

BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, November 8, 2006

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by Chairperson Wadler, Valley Transportation Authority, Auditorium, Building A, 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Anna Brunzell
John Carpenter
Bruce Entin
Carl Hagenmaier
David Kobayshi
Thomas Muniz
Bill Reisinger

Members Present

Norma Rome
David Simons
Jim Stallman
John Sullivan
Bart Thielges
Herman Wadler, Chairperson
Joe Walton

Members Absent

Bill Manry

Members Absent

Richard Swent, Vice Chairperson

A quorum was declared.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Staff requested Agenda Item #11., Review a report on the Draft Checklist for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Routine Accommodation Policy, Agenda Item #14., Receive the Guadalupe River Trail Status Update, and Agenda Item #15., Receive the Draft Project Study Report for the Mary Avenue Overcrossing of US 101 and State Route 237 in Sunnyvale moved to the beginning of the of the Regular Agenda.

Chairperson Wadler requested Agenda Item #7., Approve the Minutes of October 11, 2003 be deferred to the BPAC Meeting of December 13, 2006.

Member Stallman requested Agenda Item #6., Approve the Minutes of September 13, 2006 removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.

M/S/C (Stallman/Walton) to approve the Orders of the Day.

3. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

4. Committee Staff Report

- Project Design Review

Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, advised there were no projects to discuss regarding Project Design Review.

Ms. DeRobertis announced that the County of Santa Clara (“County”) is in the process of developing their own Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee. Ms. DeRobertis encouraged the BPAC Members to attend the County’s meeting on November 16, 2006 to provide their input.

Member Sullivan took his seat at 6:11 p.m.

5. Chairperson’s Report

Chairperson Wadler reported that the County has decided not to take action regarding Senate Bill 1233 (Committee on Transportation) (SB1233) and read Jane Decker’s, Deputy Executive, comments into the record:

“We weren’t anticipating trying it again because, last year’s effort was not successful and the only reason that SB1233 was introduced after going through substantial discussion was to clarify what we believe is already the authority of the County to impose pedestrian prohibitions. So in our mind that this point, even though the language of SB1233 might look as if it is prohibiting pedestrians, it really is not, and the County, it authorizes the County to pose signs regarding pedestrian prohibitions. It does not require the County or it doesn’t say that there will be pedestrian prohibitions. It gives the County this authority to do that so I think at this point we weren’t anticipating introducing legislation – to change it – no we are not – to change it.”

Member Stallman inquired if VTA received a formal response from the County regarding BPAC’s repeal of the SB 1233. Staff responded that they will be meeting with VTA’s Legislative Analyst and the County to discuss what can be accomplished.

Member Kobayashi stated that subcommittee held discussion regarding repealing SB 1233 but politicians at the state level were not willing to work on the repeal due to personal reasons.

Chairperson Wadler recommended repealing SB1233 in 2007.

Chairperson Wadler stated that since SB1233 was not open for discussion it may have been passed illegally and could ask the County of Santa Clara District Attorney for a Grand Jury investigation regarding irregularities or illegal activities in passage of SB1233. Member Simons and Member Stallman offered their support.

Member Stallman advised that there is a sidewalk missing that would connect Coleman Avenue to the San Jose Mineta Airport.

CONSENT AGENDA

6. (Removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.)

Approve the Minutes of September 13, 2006.

7. (Deferred to BPAC Meeting of December 13, 2006.)

Approve the Minutes of October 11, 2006.

8. Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report – July through September 2006

M/S/C (Simons/Hagenmaier) to approve the Consent Agenda.

REGULAR AGENDA

The Agenda was taken out of order.

6. Minutes of September 13, 2006

Member Stallman reported that he received an email from Kevin Jackson, City of Sunnyvale BPAC, requesting on Page 7, Paragraph 11, "Bicycle/Pedestrian Update Working Group" changed to "Bicycle Plan Update Working Group. On Page 8, Paragraph 1, remove John Sullivan as a Member and add Joe Walton and Corrine Winters.

M/S/C (Stallman/Hagenmaier) on a vote of 13 ayes to 0 noes to 1 abstention to approve the Minutes of September 13, 2006 as amended. Member Reisinger abstained.

11. Draft Checklist for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Routine Accommodation Policy

Corrine Winters, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC), stated that in conjunction with MTC she has been working on the Route Accommodation's Checklist Committee, a subcommittee of the Regional Bicycle Working Group and the Regional Pedestrian Working Group.

Member Carpenter took his seat at 6:19 a.m.

Ms. Winters distributed a document entitled Route Accommodations of Pedestrian and Bicyclists in the Bay Area: Study Recommendations, dated June 28, 2006, approved by the Board of Directors at MTC."

Ms. Winters reported that the most important recommendations from the MTC was a policy change to encourage consistency with local and regional plans. This policy change would require that projects funded with regional monies coming through MTC need to consider accommodation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Ms. Winter referenced PROJECT PLANNING and DESIGN 3., which states that Caltran's District 4 needs to maintain and share a table listing the ongoing project documents which will keep members of the public apprised of Caltrain projects.

Ms. Winters read the following into the record: "FUNDING AND REVIEW 5., MTC's fund programming policies shall ensure project sponsors consider the accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians consistent with Caltrans' Deputy Directive 64."

Ms. Winters summarized FUNDING AND REVIEW 6., stating that funding to enhance bicycle and pedestrian access associated with new roadway or transit construction projects should be included in the original funding for the project.

Ms. Winters stated FUNDING AND REVIEW 7., is the checklist that is going to be used by implementing agencies to evaluate bicycle and pedestrian facility needs and to identify its accommodation associated with regionally funded roadway and transit projects.

Ms. Winters read FUNDING and REVIEW 8., into the record: "CMA's will review completed project checklists and will make them available through their websites and to their countywide BPACs for review and input to ensure that routine accommodation is considered at the earliest stages of project development." Ms. Winters advised MTC will be holding trainings in the cities of Oakland and San Jose.

The first of the three categories, "projects located in corridors wherein the engineer or designer is incorporating pedestrian and bicycle project", would require answers to questions such as what plans identify the proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities; what bicycle and pedestrians facilities are included in the project design; does the bicycle

and/or pedestrian facility design conform to the applicable design standards; and what are the bicycle and pedestrian connections.

The second category, “projects and corridors wherein bicycle and pedestrian facilities are in the planning document but are not included in the project”, would require answers to such questions as why the planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities are not included in the project, the cost, the right of way, or is it something else; has Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) collision data been analyzed; has the decision not to implement a portion of an adopted plan been reviewed by the applicable BPAC and policymaking body that originally adopted the applicable plan; and are there plans to amend the applicable planning document to reflect what will then be reality if it goes through.

The second category “facilities not included in planning documents nor the project and may or may not need to include an overarching policy but there is no actual document governing the engineering”, is a request to list the applicable plans that have been consulted; to answer if the respective agency have a bicycle and/or pedestrian master plan accommodations made for bicyclists and pedestrians; and if not, why not.

Ms. Winters provided the list that accompanies the pedestrian related considerations as follows:

Bicycle Data:

- Are there existing bicycle facilities in the project area or crossing the corridor?
- Are there bicycle trip generators within a certain number of miles? If not, the certain number of miles is to be decided.
- Would a bicycle facility connect to planned or existing bicycle facilities or to a transit station?
- Is there a parallel bicycle facility within one-eighth mile or two city blocks?
- Have you analyzed SWITRS Collision Data?
- Will the project result in a degradation of conditions for bicyclists?
- What are the barriers to bicyclists that this project could eliminate?

Pedestrian Data:

- Are there existing pedestrian facilities?
 - Are there pedestrian trip generators within one-half mile?
 - Are there sidewalks on both sides of the roadway?
 - Are there adequate pedestrian crossing facilities?
 - Have you analyzed SWITRS Collision Data?
 - Have you considered supporting facilities?
 - Will the project result in the degradation of conditions for pedestrians?
 - Are there barriers to pedestrians that this project could eliminate?
 - Have you observed or been told of special pedestrian needs along the project corridor?
-

Consideration for Bicyclists and Pedestrians:

- Has the applicable BPAC had the opportunity to review the project proposal?
- Have there been public and/or stakeholder meetings at which this project has been discussed?
- Why the planned bicycle and pedestrians facilities are not included in the projects?

Ms. Winters stated that to date a decision has not been made by the MTC. However, the adopted resolution does state that the form would be intended to be used on projects at their earliest conception or design phase but it is necessary to get it specified exactly when by the Congestion Management Agency's (CMA's) process.

Ms. Winters requested input from the BPAC regarding reviewing every single project or making the project list available on the website for review by not only the BPAC but the public as well.

Member Stallman stated he would like to see a list of projects that are planned in order make area residents aware.

Member Stallman recommended that where bicycle, pedestrian or both accesses presently exist, it is necessary that access be maintained throughout the duration of the project. Member Stallman expressed concern that while bicycle and pedestrian elements are included in as part of a project, it is not stated at what phase the bicycle and pedestrian elements of the project need to be completed. Member Stallman stated that a project should not be considered completed until the Routine Accommodations (RA) is satisfied.

Member Thielges asked if the section that covers bicycle and pedestrian accommodation could include documents that provide opportunities for connections.

Member Thielges recommended replacing the wording "bike trip generators" with "trip generators."

Member Thielges expressed concern that bicycle trips are not generated to airports because it is assumed that no one would ride their bicycle to the airport. Ms. Winters advised that the Committee has discussed bicycle trips to airports at length and stated she will bring the subject up at the next Checklist Committee Meeting.

Member Kobayashi recommended the Checklist be added into the Bicycle/Pedestrian Guidelines.

Member Hagenmaier requested clarification as to how the information applies and when there is a need to use the Checklist. Ms. Winters explained that VTA, as the CMA, will determine when to utilize the Checklist. Ms. Winters explained that if VTA applies for funding through MTC, the questions will be asked and VTA can easily take the Checklist and incorporate it into its own process for planning and projects.

Ms. DeRobertis stated that VTA manages several highway construction projects as well as being the CMA that allocates funding to cities within the County and it may be necessary to ask for input from the VTA Board of Directors as to how best to incorporate RAs. Ms. DeRobertis also stated that because the Bicycle/Pedestrian Guidelines already exist there might be areas where the Checklist will dovetail nicely with policies already in existence.

Member Simons recommended contacting other MTC organizations that already have their guidelines formally drafted.

Member Simons expressed concern that while the process sounds wonderful, the procedure is for public review not staff review. Member Simons encouraged the involvement of staff and stated the BPAC wants to utilize the checklists and reviews.

Member Kobayashi recommended, particularly with the freeway interchange projects, to urge Caltran's to develop a policy that will use the Checklist during the project study process.

Chairperson Wadler commended Ms. Winters for her work with and for the BPAC.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, the Report on the Draft Checklist For the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC's) Route Accommodation Policy was received.

14. Guadalupe River Trail Status Update

Ms. DeRobertis introduced Yves Zsutty, City of San Jose Parks and Recreation Department.

Member Kobayashi left his seat at 6:50 p.m.

Mr. Zsutty thanked the BPAC for the invitation extended to him.

Mr. Zsutty stated that the Guadalupe River Trail is one of 30 trails in the City of San Jose that will total 106 miles when they are all constructed. Eventually, the Guadalupe River Trail System will run from the Bay in the City of Alviso to Lake Almaden in South San Jose.

Mr. Zsutty stated that his report of the Guadalupe River Trail at the Coleman Road Bridge provides a connection across the river and a safer route than Coleman Road.

Mr. Zsutty reported that in the Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP) \$450,000 has been allocated to develop another pedestrian bridge over Almaden Expressway. While the \$450,000 is enough to complete a portion of the design work and to get a package ready for bidding it is not enough to build a project. Mr. Zsutty stated he is proposing obtaining a new cost estimate for review by the San Jose City Council during the

2007/2008 budget process. These funds would then serve as front money to allow the project to move forward.

Mr. Zsuttu advised that the Guadalupe River Trail begins formally at Coleman Road and follows along the eastern edge of the River with an under crossing at Blossom Hill Road and travels under the roadway along Blossom River Drive. The Trail continues around a senior housing facility, along ponds located underneath State Route 85 (SR-85) and ends at Chenoweth Avenue.

Member Kobayashi took his seat at 6:52 p.m.

Senior Citizens from the senior housing facility would like the property to dead end onto the Trail but unfortunately due to existing fencing they have to walk along Blossom River to access the Trail. While opening up the existing fencing is a small project for the City of San Jose, getting an easements on the senior housing property to build a ramping system with benches, more difficult. The owners of the property are not interested in offering an on their property. Mr. Zsuttu stated he is currently working with the Council Office in the applicable District to schedule another meeting with the property owners.

The Trail picks up at Chenoweth Avenue and continues through San Jose past SR-85 through Downtown San Jose to Virginia Avenue.

Mr. Zsuttu stated he believes the City of San Jose will commence design work in the areas around Virginia Avenue in 2007/2008 and the area around Branham Lane in South San Jose in 2011/2012.

From Virginia Avenue, going south to north, to the 280 Interchange and Woz Way the City of San Jose is working with Caltrans and the San Jose Water District, as land owners, on the design of the trail project. One potential challenge will come from the cost of the project. If built within Caltrans' right-of-way at a cost under \$1 million, the permit process will be straightforward. If over \$1 million, the City of San Jose will have to enter into a cooperative agreement with Caltrans and more significant review will take place. While this section of the trail is less than one mile the current budget is approximately \$950,000. Over the last three years costs have been escalating 20 percent to 30 percent because of high oil costs.

Through Downtown San Jose the Trail provides continuous access from Interstate 280 (I-280) to Coleman Avenue and out towards Interstate 880 (I-880). There is a barrier at the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) crossing, which the Federal Government, through the Army Corp of Engineers, was set to remove the railroad trestle and replace it with a new structure. However funding priorities changed the plan and the project was put on hold. Until the new structure is put in, Autumn Street will be a dead end street.

I-880 is the beginning of the lower Guadalupe River Trail System, which goes down to the City of Alviso. In 2005, the Master Plan discussed a staged approach to the six-mile section of Trail from Tasman Road to Trimble Road. It also included a short segment

from Skyport Drive to I-880 opened on an interim basis. New signage and call boxes will be installed and some gates will be opened. The City of San Jose will assume liability for all recreational users while the San Jose Water District will continue to have responsibility for maintenance of the levees.

The Highway 237 (I-237) segment is almost completed and the section from Tasman Road to Gold Street will most likely open up in the same timeframe. While service orders have been submitted the Santa Clara Valley Water District permit process is causing delay.

The section from Skyport Drive to Trimble Road will not be open at any time soon as there are a couple of projects that need to occur before the City of San Jose can open up that section. These projects include an undercrossing at Airport Parkway and an undercrossing at US-101. The December 5, 2006 San Jose City Council Agenda will include a request to transfer \$2 million to the Santa Clara Valley Water District for construction of the undercrossing at US-101.

Member Entin left the meeting at 7:01 p.m.

The undercrossing at Airport Parkway will go from I-880 along the maintenance road will underneath Airport Parkway to a spur that leads out to the Green Island Bridge and to the parking structure for Airport employees. The Trail continues up a ramp on a distinct pedestrian/bicycle pathway on a bridge structure. It will continue to the east bank of the Guadalupe River all the way to Gold Street. The cost of this project is approximately \$2.1 million.

In the City of Alviso, the Guadalupe River crosses to Gold Street. The Master Plan for the lower Guadalupe River System considered an undercrossing at Gold Street and an undercrossing at the railroad track, which serves the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) Train. Both of those undercrossing would be underwater for a large part of the year, especially during the winter and the City of San Jose will need to make a decision as to whether or not they can afford the maintenance of those facilities. To date there is no funding available for this portion of the project.

Mr. Zsutty reported that on the lower Guadalupe River Trail System to I-880 there is approximately \$6 million available. This represents half of the funding needed to pave the Trail.

Member Stallman expressed concern that on the east side of the Guadalupe Trail at Tasman Drive, the undercrossing is under water most of the time and asked Mr. Zsutty if he is aware of that. Mr. Zsutty responded that he is aware of it and environmental clearance to raise that levee a few feet has been received which will keep the undercrossing underwater at certain times of the year but will reduce the frequency.

Member Thielges referenced the section of the Trail connection at northbound I-280 and asked if there is going to be a connection across the river at Grant Avenue. Mr. Zsutty responded that while there is an existing trail access at the cul-de-sac of Grant Avenue

and Palm Street that can be followed along the river there will be no connection over the river beyond the connection at Virginia Avenue.

Member Hagenmaier recommended that besides putting signage at new undercrossings advising of flooding they should also erect signs of providing alternate routes. Mr. Zsutty stated that it is not possible to do that as trail design is a recreational facility along the waterways.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, the Guadalupe River Trail Status Update was received.

15. Draft Project Study Report for the Mary Avenue Overcrossing of U.S. 101 and State Route 237 in Sunnyvale

Ms. DeRobertis distributed a document entitled “MARY AVENUE OVERCROSSING OF US 101 & SR 237 PROJECT SCHEDULE” to the BPAC. Ms. DeRobertis stated that the handout depicts the proposed schedule for the Mary Avenue Overcrossing in the City of Sunnyvale. The four main pieces of the project are: 1) Project Study Report/Project Report (PSR/PR); 2) Environmental Document (ED); 3) Design (Plan Specifics & Estimates (PS&E); and 4) Construction.

David Loftus, VTA Highway Program, reported that VTA is currently working on the Preliminary Studies for the extension of Mary Avenue in the City of Sunnyvale. The extension will extend Mary Avenue south of US-101 at its terminus at Almanor Avenue, over US-101 and SR-237, and over Moffett Park Light Rail Station into the development north of SR-237.

Mr. Loftus stated there are currently office buildings and more development is being planned.

Staff is combing the PSR and PR, to help document when the Preliminary Engineering (PE) is completed, funding sources identified, environmental issues, as well as getting project approval.

The first potential alignment will extend Mary Avenue in a northerly fashion south of US-101 at the terminus at Almanor Avenue over US-101 and SR-237 just adjacent to the interchange of the two highways over Moffett Park Drive and Moffett Light Rail Station with a terminus at 11th Street just south of the Lockheed site. The second potential alignment is generally the same over US-101 and SR-237. Just north of SR-237 the alignment will curve to the west and terminate at H Street.

For the most part, the extension will be a four-lane road with a raised median, Class 2 Bikeways, and a six-foot sidewalk with breachable barriers.

Member Simons stated that the Mary Avenue Overcrossing and the Moffett Towers Project are tied together because the funding for the project is coming from the Development.

Member Simons asked what phase the ED is in. Mr. Loftus responded that the technical studies for the ED has commenced and the environmental report is scheduled for public circulation April or May 2007.

In response to Member Simon's inquiry, Mr. Loftus stated that all recommendations will go to the Project Development Team. Member Simons stated his three recommendations are as follows: 1) the project should be intended as a multi-modal structure, which support bicycle, pedestrians and automobiles; 2) the project should be multimodal in that lane widths should accommodate bicycle and pedestrians at peak hours; and 3) to add restrictions that force people to move onto Central Expressway with access limits and put some limits for access at different directions.

Member Brunzell inquired if when developing the bicycle lane and pedestrian path if staff is considering keeping them both separate from traffic other than just striped lanes. Ms. Loftus responded it will be Class 2 Bicycle Lane, a bicycle lane along the shoulder for the bicyclists and a sidewalk separated with a breachable barrier that has not been completely designed. Member Brunzell recommended bicycle lanes separate from traffic.

Member Carpenter recommended only one automotive lane in each direction.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, the Draft Project Study Report for the Mary Avenue Overcrossing of U.S. 101 and State Route 237 in Sunnyvale was received.

12. Pedestrian Element of the County Expressway Plan

Dan Collen, Deputy Director, Roads and Airports Department Infrastructure Development Division, provided a handout entitled "COMPREHENSIVE COUNTY EXPRESSWAY PLANNING STUDY Expressway Pedestrian Access City BPAC/BAC Outreach Summary." Mr. Collen reported that in late 2005 and early 2006 the County stated they would address pedestrian access on expressway by way of an update to the Expressway Planning Study. Events such as the planned timeline for the next update of VTA's VTP 2030 changed the County's plan for the Expressway Study Update. The County is now proceeding with a focused study of the pedestrian access question in part, at the specific request of one of the cities. The City of Santa Clara, as part of considering their City Ordinances related to pedestrian access, asked the County to first determine their recommendations. The County has taken the opportunity to consider all of the expressways to ensure that the County's recommendations are developed consistently and focused pm safety.

Mr. Collen advised that the County's approach is proceeding with two lines of inquiry. First, the County reconvened a Technical Working Group (TWG) for technical input and criteria for the Engineering Safety Evaluation. Some of the criteria considered include vehicle speed, shoulder width, level of access control, exposure to high speed, merging ramps, and availability of curbside area for pedestrians.

Mr. Collen advised that County staff is currently in the field doing block-by-block review of existing conditions such as shoulder widths and formal paths behind curbed barriers.

Secondly, the County has met with representatives of each city BPAC or equivalent committees for input. The purpose of the meetings has been to allow the BPAC Members to share their viewpoints, the County has recorded in meeting summaries. The summaries form a part of the written record of the study. The County spoke with 92 individuals from 11 city BPAC's addressing all eight expressways in the outreach process.

Mr. Collen introduced Dawn Cameron, Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department, and stated that Ms. Cameron prepared an overview of the effort and a summary of the summaries.

Mr. Collen claimed that in general, the County found that the majority of the BPAC representatives are uncomfortable with or opposed to prohibitions even when conditions are acknowledged as potentially unsafe. There is general consensus that in certain situations convenient alternate routes are preferable with appropriate signage. A significant majority are concerned with pedestrians on the pavement as opposed to behind the curb, because of exposure to motorized traffic and/or potential conflict of bicycle use of a long shoulder area.

Mr. Collen stated that his impression was that nearly all thought that sidewalk improvements were a desirable goal although a few said there was no demand or no need for sidewalks.

Mr. Collen summarized that a diverse opinion was noted and a variety of views provided staff with plenty to reflect on and consider.

Mr. Collen stated that the County will continue to consult with TWG to see if consensus on a technical approach and recommendations can be achieved. Mr. Collen informed the BPAC that the resulting study recommendations, including the outreach notes will be provided through the committee structure for approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Collen reported that the Pedestrian Access Plan will be incorporated into the update of the Expressway Study when it commences in 2007. The update will also include the newly acquired improvement request coming from the Pedestrian Access Study Process.

Mr. Collen stated that while the County is unclear as to what the recommendations will include, the County is, optimistic and hopeful that a technically sound and consistent analysis will yield agreeable results.

Akos Szoboszlay, Modern Transit Society, provided a handout entitled "Violated Board (BOS) policies and orders", stating that he attended several of the BPAC Meetings

throughout the County of Santa Clara and neither Mr. Collen nor his staff mentioned the Board policies and orders and sometimes blatantly contradicted the policies and orders such as “provide pedestrian pathway facilities along the expressway system.”

Mr. Szoboszlay referenced his PowerPoint Presentation, which depicts photos of Caltrans’s highways through suburban areas of cities, County roads and expressways contradicting what County Staff has reported.

Member Thielges stated that pedestrians on expressways were not depicted as a safety issue in the Summary.

Member Thielges advised there are plenty cross-sectional widths to provide safe pedestrian facilities on all of the expressways and the issue really should be allocating space for safe pedestrian access and safe road access simultaneously.

Member Simons thanked Mr. Collen and Ms. Cameron for their attendance.

Member Simons stated that one of the things that has consistently been brought up over the years is that the County does not have expressway maintenance in their budget and currently maintenance is on an as needed basis.

Member Muniz asked what the criteria are to define safety. Mr. Collen responded that there is an attempt to define the degree of lack of safety and relating it to quantifiable and measurable attributes of the roadway.

Member Stallman inquired why a sidewalk was removed on the Guadalupe Bridge on Montague Expressway/San Tomas Expressway. Mr. Collen responded that the environmental documents that were used to approve the project showed that there would be a sidewalk on the north side only. The County worked to ensure that sidewalks were improved by the Rivermark Development and by Sun Microsystems, and included improvements in the Montague Expressway Project. Mr. Collen continued that the City of San Jose has collected a number of deficiency fund mitigation monies from developers with the intent to build those sidewalks on Montague Expressway.

Mr. Stallman stated that the VTA BPAC sits as the County BPAC and the VTA BPAC was not given the opportunity to provide input regarding materials that were being distributed for the review of the Pedestrian Plan update.

Member Stallman expressed concern regarding the County’s idea for their own BPAC.

Member Stallman distributed a copy of the approved Motion adopted on November 9, 2005, by the BPAC regarding Agenda Item #15., Draft Policy for Bicycle and Pedestrian Use of Santa Clara County Expressway which calls for the adherence by County Roads to the Board of Supervisor’s direction. Member Stallman stated that there have been violations after violations, month after month, including money spent to destroy pedestrian facilities. In addition, the county is putting up signs to prohibit pedestrians due to the lack of facilities and funding. Mr. Collen stated that County staff

did go to the City of Saratoga and discussed plan to construct sidewalks to remove pedestrian prohibitions in the City of Saratoga. Mr. Collen provided other examples to the BPAC regarding sidewalks and other construction the County has been a part of.

Member Walton requested clarification of the County's process. Mr. Collen clarified that the idea is to address the access questions at this time and the results of that process could be rolled into a future update of the Pedestrian Element.

Member Walton inquired if Mr. Collen is stating that the County will erect signs prohibiting pedestrians on given portions of the tree-lined expressways at a future date. Mr. Collen responded there is the potential, if cities concur because it is a two-step process. Mr. Collen explained that SB1233 has new changes that the County could initiate where the County had no real role other than posting the signs in the past. Member Walton inquired if at the conclusion of the two-step process there will be signs erected along the expressways prohibiting pedestrians. Mr. Collen responded yes, at locations that come out of the study is where the County would recommend them.

Member Carpenter advised that the City of Mountain View will not adhere to recommendations to erect signs prohibiting pedestrians on expressways.

Member Thielges inquired if the prohibitions are intended to be temporary. Mr. Collen replied that the Expressway Plan has significant amount of sidewalks proposed to provide pathway from one end of the expressway to the other. Member Thielges again inquired if prohibitions are intended to be temporary. Mr. Collen replied that there is the potential to change the Plan. Member Thielges recommended using K-rail to provide a safe access for pedestrians instead of erecting prohibition signs.

Member Carpenter recommended mini walk facilities for vehicles that need to pull off of the road due to emergencies. Mr. Collen stated that he wanted to explore that idea in 2003 but he had to stop when he realized that it was not possible because of the Americans with Disability Act (ADA).

Member Simons requested discussion regarding years of disenfranchisement and how a duplication of effort may not be in the best interest for the bicycle and pedestrian countywide interests agendized for the December 13, 2006 BPAC Meeting to allow input to the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Collen responded to Member Stallman's earlier comments stating that the proposal to have an exclusive County BPAC, which staff is really excited about, stating it is a real positive step for the County to bring into their structure the BPAC responsibility so that it has more visibility and is better understood by all of the management levels within the County.

Mr. Simons expressed concern regarding the formation of a County of Santa Clara BPAC and the impact on bicycles and pedestrians.

Member Simons recommended a subset of BPAC meet with the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisor as soon as possible.

Member Sullivan stated that the US Department of Transportation (DOT) adopted a policy in 1999 which stated that all road projects should include full access and facilities for pedestrians and bicycles but that the County seems to be going back to how things were done in the 1950's and 1960's when pedestrians, bicyclists and equestrians were prohibited on the expressways. Mr. Collen stated that it is a matter of perception and unfortunately, for whatever reasons, the perception is that the County wants prohibition of pedestrians to be a first resort when in fact staff is looking at it as a second resort.

Chairperson Wadler stated that since 2005 the relationship between the County and the VTA BPAC has taken a nosedive because of actions taken with regard to SB1233.

Member Kobayashi acknowledged the BPAC's angst regarding SB1233 and reminded the Members that the Plan is an evolving document.

Members Sullivan stated he is in favor of safer conditions for cyclists and pedestrians everywhere and every effort should be made to correct these conditions.

Member Simons recommended a workshop to discuss the Access Study Update.

Member Stallman recommended installing pedestrian prohibitive signs or, where there is consideration to put up signs along with any existing sign, that those locations have the sign replaced with diamond signs showing a pedestrian so that motorists are aware that pedestrians are present. Member Kobayashi advised that the diamond sign is a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) symbol so it cannot be used.

Chairperson Wadler stated that in October 2006 Member Stallman requested that the VTA Legislative Analyst review SB 1233 and he again is requesting that comments be provided to the BPAC at their December 13, 2006 Meeting.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, the Pedestrian Element of the County Expressway Plan was received.

9. Election Process for Advisory Committee Chairperson and Vice Chairperson

Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, stated that the chairperson and vice chairperson serve for one year, are separate positions, and are elected separately as well. The current chairperson and vice chairperson are eligible to be re-elected.

VTA Advisory Committees have a three-step process; assembling the nominating committee in November, report from the nominating committee in December and elections in January with the new chairperson and vice chairperson assuming their duties at that very meeting.

Mr. Flynn explained that the purpose of the nominating committee is to determine who is interested in serving as chairperson and vice chairperson, is usually done in private via e-mail or phone as opposed to doing it at the table.

Mr. Flynn noted that if no one volunteers to be on the nominating committee, Chairperson Wadler has the prerogative of making the appointments to the nominating committee.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, Member Walton and Member Sullivan were appointed to the Nominating Committee.

10. VTA Board of Directors approve the project list to program \$5,843,440 in Community Design & Transportation Program Capital Grants

Member Muniz referenced the additional funds of \$5.84 million that is being granted and inquired if calling for projects is typically what is done when funds are left over or would staff consider projects that did not make the earlier call for projects. John Sighamony, Transportation Planner III, responded that one of the reasons VTA is doing another call for projects is that once the Scoring Committee did the actual scores for the projects, staff wanted to fund the projects that staff felt believe the spirit of the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program.

Mr. Sighamony advised that the next call for project should be in either spring or summer 2007.

Mr. Sighamony stated that if the City of Gilroy resubmits their project again staff encourages them to get together with VTA to discuss and figure out a better way to get the project scored higher.

Mr. Sighamony stated that staff is in the process of revisiting the Scoring Criteria and the Scoring Committee will be meet on Friday, November 17, 2006 to begin discussion regarding revisions to the material.

M/S/C (Stallman/Kobayashi) to review and recommend that the VTA Board of Directors approve the project list to program \$5,843,440 in Community Design & Transportation Program Capital Grants.

13. Revised Cross Country Bicycle Corridors for the 2006/07 Countywide Bicycle Plan

Ms. DeRobertis referenced the Cross County Corridor Amendments for the Countywide Bicycle Plan stating that the VTA BPAC as well as other BPACs around the County of Santa Clara provided many recommendations at meetings, via emails and letters.

Ms. DeRobertis presented an enlarged copy of the maps provided in the Agenda Packet for review and stated the existing Cross County Corridors are indicated in the color grey and the color orange depicts proposed additions to the Bicycle Corridor Network.

Ms. DeRobertis advised that all of the expressways are being proposed to be part of the Cross-County Corridor.

Ms. DeRobertis reported that the El Camino Real's extension to the Diridon Station is a major thoroughfare that is currently the subject of a study that encompasses the El Camino Real through the County of San Mateo to Diridon Station and is considering land use as well as a unified look and theme for El Camino Real.

Ms. DeRobertis noted that the two recommendations from the City of Campbell are considering Winchester Boulevard to Bascom Avenue or Leigh Avenue as a Cross-County Corridor. Ms. DeRobertis stated that there is a blank area in the north/south direction so there is the potential, if BPAC agrees to add either Bascom Avenue or Leigh Avenue as a Cross-County Corridor. Chairperson Wadler stated he is in agreement with Leigh Avenue because it is not quite as congested of an area.

Ms. DeRobertis stated that there is some logic to also include Winchester Boulevard because of the creek trail.

Member Simons stated that bicycle lanes go past the City of Sunnyvale Community Center and recommended the Stevens Creek Trail as an option in the future.

Member Walder recommend Winchester Boulevard and Leigh Avenue be added to the list of Cross-County Corridors.

Member Carpenter recommended the connection from Santa Teresa Boulevard State Highway 25 have a bicycle facility put in with the extension.

Member Thielges pointed out that the biggest void on the map is located in East San Jose, an area that is usually not served by bicycle paths. Member Thielges stated that San Antonio Street would make an excellent route because it is the only street for miles that crosses US-101 without a freeway interchange.

Member Thielges inquired about the Grand Avenue Study with regard to the El Camino Real. Ms. DeRobertis responded that the study is lead by the County of San Mateo for land use as well as an ambience feel based on the historic aspect of the El Camino Real. Ms. DeRobertis stated that a presentation could be provided to the BPAC at their December 13, 2006 BPAC Meeting if the Members are interested.

Member Kobayashi recommended making White Road a Cross-County Corridor due to the north/south traffic along the road.

Member Stallman stated that if Big Basin continues to Pierce Road, as a bicycle route is not included in the Plan staff should consider finding funding for the bicycle route.

Member Reisinger left his seat at 8:54 p.m.

Chairperson Wadler inquired if Moody Road in Los Altos Hills could be considered a Cross-County Corridor. Member Brunzell responded that while it is a connector it is not very safe. Ms. DeRobertis advised that part of the purpose in identifying Cross-County Corridors is to identify improvements that are needed. Member Brunzell recommended Moody Road up to Page Mill Road.

Member Hagenmaier recommended a solution to providing people access to Shoreline.

Member Reisinger took his seat at 8:38 p.m.

Member Reisinger recommended that Agenda Item #13., Revised Cross Country Bicycle Corridors for the 2006/07 Countywide Bicycle Plan is agenzized for the December 13, 2006 BPAC Meeting for further discussion.

Member Carpenter informed the BPAC that the Grand Avenue Study did commence in San Mateo County with the idea to set an ambience that it encourages more pedestrian and bicycle traffic along the El Camino Real. Member Carpenter stated that although the Study did commence in San Mateo County other counties could also use it.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, discussion regarding Agenda Item #13., Revised Cross County Bicycle Corridors for the 2006/07 Countywide Bicycle Plan will be agenzized for the December 13, 2006 BPAC Meeting.

16. Announcements

Member Walton, City of Cupertino, reported that on December 5, 2006, 7:00 p.m., Community Hall, City of Cupertino, Department of Public Works staff will be present to discuss how to build the Mary Avenue Bridge over I-280. Member Walton advised that the project will be going out to bid soon.

Member Thielges, City of San Jose, expressed concern that creating a County BPAC could delude cyclists' ability to communicate with government parties.

Member Rome, City of Morgan Hill, stated that the City of Morgan Hill did not have the Bike Rodeo in 2006 due to the lack of funds. Member Rome requested if anyone has any ideas as to resources to please contact her.

Member Stallman, City of Saratoga, reported that a bicycle rack has been added at Transit Center at West Valley College. Member Stallman requested that the status of the installation of bicycle racks at light rail stations be agenzized for a future BPAC Meeting.

Member Simons, City of Sunnyvale, reported that 16 high tech electronic card key bicycle lockers have been added to the Moffett Park Light Rail Station next to US-101 between Mathilda Avenue and H Street. Member Simons offered his help again with coordinating meetings with the County Board of Supervisors.

Chairperson Wadler, City of Campbell, reported City of Campbell had an appreciation dinner for all of the people who volunteered on committees and this is the first time that the Bicycle Advisory Committee was invited. Chairperson Wadler advised that a lot of people did not realize that the City of Campbell had a Bicycle Advisory Committee.

17. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gilda M. Gozdanich, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors