for automated grade-separated transit systems already proven effective in the North American urban context. Stevens Creek is a vital transportation corridor that deserves a high-quality rapid transit connection.

Thank you,

Jake Wilde

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

FW: 04/18/23 City Council Meeting Public Comment - Agenda Item #5.2: Diridon Station to Airport Connector Project

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 4/18/2023 7:45 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Tony Tran [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2023 11:57 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: 04/18/23 City Council Meeting Public Comment - Agenda Item #5.2: Diridon Station to Airport Connector Project

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

To the San Jo e City Council

I am submitting a public comment to ask that the City of San Jose needs to take action against moving forward with the Glydways San Jose Diridon to Airport Connector Project. This is a poorly designed and expensive system that will not meet the needs of connecting public transportation to the San Jose Airport. There is a similar real-world analog of the Tesla Vegas Loop in Las Vegas, showcasing the current failures of such a system: requiring drivers, traffic jam congestion, low peak passenger efficiency. And this system was built only for transportation between hotels with smaller passenger count and density.

If anything, there are more viable alternatives such as taking the opportunity with the BART extension to Santa Clara to extend a little further to the airport or perhaps a BART connector if we want to match the other major Bay Area airports. Additionally, there can be a possibility for VTA to create a route splitting down along Taylor St and along Coleman Ave to the airport, with added benefits to reach Paypal Park and the office buildings along Coleman Ave. Or extending a line along the VTA light rail facility to the airport if there is still an intention to building an 880 overpass. All of these ideas would still give a connection from San Jose Diridon to the airport and using the VTA light rail would give a direct connection from the airport to downtown San Jose and the convention center, rather than at the Diridon station being at least a mile away from the area of downtown that visitors would be attending to.

I've recently had the pleasure to test out San Jose's public transit to the airport on a recent trip back in Feb. A hour-long trip from VTA bus to Curtner VTA light rail to Caltrain Tamien Station to the VTA airport connector bus at the Santa Clara Caltrain Station was inefficient to say the least compared to a 10-15 min drive down the 87, let along the excessive transfers. San Jose residents and visitors deserve a better public transit system option befitting of a major city, especially for one with the title of Capital of Silicon Valley.

- Resident of Radio Ave

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

FW: Agenda #5.2: Concerns about Glydway's Public Transportation Plan.

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 4/18/2023 7:46 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: David Sherbinin [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 1:37 AM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Agenda #5.2: Concerns about Glydway's Public Transportation Plan.

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Dear City Council,

I hope this message finds everyone well.

I wanted to express my concerns regarding the upcoming vote on the allocation of funds for the research of Glydway's public transportation plan, as I understand you and other city council members will be deciding on this matter.

I respectfully urge you to vote **against** this plan. In my opinion, I believe it's a scam, as it lacks the efficiency and speed of other transportation systems, resembling more of a Gadgetbahn, than a viable transportation system. The projected capacity of transporting only 2000 people per hour is comparable to a highway, and I doubt it would be widely utilized by the public.

In case you have an opportunity, I recommend watching a YouTube video which provides a comprehensive analysis of various "smart" transportation systems: https://youtu.be/fvvA_GToc0M

As an alternative, I would like to suggest considering investments in more efficient and faster options, such as dedicated bus lanes or a rail system. For instance, connecting the light rail to the airport or exploring the possibility of a high-speed monorail to Diridon could be far better alternatives.

I strongly believe Glydways will not be the optimal choice for our growing city's future transportation needs.

Thank you for your time and consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,
David Sherbinin

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

FW: Agenda #5.2

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 4/18/2023 10:39 AM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Everett Wu <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 9:30 AM

To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Agenda #5.2

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hello,

I would urge all members of the council to vote against this resolution. The proposed transit system is not a good proposal or use of public funds.

In transit, uniqueness does not give you any points. The reason there are standards is because we have used these systems for years and they work the best. More traditional light rail and train systems have more standardized parts and construction processes, so building and maintaining these systems is cheaper and easier.

Additionally, the proposed system lacks the capacity and efficiency required of a public transit system in such a large city. With only 4 seats and rubber tires, the proposed vehicles are inferior to rail systems and buses in every way.

The only thing worse than not building transit is building bad transit. These types of projects encourage ideas that public transit is unfeasible, a waste of resources, and not a viable solution for climate issues, traffic congestion, and accessibility of the city for the disabled population.

Thank you,

Everett

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

FW: City Council: Oppose Diridon-Airport Connector (Item 5.2)

City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>

Tue 4/18/2023 12:08 PM

To: Agendadesk <Agendadesk@sanjoseca.gov>

From: Suyog Vibhuti <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2023 12:04 PM
To: City Clerk <city.clerk@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: City Council: Oppose Diridon-Airport Connector (Item 5.2)

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

Hello. This is an email from Suyog Vibhuti, West San Jose.

Due to time issues that may prevent me from attending Tuesday's council meeting, I'll simply state what I have to in this email.

That being, the planned autonomous electric vehicle connection between Mineta Airport and Diridon Station is an extremely dangerous, low-capacity, and expensive proposition, and should immediately be completely scrapped and replaced with a cheaper, higher-capacity, and safer option.

First of all, the pods themselves are extremely small. They may appear futuristic but offer even less space and carrying capacity than a car. Wheelchair-bound individuals will have a nightmare boarding, staying, and departing these vehicles. The maximum number of people transported is staggeringly small as well, with best estimates being about 4 people, and most likely being only about 2 to 3 people on average in each pod.

That kind of low capacity would then lead to massive waiting queues at the airport, and even if more pods are bought to increase capacity, the guideway would likely fill up with pods long before it could reach the kind of capacity needed to serve an airport and a central train station. Any dreams of the pods reaching 70mph on regular use would be dashed by extreme traffic owing to their small size and similarly miniature capacity. In fact, any future plans to bring these pods to roads like Stevens Creek Blvd. would make their traffic issues even worse without representing a true increase in capacity in any sort of way.

The pods are supposed to run on elevated guideways, which in and of itself isn't bad, but considering just how far the elevated guideway is supposed to run, this will incur major expenses. Even if it's only one lane each way, it will have even less capacity than an elevated road. An elevated platform like as planned could be much better served by a bus or rail connection, and parts of the platform could be kept at ground level to save on installation and maintenance fees.

Autonomous road vehicles have also proven extremely problematic when tested as well. Collisions faced by Tesla vehicles, for example, are shockingly common compared to other methods of transportation. If using autonomous vehicles to cut down on operator costs, an autonomous LRT system would be much safer, as the rails both save costs when it comes to autonomous driving and physically prevent the vehicle from accidentally veering off course.

Pod based transit is not transit. Pods are just thinly-veiled cars from a cost-benefit analysis, and a futuristic aesthetic does not excuse the glaring flaws in this major project. Transit oriented development is supposed to be built along high-capacity lines, and because pods offer shockingly low capacity, whatever development is zoned along the guideways will serve to only further increase the abysmal traffic issue mentioned prior. A much better connector between Mineta Airport and Diridon Station would be a busway or dedicated LRT line with automated rolling stock.

To summarize, the current pod-based plan would be a major embarrassment to San Jose for decades to come, and a common-sense high-capacity system would do the job much better, much cheaper, and much safer.

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.