

BICYCLE & PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, December 13, 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 6:06 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
David Kobayashi
Bill Manry
Thomas Muniz
Bill Reisinger

Members Present

David Simons
Jim Stallman
John Sullivan
Richard Swent, Vice Chairperson
Bart Thielges
Joseph Walton
Herman Wadler, Chairperson

Members Absent

Carl Hagenmaier

Members Absent

Norma Rome

A quorum was declared.

Member Swent took his seat at 6:08 p.m.

2. ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Chairperson Wadler requested Agenda Item #6., Minutes of October 11, 2006 and Agenda Item #7., Minutes of November 8, 2006 be discussed as separate items.

M/S/C (Walton/Simons) to accept the Orders of the Day.

NOTE: M/S/C MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND CARRIED, AND UNLESS OTHERWISE INDICATED, THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The Agenda was taken out of order.

6. Minutes of October 11, 2006

Member Sullivan requested that on Page 7 of 8, Paragraph 3, BPAC be added after the second reference to the City of Santa Clara.

Chairperson Wadler referenced Page 2 of 8, #5. Chairperson's Report, requesting the word "he" be added between the words "and" and "has".

M/S/C (Walton/Simons) on a vote of 10 ayes to 0 notes to 1 abstention to approve the Minutes of October 11, 2006. Member Kobayashi abstained.

Members Brunzell and Manry took their seats at 6:11 p.m.

7. Minutes of November 8, 2006

Member Simons referenced Page 11 of 19, and requested the Board Assistant review the tape of the November 8, 2006 BPAC Meeting to identify whether he asked staff to consider adding pedestrian access to the business area between State Route 237 and Highway 101 on the new Mary Avenue Bridge.

Member Simons referenced Page 15 of 19, Paragraph 6, and requested the wording in the sentence be changed to "Member Simons stated that a workshop would be a better forum for reviewing the Access Study Update."

Member Simons referenced Page 18 of 19, Paragraph 11, and requested the word "added" changed to "funded".

Member Thielges referenced Page 13 of 19, Paragraph 3, and requested the sentence reads as follows. "Member Thielges stated that pedestrian prohibition on expressways was being stated as a safety issue but instead is actually a space allocation issue."

Member Thielges referenced Page 18 of 19, Paragraph 8, and asked "delude" be replaced with "dilute."

Member Brunzell requested that on Page 8 of 19, Paragraph 3, the word "easement" be added between the words "an" and "on".

Member Brunzell requested that on Page 18, Paragraph 1, add "Arastradero Road" after the word "Road."

Member Brunzell referenced Page 16, Paragraph 4, and asked for the removal of the word "be".

M/S/C (Walton/Simons) on a vote of 11 ayes to 0 noes to 2 abstentions to approve the Minutes of November 8, 2006. Members Swent and Manry abstained.

Member Reisinger took his seat at 6:15 p.m.

3. Public Presentations

Kevin Jackson, City of Sunnyvale BPAC, announced that the County of Santa Clara's proposal to form their own BPAC is agendaized for the City of Sunnyvale's December 14, 2006 meeting. Mr. Jackson reported that the Santa Clara Valley Bicycle Coalition is hosting their winter party the week of December 18, 2006.

4. Committee Staff Report

- Project Design Review

Chris Augenstein, Transportation Planning Manager and Staff Liaison, requested Member Thielges, Member Hagenmaier, and Member Rome complete the Ethics Training.

Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, reported that the consultant for the Santa Clara Caltrain Station Project, Safe Routes to Transit Grant, surveyed people crossing the tracks and walking over De La Cruz during weekdays and weekends. Staff is currently developing a survey to identify latent demand for crossing and it is staff's hope to distribute a survey to 1000 members of the public and 1500 employees in January 2007, as well as have it available on VTA's website at www.vta.org.

Ms. DeRobertis advised Phase II of the Project is currently being reviewed by a consultant.

Ms. DeRobertis announced that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Bicycle Working Group and Pedestrian Committee will discuss Routine Accommodations (RA). Ms. DeRobertis advised that the Committee will have another version of the Draft Check List available.

Ms. DeRobertis advised that a Revised Project Development Procedures Manual was available at the California Bicycle Advisory Committee Meeting.

Ms. DeRobertis stated that at the December 12, 2006 Highway 101 Widening Project in South County Meeting, VTA informed the design consultant that the design of the freeways should include bicycle access. Member Muniz asked for clarification on the specific stretch of Highway 101 under discussion. Ms. DeRobertis responded that the section is over a waterway between Gavilan College and the county line.

5. Chairperson's Report

Chairperson Wadler stated that the VTA BPAC should reconcile with the County of Santa Clara and move forward to see what can be accomplished.

Chairperson Wadler stated that BPAC should consider California Vehicle Code §21960 (CVC §21960) and not AB 1233. He stated that the pedestrian issue is a difficult issue to win because the cities already have the authority to ban pedestrians from the expressways whether the County maintains CVC §21960 or not. Chairperson Wadler expressed concern that VTA BPAC's all or nothing stance may not benefit the BPAC. Chairperson Wadler stated it is important to look after the interest of pedestrian and bicyclists and there is a need to move forward and maintain communications with the County of Santa Clara and pursue repeal of CVC §21960.

Chairperson Wadler asked the Committee to consider adding the Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition Executive Director or alternate as a non-voting member of the BPAC. Chairperson Wadler requested this item be agendaized at a future time.

REGULAR AGENDA

8. Nominating Subcommittee Report for Chairperson and Vice Chairperson Elections.

Member Walton and Member Sullivan reported that the Nominating Committee proposed the following slate of candidates: Herman Wadler as Chairperson and Richard Swent as Vice Chairperson for 2007. Member Wadler advised that both candidates have accepted.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection the Nominating Subcommittee Report for Chairperson and Vice Chairperson Elections was received.

9. Revised Scoring Criteria for Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager Fund

Bill Hough, Transportation Planner III, reported that staff is requesting that the BPAC recommend to the Board of Directors revisions to the criteria used to evaluate and select projects for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager Fund. Funds from the TFCA come from 40 percent of a \$4.00 surcharge on vehicle registrations. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) collects the funds from the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) and returns it to the county of origin.

Mr. Hough explained that VTA staff developed the revisions based on analysis of the current criteria. Mr. Hough noted the revisions will not impact the half of the TFCA 40 percent allocation that is currently set aside for bicycle projects in the Countywide Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP).

Mr. Hough provided the following brief summary of each recommendation:

Recommendation #1: Increase the value of the Cost Effectiveness criterion from 15 to 30 points to better reflect the importance of the per ton effectiveness requirement that the BAAQMD places on these projects.

Recommendation #2: Rename “Project Effectiveness” criterion to “Community Benefits” and revise the subcomponents of the particular criterion to more effectively measure project performance and increase the value of the entire criterion from 40 points to 50 points.

Recommendation #3: Increase to Local Match from 15 to 20 points to encourage each project sponsor to leverage additional funds.

Recommendation #4: Eliminate the Multi Agency/Public-Private Partnership criterion because a number of agencies involved in a project often negatively impact a project.

Recommendation #5: Encourage timely completion of projects by including a prior delivery record component in the project scoring criteria to disqualify a project sponsor from receiving funding if they have not completed a project within two weeks.

Chairperson Wadler asked if a project must be complete before funds for a new project are available. Mr. Hough responded that occasionally projects require more than two years to construct and require a mechanism to pursue an extension.. Mr. Hough explained Recommendation #5 applies to project sponsors who have five or more projects that are more than two years past due.

Vice Chairperson Swent referenced Recommendation #1 and stated it is too much of an increase. Mr. Hough stated that the recommendation does not impact the half of the funds that are dedicated to the BEP. Vice Chairperson Swent recommended that the heaviest scoring should apply to Recommendation #2.

Vice Chairperson Swent stated that while Recommendation #3 is a small increase he does not support it because it appears that the more points a project receives the more funds the project can receive.

Member Simons stated he agrees with Vice Chairperson Swent’s comments regarding Recommendation #1 because it tends to change the performance of bicycle/pedestrian projects versus other road efficiency projects.

Member Simons referenced Recommendation #3 and expressed concern regarding increasing local match because larger local match may be more than what the smaller cities receive. Member Simons recommended that Recommendation #3 should increase a few points.

Member Simons expressed concern regarding Recommendation #4 and stated that agencies not talking about the quality or need for a project could be problematic.

Member Simons referenced Recommendation #5 and asked which cities have delayed completing their projects within the allotted two years. Mr. Hough explained that while the problem does not currently exist, there is the potential for such a problem in the future. Member Simons asked why the “five projects” limit was chosen. Mr. Hough responded that most cities have one or two projects, if any, and this recommendation is based on years of experience administering the TFCA Program.

Member Carpenter recommended replacing the word “and” with “through” on Recommendation # 2 because it is more important to relieve congestion through providing alternative choices.

Member Entin left his seat at 6:47 p.m.

Member Kobayashi asked if a higher score can be added to “person-trips” because it is important for transit. Mr. Hough responded that there is an item for number of people served. Member Kobayashi recommended a higher score for projects that cause modal shifts. Mr. Hough advised that a transit project would score well under mode shift, number of people served, reduced congestion, and possibly countywide significance.

Member Thielges stated he supports Member Simons’ opposition and comments on Recommendation #3 because the City of San Jose provides limited funding to bicycle projects.

Member Thielges stated that with regard to Recommendation #5 the number of noncompliant projects should be proportional to the city size because the needs are higher.

Member Thielges recommended a change to the mode shift calculation. Mr. Hough stated that his recommendation is not part of the process before the Committee because it is controlled by the BAAMQD and not VTA. Mr. Hough stated that he will forward Member Thielges comments to the BAAMQD.

Member Brunzell stated she agrees with Recommendation #5 but was not able to find the number of points that will be awarded in Attachment B, Proposed Scoring Criteria. Mr. Hough explained that it is not a point value so therefore is not on the Proposed Scoring Criteria.

Member Brunzell stated that she principally agrees with Recommendation #1 and asked what cost per ton or reduced emissions is calculated. Mr. Hough responded the BAAMQD, as part of the process to applicants, provides spreadsheets for calculation.

Member Entin took his seat at 6:51 p.m.

Member Brunzell asked how many years the emissions are calculated. Mr. Hough responded that it depends on the type of the project.

Member Brunzell referenced Attachment A: Existing Scoring Criteria and asked how the cost effectiveness of \$0 to \$90,000 was established. Mr. Hough answered that the \$90,000 is the BAAMQD's policy cut-off.

Member Brunzell asked if the cost per ton calculation is included in the spreadsheet. Mr. Hough responded that the BAAMQD developed the models and calculations used in the spreadsheets.

Member Brunzell inquired if the Program will be audited. Mr. Hough responded that the BAAMQD audits the Program every two years.

Member Manry noted that the metrics that went into the past funding decision were a matter of record and inquired if staff applied the revision criteria to the metrics. Member Manry further requested an example of a decision that would have been different if the criteria had been in place. Mr. Hough stated that staff has not completed that level of analysis because that would require review of old files.

Member Muniz asked if Recommendation #2 is based on census data. Mr. Hough stated that the information is based on census data and noted that MTC developed the Communities of Concern across the whole region.

Member Sullivan referenced Attachment A: Cost Effectiveness Criteria, and asked if the calculations were done by VTA. Mr. Hough responded that either VTA staff or the project sponsors complete the calculations.

M/S/C (Thielges/Walton) on a vote of 13 ayes to 1 no to 0 abstentions to approve the Revised Criteria for Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager Fund with the following recommendations: to drop the change in Recommendation #3, the Cost Effectiveness Criteria be maintained at 15 points and add 15 points to Community Benefits, Recommendation #5 not penalize large municipalities by making the amount of noncompliant projects proportional, per staff's determination, to the size of municipality, and that the heaviest scoring should be on Recommendation #2. Board Member Brunzell opposed.

Ms. DeRobertis asked the Members that if the points are lowered to 15 how are the points going to be made up. Member Swent stated he recommends transferring the points to Community Benefits if the number of points for Cost Effectiveness is decreased.

10 California Vehicle Code §21960: Bicycle Access to Expressways

Kevin Jackson, City of Sunnyvale BPAC, noted that you cannot promote non-motorized transportation if you do not treat it equally. He recommended the following: 1) BPAC communicate directly with the Board of Supervisors; 2) BPAC monitor upcoming Board of Supervisor Meetings; 3) BPAC designate members to attend the Board of Supervisors meetings; 4) BPAC send letters to the Board of Supervisor; 5) Invite the

Board of Supervisors to attend BPAC meetings; and 6) Form a subcommittee to focus on CVC §21960.

Ms. DeRobertis stated that staff has run out of options in how deal with CVC §21960.

Mr. Augenstein provided background information on the legislative history of CVC §21960. He stated that County staff did its due diligence and encouraged the Committee to move forward.

Member Swent stated the main concern of the BPAC is the prohibition of bicyclists and suggested surrendering the pedestrian prohibition issue. Mr. Swent stated the BPAC should focus on how to remove the bicycle on expressways prohibition signs.

Chairperson Wadler clarified his earlier comments that he supports review of pedestrian issues in the future.

Member Kobayashi stated that the Countywide Expressway Study is clear about bicycle and pedestrian access at the local level.

Discussion ensued regarding the meaning of local level. Ms. DeRobertis clarified that this is the time to discuss strategy and not the time for word-smithing the CVC language.

Chairperson Wadler stated that the legal options are limited and the BPAC will have to develop recommendations on how to overturn CVC §21960 and send them to the Board of Supervisors.

Member Sullivan stated SB 1233 defined expressway under CVC §21960. He added that this was a loose definition and recommended redefining an expressway to bring it more in line with the state standards for freeways.

Chairperson Wadler stated that Santa Clara County is the only county that has expressways within city limits. Member Kobayashi explained that what makes the expressway system different in Santa Clara County versus another road in another county is that the County of Santa Clara owns the access rights to that road.

Chairperson Wadler recommended lobbying the Board of Supervisors for more exchange between County Roads and BPAC.

Member Stallman recommended forming a subcommittee to write a draft letter to the Board of Supervisors to develop proposals, and provide a report to the BPAC at their January 10, 2007 BPAC Meeting.

Member Walton inquired as to the timeline and if the Board of Supervisors are in a position to make a decision in the absence of receiving the BPAC's concerns. Ms. DeRobertis responded that the timeline is pretty tight and stated it is not too soon to take recommendations to the VTA Board of Directors to their February 2007.

Mr. Augenstein stated that an action by the Board of Supervisors is necessary to overturn CVC §21960.

Member Simons encouraged the formation of a subcommittee to bring forward procedural recommendations. Mr. Simons stated that while he supports a letter from VTA the BPAC should have a formal meeting as the County BPAC to discuss and forward recommendations to the Board of Supervisors. Member Kobayashi advised that a better procedure might be to go through the Road Commissions.

Member Sullivan expressed concern that anything that minimizes pedestrian access discourages transit use and is not in the best interest of VTA.

Mr. Augenstein advised that VTA, in its legislative program, is adding language that VTA supports county and bicycle/pedestrian advocacy group efforts to amend the language of CVC §21960 to remove bicycle and pedestrian prohibitions.

Ms. DeRobertis read Item E of the BPAC Bylaws stating that the BPAC serves as an advisory committee to the Board of Directors and the duties of the Committee are to serve as the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee for the County of Santa Clara with the limitations that the BPAC shall serve as a an advisory capacity to the Board of Directors with no independent duties and no authorities to take actions that bind the VTA or the Board of Directors.

Member Simons clarified that the BPAC Members have not been asked to do anything but advise the Board of Supervisors or the VTA Board of Directors. Chairperson Wadler stated that the BPAC cannot bind the VTA Board of Directors but can write a letter to the Board of Supervisors with the BPAC's recommendation under the name of the VTA Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee.

Member Stallman recommended meeting as the County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee in January 2007 so the recommendations are made from the County BPAC and not the VTA BPAC.

Mr. Augenstein asked Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, the process of writing a letter to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Flynn highlighted the process and stated that any letter requires approval by the Board of Directors.

Chairperson Wadler recommended the letter be written, a subcommittee formed, and Corrine Winters, Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition (SVBC) or an SVBC alternate serve as an ex-officio member of the BPAC.

Chairperson Wadler, Member Kobayashi, Member Stallman, Member Walton, and Member Stallman volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, the California Vehicle Code §21960: Bicycle Access to Expressways was discussed.

11 Proposed County Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Kevin Jackson, City of Sunnyvale BPAC, referenced a letter from Michael Murdter, Director of Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department to the Board of Supervisors dated November 16, 2006, REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS “The current shared committee arrangement is awkward.” and recommended asking VTA Staff to find out if County Staff has contacted them to discuss the awkwardness and how to resolve it.

Mr. Jackson stated that the VTA BPAC has an excellent track record when looking out for the interest of non-motorists when they are given the necessary information and allowed to provide input. Mr. Jackson expressed concern that the proposed replacement from County Staff has no such track record apart from their responsibility to provide the VTA BPAC with information.

Mr. Jackson recommended the VTA BPAC request the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors retain the VTA BPAC as the County BPAC, direct County Roads to cooperate with the BPAC in a much greater degree than they have been, and ask the Board of Supervisors to issue a moratorium regarding the changes to CVC §21960.

Mr. Flynn stated that it would be extremely hard to forward comments to the January 4, 2007 Board of Directors Meeting because the review and publication process has already been completed. Mr. Flynn advised that a more likely timeline is the February 1, 2007 Board of Directors Meeting.

Member Sullivan stated that when the County of Santa Clara did have its own Bicycle Advisory Committee each Board of Supervisor made an appointment to the committee.

Chairperson Wadler advised that there has to be five members on the advisory committee in order to qualify for Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding.

M/S/C (Swent/Walton) on a vote of 13 ayes to 0 noes to 1 abstention to recommend that the Board of Supervisors not approve the County Roads an Airports proposal to form a new Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee for Santa Clara County.

Further, the MTC requires a county BPAC to have at least five members. A large and populous county such as Santa Clara County needs a much larger committee to provide reasonable representation. To function effectively as a BPAC the committee needs to be filled with members who are active and experienced bicyclists with connections to their local communities in order to provide communications between these communities and the County. To provide an effective and unbiased channel for advice the Committee should report to the Board of Supervisors directly. (Note that the MTC requires that BPAC members be appointed by the County Board of Supervisors and/or Congestion

Management Agency.) The committee proposed by County Roads does not meet these requirements, while the VTA BPAC does.

In addition, we feel that the VTA BPAC can effectively fulfill the role of a County BPAC, and there is no reason to form another committee. If there are procedural issues or communications problems between County staff and VTA staff that make this awkward, these problems should be addressed and resolved at the staff level. We feel that forming a new committee is not justified on the basis of the arguments set forth in the County Roads staff report.

Lastly, we acknowledge that the relationship between the VTA BPAC and County Roads has been strained recently over the issue of pedestrian access to expressways. The Committee is willing to look beyond this past disagreement and work constructively to improve pedestrian and bicycle access to county transportation facilities in the future. If County Roads and Airports management is willing to make a similar commitment to operate in good faith and make transportation policy decisions by means of an open and public process, there should be no problems with the VTA BPAC continuing to serve as the County BPAC, as it has for many years. Member Kobayashi abstained.

Member Simons recommended that there be a standing meeting with County Roads Management, the BPAC Chairperson or Vice Chairperson or both, staff from the Board of Supervisors that would be on a rotating basis for individual Board of Supervisors to increase the communication for a year, and that three or four times in the future years the meeting be held at the County facility. Member Sullivan requested the reason behind meeting at the County facilities. Member Simons responded that the purpose of meeting at the County facility is visibility. Member Swent expressed concern that changing meeting locations could confuse members of the public.

Member Brunzell stated that as a Committee if the goal is to make a working relationship with the County of Santa Clara, the BPAC has the responsibility in making it a working relationship, and as a group, decide how communication can improve.

Chairperson Wadler stated that it appears the BPAC is open to communication and reconciliation with the County of Santa Clara. He noted that the County will need to determine if they are open to such dialogue.

12. Bicycle Plan Update – Capital Project Needs: Safe Routes to Transit and Across Barrier Connections

Member Kobayashi left his seat at 7:58 p.m.

Ms. DeRobertis stated that progress is underway on the assessment of across barrier connections (ABCs).

Ms. DeRobertis referenced Table 1 Safe Routes to Transit Potential Projects stating it is policy to analyze the needed ABCs.

Ms. DeRobertis stated that Step 1 obtained bicycle lane and shoulder information for every existing crossing of freeway, railroad track, creek or river in the County of Santa Clara. It further identified if those projects were under construction or were fully funded.

Ms. DeRobertis thanked Adam Burger, Transportation Planner II, who evaluated and plotted all of the connections.

Ms. DeRobertis noted that if the projects have bicycle lanes or wide shoulders it was considered to have adequate bicycle access and the rating was increased from red node to green node. If the arterials or connectors do not have bicycle lanes or if the projects has narrow or no shoulders the project was rated to have inadequate bicycle access and coded a red node.

Ms. DeRobertis stated it is important for staffs to complete a second iteration for freeways because many interchanges have bicycle lanes and shoulders across an overpass that are considered unsafe because of the design of the ramps. Ms. DeRobertis advised that those projects will be added to a separate list entitled Interchange Ramp Termini Need Redesign. Ms. DeRobertis also advised that if a roadway has been rated red because it has no bicycle lanes or shoulders, the project might be a local streets project due to the location of where the local streets were built and will be upgraded to a green node.

Ms. DeRobertis informed the BPAC that she will email a spreadsheet to the cities for input, the maps will be provided on the VTA's FTP site, and staff expects to have the nodes rated correctly by January 2007. The spreadsheet will help determine the links and segments that do not have adequate access.

Member Stallman left the Meeting at 8:02 p.m.

Mr. Burger stated some of the data received from the cities was not complete and VTA staff does not have local knowledge of the roads so the Member's input is required. The information will be provided via email and a set of files and the posters will be made available on VTA's website at www.vta.org.

Member Sullivan advised that the lane width was left out of the initial classification and when reviewing preliminary maps he noticed that there were areas that were both red nodes and for a cyclists the width of the curb length provided a significant amount of comfort level between two red zones. Member Sullivan stressed that lane widths are not subjective but rather measurable.

Member Kobayashi took his seat at 8:06 p.m.

Member Thielges thanked staff for their hard work stating the analysis gathering will be useful in planning the network.

Member Thielges referenced Iteration 2 and asked if “IC ramp termini redesign needed” is supposed to be a red box. Ms. DeRobertis responded that staff is considering putting it in a separate category. In response to Member Thielges’ inquiry regarding a freeway interchanges with wide shoulders and high-speed traffic. Ms. DeRobertis stated that staff is not sure how to visually display those types of interchanges.

Member Kobayashi referenced Stevens Creek Boulevard and I-880. Ms. DeRobertis stated it is staff’s intent to add it to a list and that a green node may not be a good idea.

Member Swent thanked staff for their work, their objectiveness and flexibility to change categories as necessary.

Member Walton stated the City of Cupertino has a restriction on Bollinger Road as it crosses Calabazas Creek because of the disappearance of the bicycle lane as the bridge widens headed west.

Member Simons referenced Page 2 of 4 of the Memorandum, Paragraph 5, stating there is always a push especially along transit lines to increase development and change land use and asked if staff has take into account the redirection of land use for the future. Ms. DeRobertis responded that will have to be worked out. Member Simons stated that the main key is that it is not so much about the present use but the zoning. Member Simons recommended a caveat that under any land use change will impact an under utilized intersection or node. Ms. DeRobertis advised that staff will review it.

Member Muniz asked how staff determines if a road is a “local roadway?” Ms. DeRobertis responded that the cities and public works department makes the designation.

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, the Bicycle Plan Update – Capital Project Needs: Safe Routes to Transit and Across Barrier Connections was received.

13. Bicycle Plan Update – Capital Project Needs: Cross County Bicycle Corridors

M/S/C (Simons/Walton) to approve the revised Cross County Corridors for the 2006/07 Countywide Bicycle Plan with the inclusion of Fair Oaks and Remington.

14. Announcements

Member Walton, City of Cupertino, announced that construction of the Mary Avenue Bicycle/Pedestrian Foot Bridge will begin construction in 2007. The City Council approved the plan and the funding.

Member Thielges, City of San Jose, reported there has been pressure on the Airport Committee to reduce costs, which means there will be no guarantee that any of the

bicycle or pedestrian facilities suggested by the contractor will be included. Member Thielges requested the BPAC write to their cities and Airport Committee.

Member Manry, City of Monte Sereno, reported that on November 27, 2006 the City of Sereno hosted a public meeting to discuss the Highway 9 efforts.

15. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Wadler, there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gilda M. Gozdanich, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors