

From: Robin Roemer

Sent: Monday, December 09, 2019 9:19 AM

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

Cc: The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Comment to TIF report / Item 6.1, City Council 12/10

Hi,

I would like to respectfully submit the attached pdf as a public comment to Item 6.1. "Report on Fiscal Year 2018-2019 Traffic Impact Fee" at the 12/10 City Council.

Thank you,

Robin

1. Developers will seemingly have to pay at least another \$535 million in NSJ TIFs.

Developers have so far paid roughly \$55 million in NSJ TIF (Table 2). Based on the outstanding capacity in phases 2,3 and 4 of another 24,000 housing units and 19.7M sq ft of industrial space, developers might have to pay at least another \$535 million NSJ TIF. This is before considering any outstanding capacity from phase 1, any commercial or hotel development, or any future increase in the TIF. Yet, according to (potentially incorrect – see below) City estimates (Table 4) only \$472 million are needed for the transportation improvements.

2. Project cost increases based on inflation rate alone seem to underestimate actual cost increases as seen in other recent projects.

Most project costs in Table 4 seem to be only adjusted for inflation (projects **not** marked with an * in Table 4). The adjustment is a uniform +59% since 2005 and +1.77% from 2018 to 2019. But looking at the actual cost increases for those projects that were updated based on real engineering progress suggests costs have increased by much more than the estimated 59% (average actual cost increase +114%).

3. The traffic impacts addressed by the TIF are LOS “improvements” and do not necessarily considered VMT or Vision Zero

The report should note that any “improvements” funded by the TIF are based on the outdated LOS approach. The TIF therefore in the most part does not address VMT impacts and might even worsen VMT.

E.g. planned Zanker Widening especially between Trimble and Tasman seems unnecessary based on current traffic counts and San José Climate Smart goals. It creates additional car capacity parallel to the underutilized VTA lightrail line on N1st.

The “improvements” also do not address impact on the City’s Vision Zero. Some roads in NSJ are already seeing very high speeds. Many of the “improvements” would be further widenings. A recent traffic study on Trimble Road (45mph official speed limit) counted within a single **24h-timeframe**:

2,800 (!) drivers that were driving 55mph or more (if accurate, this would mean this segment sees 1 million speeding drivers per year)

350 of which were driving 65mph and more

- *75 drivers were driving over 70mph (in one day!)*

1. Developers will seemingly have to pay at least another \$535 million in NSJ TIFs.

Developers have so far paid roughly \$55 million in NSJ TIF (Table 2). Based on the outstanding capacity in phases 2,3 and 4 of another 24,000 housing units and 19.7M sq ft of industrial space, developers might have to pay at least another \$535 million NSJ TIF. This is before considering any outstanding capacity from phase 1, any commercial or hotel development, or any future increase in the TIF.

	# remaining in Phase 2, 3 & 4	TIF (2019-20)	Total to be collected
Residential (multi-family)	24,000 units	\$8,816 / unit	\$211,584,000
Industrial	19,700, 000 sq ft	\$16.45 / sq ft	\$ 324,065,000
			\$ 535,649,000

Yet, according to (potentially incorrect – see below) City estimates (Table 4) only \$472 million are needed for the transportation improvements.

NET TOTAL to be funded by the NSJ TIF**	\$460,000,000	\$472,620,778
--	----------------------	----------------------

2. Project cost increases based on inflation rate alone seem to underestimate actual cost increases as seen in other recent projects.

Most project costs in Table 4 seem to be only adjusted for inflation (projects not marked with an * in Table 4). The adjustment is a uniform +59% since 2005 (table below on the right) and +1.77% from 2018 to 2019. But looking at the actual cost increases for those projects that were updated based on real engineering progress (table below on the left) suggests costs have increased by much more than the estimated 59% (average cost increase +114%).

Projects with updated costs based on engineering progress [marked with * in memo]				Other projects (based on index/inflation)			
	Cost 2005 in M USD	Cost 2019 in M USD	Increase		Cost 2005 in M USD	Cost 2019 in M USD	Increase
Montague Widening*	18.0	35.2	+96%	Zanker Widening	49.0	78.0	59%
Zanker to Skyport*	64.0	152.7	+139%	Montague/Trimble	30.0	47.7	59%
Charcot Extension*	32.0	55.0	+72%	Montague McCarthy	68.0	108.2	59%
101/Trimble*	27.0	50.9	+88%	NSJ Grid	55.0	87.5	59%
Mabury*	43.0	96.7	+125%	1 st /237	7.0	11.1	59%
101/Oakland*	20.2	57.0	+181%	1 st /Charcot	2.0	3.2	59%
				Bering/Brokaw	1.0	1.6	59%
				King/McKee	2.0	3.2	59%
				...			
Average			+114%	All			59%

3. The traffic impacts addressed by the TIF are LOS “improvements” and do not necessarily considered VMT or Vision Zero

The report should note that any “improvements” funded by the TIF are based on the outdated LOS approach. The TIF therefore in the most part does not address VMT impacts and might even worsen VMT.

- *E.g. planned Zanker Widening especially between Trimble and Tasman seems unnecessary based on current traffic counts and San José Climate Smart goals. It creates additional car capacity parallel to the underutilized VTA lighttrail line on N1st.*

The “improvements” also do not address impact on the City’s Vision Zero. Some roads in NSJ are already seeing very high speeds. Many of the “improvements” would be further widenings. A recent traffic study on Trimble Road (45mph official speed limit) counted within a single **24h-timeframe**:

- *2,800 (!) drivers that were driving 55mph or more (if accurate, this would mean this segment sees 1 million speeding drivers per year)*
- *350 of which were driving 65mph and more*
- *75 drivers were driving over 70mph (in one day!)*