



## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, November 9, 2006

### MINUTES

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:35 p.m. by Vice Chairperson Dey in Conference Room B-104, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

#### ROLL CALL

##### Members Present

Greg Armendariz  
Rajeev Batra  
Dan Collen  
John Curtis  
Don Dey, Vice Chairperson  
Joan Jenkins

##### Members Present

Robert Kass  
Henry Louie  
Jim Rowe  
Ben Tripousis  
Jack Witthaus

##### Members Absent

John Cherbone  
Nancy Coss-Fitzwater, Ex-Officio  
Gayle Likens  
Jim Porter

##### Members Absent

Ralph Qualls, Jr.  
Gordon Siebert  
Lee Taubeneck, Ex-Officio

**A quorum was present.**

#### 2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

#### 3. Committee Staff Report

Jim Lawson, Government Affairs Manager and Staff Liaison, reported that the State Infrastructure Bonds was approved by the voters in the November 2006 election, and the VTA Board of Directors has begun prioritizing items under the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) category. Santa Clara County anticipates receiving between \$200-\$350 million from the CMIA category. The projects have to be proposed

by Caltrans and must be under construction by 2012. The proposed key candidate projects are as follows: 1) US 101 – Additional lanes from Monterey Road in Gilroy to

Route 129 in San Benito County, including an upgrade of the US 101/State Route (SR) 25 Interchange; 2) U.S. 101 - Additional southbound lane from I-280 to Capitol Expressway/Yerba Buena Road in San Jose, including interchange improvements at Tully Road, Capitol Expressway and Yerba Buena Road; 3) U.S. 101 - Interchange improvements and potential widening from Trimble Road to McKee Road in San Jose; 4) U.S. 101 - Additional lanes from Marsh Road in San Mateo County to Route 85 in Mountain View (coordinated with San Mateo Transportation Authority and San Mateo City/County Association of Governments); and 5) I-880 - Additional lanes between U.S. 101 and SR 237.

Member Kass took his seat at 1:37 p.m.

Member Jenkins requested that the information on the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account projects be e-mailed to TAC.

Mr. Lawson reported that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) signed the BART to Warm Springs Record of Decision (ROD) on October 24, 2006, which allows BART to apply for Federal funding.

Mr. Lawson reported that the River Oaks Bicycle and Pedestrian Project was awarded the American Society of Civil Engineers Outstanding Small Project of the Year Award for 2006. VTA's Palo Alto Transit Center Project was named the winner of California Construction Magazine's Best of 2006 Award.

Mr. Lawson reported that VTA has encountered delays on the final approval of the Highway 152/156 Project in South County, due to an issue with the FTA and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

Mr. Lawson reported that VTA and the City of San Jose hosted the Caltrain Joint Powers Board meeting at San Jose City Hall the week of October 30, 2006, and following the meeting members toured the Caltrain Maintenance Facility being constructed on the Lenzen Avenue site.

Mr. Lawson reported that overall VTA ridership increased 10 percent for the month of September 2006.

Alternate Member Batra noted that a press conference was held today indicating that the San Francisco 49ers have cancelled negotiations with the City of San Francisco and the City of Santa Clara is their first choice for relocation.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Dey**, there being no objection, the Committee Staff Report was received.

**4. Chairperson's Report**

Vice Chairperson Dey noted that VTA staff would be showing a video of the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) Conference at the end of the meeting.

Member Curtis took his seat at 1:40 p.m.

**5. Reports from TAC Working Groups**

- **Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

Peter Skinner, Sr. Administrative Analyst, City of Mountain View - Public Works Department, and CIP Working Group Chairperson, provided a report on the October 2006 CIP meeting. Items discussed included: 1) Community Design and Transportation (CDT) Program Capital Grant recommendations; 2) Potential modifications to the CDT Capital and Planning Grants; and 3) Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program Manager Fund Scoring Criteria.

- **Systems Operations & Management (SOM)**

P. Paul Ma, Transportation Systems Planning Manager, City of San Jose - Department of Transportation, and SOM Working Group Chairperson, provided a report on the following two major items the SOM Working Group is currently working on: 1) 2006 Annual Congestion Monitoring Performance; and 2) update of the Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Dey**, there being no objection, the Reports from TAC Working Groups, CIP and SOM were received.

**BUSINESS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS/GENERAL MANAGER**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**6. Minutes of October 12, 2006**

M/S/C (Tripousis/Batra) to approve the Minutes of October 12, 2006.

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

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

M/S/C (Tripousis/Batra) to review the Proactive CMP Reviewed and Approved Projects Quarterly Status Report - July through September 2006.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

8. **Election Process for Advisory Committee Chairperson and Vice Chairperson**

Stephen Flynn, Sr. Management Analyst, reported that the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson serve one-year terms and are elected separately. He indicated that a key component is that the current Chairperson and Vice Chairperson are eligible for re-appointment, noting there are no term limits. This is a standard process that VTA uses for all its Advisory Committees and it is comprised of a three-step process as follows: 1) First step is the appointing of the Nominating Subcommittee, which will occur as part of today's meeting; 2) Second step is the presentation of the Nominating Subcommittee's report, which will be held at the December TAC meeting; and 3) Final step is conducting the elections to select the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, which will be held at the January 2007 TAC meeting.

Mr. Flynn noted that the purpose of the Nominating Subcommittee is to determine members who are willing to serve as the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson. This is done by soliciting nominations from members, either for themselves or other members, and is done at a time other than during the committee meeting, usually by telephone or e-mail. Mr. Flynn noted that the existing Chairperson asks for volunteers to serve on the Nominating Subcommittee, which is typically comprised of one to three members. Then the Committee needs to vote to approve the formation of the Nominating Subcommittee.

Vice Chairperson Dey asked for volunteers to serve on the Nominating Subcommittee. Alternate Member Batra volunteered Chairperson Yoshino and Members Jenkins and Curtis volunteered. Mr. Flynn noted that the Committee Membership Roster would be sent to the Nominating Subcommittee.

M/S/C (Tripousis/Batra) to appoint Chairperson Yoshino and Members Jenkins and Curtis as the Nominating Subcommittee to identify Committee members interested in serving as the Chairperson or Vice Chairperson for 2007.

9. **Community Design & Transportation Program Capital Grants**

John Sighamony, Transportation Planner III, reported that the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Program is intended to help Member Agencies design and build capital projects related to transit facilities, streets, and core areas. The funding for the CDT Capital Grant Program is identified in the Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2030. The funding for the Program came through the regional share of the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program established by the Metropolitan Transportation

Commission (MTC). MTC provided \$8.8 million in federal Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) and Transportation Enhancements (TE) funds for the cycle.

Mr. Sighamony reported that the VTA Board of Directors adopted policies and criteria for the CDT Capital Grants Program on April 6, 2006. He noted that Attachment B provided the Evaluation Criteria and Procedures.

Mr. Sighamony reported that VTA issued a call for CDT Planning Grants projects on July 18, 2006, and 15 projects were submitted. A Scoring Committee consisting of VTA staff, Chair of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), and members of the CIP, reviewed and scored the projects. The recommendation of the Scoring Committee was to fund projects scoring above 50 points, which would in turn leave a balance of approximately \$3 million unprogrammed. The Scoring Committee recommended another call for projects to use the remainder of the funds. Additionally, during the scoring process, the Scoring Committee felt that refinements to the criteria would result in a more efficient process in determining what projects should be funded. Mr. Sighamony noted that VTA staff and the CIP Working Group would refine the criteria to bring to the Board of Directors for approval at a later date. It is anticipated that VTA will issue another call for projects in summer 2007. He directed attention to Attachment A – Community Design & Transportation Capital Grant Program Final Project List.

Alternate Member Collen commented that in VTP 2030 the program is described as Livable Communities and Pedestrian Programs. He expressed concern that the title may be confusing, because the program under existing requirements and criteria cannot meet pedestrian needs. He commented that in the interest of transparency and clarity, perhaps the program could be renamed “The Transit Enhancements Program” or perhaps some portion of the total program could be set aside to address purely pedestrian issues.

Vice Chairperson Dey expressed concern regarding the scoring of the projects and that the City of Gilroy fell below the cut-off line. He noted the intent of the Capital Grant Program is for implementing the designs for the CDT Program, and the outcome should be vital transit links, safer downtowns, and better infrastructure to improve the livability and sustainability. He stated that he believes that the City of Gilroy project meets all of those requirements. He noted that the Scoring Committee had the following issues with the City of Gilroy project: 1) project seemed premature, 2) there was no development or redevelopment in the project area; 3) project was not close to transit; and 4) underground utility had conflicts. He directed attention to the diagram he distributed displaying the City of Gilroy’s recently built and soon to be built developments in the downtown area and provided an overview, addressing the issues of the Scoring Committee. He commented that he understands that the Scoring Committee had issues, but believes that the Scoring Committee only had a chance to look at a portion of the City of Gilroy project.

Vice Chairperson Dey asked that TAC consider the following three options for the City of Gilroy project: 1) Lower the cut-off line from 50 to 45 points; 2) Consider Martin

Street as the City's highest priority project for receiving funding; and 3) Send the City of Gilroy project back to the Scoring Committee for re-evaluation. He commented that in retrospect, for the City of Gilroy in particular, the process was very confusing, because the City of Gilroy submitted an application to MTC for a TLC grant a month prior, and it was portrayed that the two grants were similar.

Upon query of Member Jenkins, Vice Chairperson Dey referred to the diagram and indicated that the proposed sidewalk improvements were for the Martin Street and Railroad Street corridors.

Vice Chairperson Dey commented that he had discussions with VTA staff before the call for projects came out, and he indicated that he had two projects in the City of Gilroy downtown area. He asked VTA staff if he should submit individual projects or lump the projects together, and staff's recommendation was to lump the projects together. Vice Chairperson Dey commented that it would have been better for him to have two separate projects.

Alternate Member Collen referred to Attachment A and noted that the City of Gilroy project is just below the cut-off line and there are many projects below Gilroy's. He referred to the passage of the infrastructure bonds and noted that there is a potential for work to become more expensive. He expressed concern regarding money being unused and feels that the line should be redrawn, so that the money could be used on a good project now.

Member Kass referred to the Vice Chairperson Dey's third option of referring the City of Gilroy project back to the Scoring Committee for re-evaluation and noted he is in support of the option.

Alternate Member Tripousis supported Mr. Sighamony's suggestion to issue another call for projects in late spring/summer 2007 for the programming of the remaining funds at which time it is likely the City of Gilroy project, however characterized, will score among the top of the projects that are put forward. He expressed concern that if the process is opened up for the City of Gilroy, it should be opened up for all jurisdictions. Alternate Member Tripousis commented that at minimum, the project needs to go back to the Scoring Committee, whether it is now or within the next six months. His preference is that it be done at the next call for projects.

Alternate Member Batra commented that he believes there is merit in Vice Chairperson Dey's explanation. If the City of Gilroy's project was broken into two projects, it possibly could have scored higher. He recommended that the City of Gilroy project be broken into two projects and that other sponsors be given the same opportunity as well.

Member Jenkins expressed her support in re-examining all of the projects and talking to the project sponsors to see if they want their projects re-examined.

Alternate Member Batra recommended that the criteria remain the same, but that project sponsors be given an opportunity to re-package their project to show transit connection, etc.

Member Witthaus expressed his support for Alternate Member Batra's approach. He commented that the City of Sunnyvale does not necessarily agree with the fact that their third project was disqualified. He thinks that part of the reason the project was disqualified was because there was not sufficient give-and-take between the Scoring Committee and the City of Sunnyvale. Member Witthaus expressed support for giving people the opportunity to re-explain their projects and putting them back before the Scoring Committee.

Peter Skinner, member of the Scoring Committee, commented that he believed that the top projects were really the outstanding projects in the field. The projects clearly scored far more points than other projects. Two of the City of Sunnyvale's projects really embraced the CDT Program criteria and exemplified what VTA was trying to fund out of the program. The projects that fell below the line were 30 points or more below the projects that the Scoring Committee felt were worthy of funding. The Scoring Committee decided to create a cut-off line of 50 points, because there was such a disparity between projects that scored well and projects that did not score well. He indicated that cities were given the chance to explain their projects and meet with the Scoring Committee in the field. The City of Gilroy was unable to meet the Scoring Committee in the field when examining their project, but questions were asked at a follow-up meeting regarding transit connectivity, utility relocation, and redevelopment in the area.

Member Curtis queried if it would be better to proceed with a new call for projects within the next six months or whether it is valuable to take the money that has not been programmed and do a re-packaging of available projects now. It seems that doing it earlier rather than later may save money in terms of the total cost of the projects.

Vice Chairperson Dey commented that he would rather get started on the project sooner rather than delay the whole project. He noted that these are federal funds, which means that there is a certain natural lag to getting anything on the ground.

Member Witthaus clarified his support for allowing cities to re-explain their projects by stating that he does not think project sponsors should necessarily go back and re-package their projects. It is really an opportunity for the Scoring Committee to go back and look at these projects as they were submitted and to make sure that they ask the right questions and understand the projects that were submitted.

Chris Augenstein, Transportation Planning Manager, recommended that another call for projects be issued within a few months, allowing time for projects to be re-packaged and new projects to be submitted.

Alternate Member Batra asked if the call for projects for the remaining funds could be issued immediately, noting that this would resolve the problem of re-packaging projects, etc. Mr. Sighamony noted that the call for projects could be issued sooner.

Mr. Lawson noted that the goal is to get the investment in the community and to get it as quickly as possible. He recommended that TAC approve the project list and to strongly recommend that the call for new projects be within a 30-60 day timeframe.

Member Witthaus recommended that VTA staff work with the project sponsors that fell below the line to try to make their projects more suitable for the next round of programming.

**M/S/C (Curtis/Tripousis)** 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.

**M/S/C (Witthaus/Tripousis)** to recommend that: 1) VTA staff issue a second call for projects within a time period not to exceed 60 days; 2) VTA staff contact and work with the project sponsors that fell below the first cycle cut-off line to determine ways to modify or enhance their project proposals to better meet the program goals; and 3) that TAC have the opportunity to review the scoring criteria at its next meeting.

Alternate Member Collen referred to pedestrian programs being oriented around downtowns. He noted that the County of Santa Clara is also a participant in the process and by definition does not have downtowns. He asked how VTA intends to support pedestrian needs that are not related to downtowns. Alternate Member Collen recommended that a program be developed that purely addresses pedestrian needs.

Vice Chairperson Dey recommended that the Scoring Committee address the County of Santa Clara's request to see if they can come up with any recommendations on how the County of Santa Clara could be incorporated into the program.

#### **10. Caltrain Capital Priorities Study – Status Report**

Steven Fisher, Sr. Transportation Planner, reported that VTA is one of three participating partners on the Caltrain Joint Powers Board (JPB) and is required to participate in the capital needs of Caltrain. Mr. Fisher stated that funding for the Caltrain Capital Needs from Santa Clara County are provided by local funds from either Measure A or VTA's Capital Program or grant funds that come to the San Jose Urbanized Area that can be used for transit capital projects.

Mr. Fisher reported that the purpose of the Caltrain Capital Priorities Study is to develop a prioritized list of capital improvements to the Caltrain system to meet operations needs, improve passenger accessibility and improve system ridership over a 30-year time horizon. To accomplish this, VTA staff is working with a Subcommittee of the VTA PAC, where projects are being compiled and scored. The outcome of the process will be a prioritized list of Capital Projects for VTA's Caltrain investments.

Mr. Fisher reported that VTA staff has been working closely with the Caltrain JPB staff and with cities along the Caltrain line. The cities were asked to come up with a list of Caltrain projects and there were well over 100 projects totaling over \$3 billion.

Mr. Fisher reported that VTA staff will be presenting its recommendation on the weighting and scoring of Caltrain projects at the November 16, 2006 PAC Subcommittee meeting. The study recommendations will be forwarded to PAC in December 2006 and to the Board of Directors in January 2007.

Mr. Fisher noted that Vice Chairperson Dey, a member of TWG, has asked VTA staff to come back with suggestions on how grade separations can be funded.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Dey**, there being no objection, the Caltrain Capital Priorities Study – Status Report was reviewed.

**11. Status Report on the South County Circulation Study**

Murali Ramanujam, Sr. Transportation Planner, provided a PowerPoint Presentation on the South County Circulation Study (SCCS), highlighting: 1) Study Area Limits; 2) Study Objectives; 3) Study Scope; 4) Study Approach; 5) Stakeholder Input; 6) Land Use Growth Alternatives; 7) map of Year 2030 No Build Conditions – Origins and Destinations of US 101 Northbound AM Peak Traffic; 8) SCCS Evaluation Process; and 9) Key Milestones.

Member Armendariz left the meeting at 2:55 p.m.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Dey**, there being no objection, a Status Report on the South County Circulation Study was received.

**OTHER**

**12. Update from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee**

Mr. Flynn distributed a document entitled, “Areas to Enhance Committee Effectiveness Recommended by TAC Members”, noting that it has been revised since the October 12, 2006 TAC meeting. He referred to the first bulleted item, “Alignment of organizational mission, goals, objectives, work programs, etc.,” and noted the addition of the following highlighted item: “Develop TAC’s mission statement and align its responsibilities more closely with those of the VTA Board of Directors.” He referred to the second bulleted item, “Provision of meaningful advice to Board of Directors,” and noted the addition of the following highlighted items: 1) Identify regional issues for Board of Directors’ consideration where an increased leadership or advocacy role may be beneficial for VTA and Member Agencies,” and 2) Identify for Board of Directors’ consideration future trends or potential areas of concern to the Board and/or Member Agencies.

Mr. Lawson indicated that the proposed recommendations developed by TAC will be considered at the November 16, 2006, Administration and Finance Committee meeting and forwarded to the December 14, 2006 Board of Directors meeting. Mr. Lawson commented that the recommendations are a work-in-progress and will continue to be revised.

Member Jenkins expressed concern that TAC is not receiving the same Agenda Items as PAC. She commented that she would like to review the items in a timely manner before the items are presented to PAC, so that she could discuss the items with her policy maker.

Upon query of Member Jenkins, Mr. Lawson noted that the following items would be placed on TAC's Work Plan: 1) Market Segmentation Analysis and 2) Draft Service Design Guidelines. Mr. Lawson noted that he would send Ms. Jenkins the "Joint Development-Developer Selection Criteria" information.

Member Kass requested clarification on what items go to PAC and TAC. He noted that he does not want to see every item that goes to PAC.

Alternate Member Tripousis commented that the issue evolves around the need to better define the initial role of TAC. The issue raised at the TAC Subcommittee was that TAC was receiving "review and comment" items instead of "action" items. TAC was not providing input on items that were being considered by the PAC/Board of Directors, and policy makers were wrestling over issues without the benefit of any technical input.

Vice Chairperson Dey indicated that City Group 4, consisting of the Cities of Milpitas, Morgan Hill, and Gilroy, meets once a month. He commented that each jurisdiction may require varying levels of involvement.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Dey**, there being no objection, the Committee received an update from the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee.

**13. Technical Advisory Committee Recommendations on How It Can Play a More Vital Role in Interacting With and Advising the Board of Directors**

**M/S/C (Batra/Tripousis)** to approve: 1) The initial recommendations developed by the TAC on how to enhance Committee effectiveness and relationships to the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and VTA Board of Directors and 2) Submitting these recommendations to the VTA Board of Directors for review, denoting that they are preliminary only, that further development is ongoing, and that final recommendations will be provided to the Board at a future meeting.

**14. Committee Work Plan**

Mr. Lawson reiterated that the following items would be placed on the Committee Work Plan: 1) Market Segmentation Analysis; and 2) Draft Service Design Guidelines.

**On order of Vice Chairperson Dey**, there being no objection, the Committee Work Plan was reviewed.

**15. Announcements**

Member Curtis announced that he his retiring after 41 years of service and that his Retirement Party will be held in Los Gatos on December 19, 2006. He extended an invitation to TAC Members.

TAC Members congratulated Member Curtis on his retirement.

Vice Chairperson Dey reiterated that the APTA Conference video would be shown after the adjournment of the meeting.

**16. ADJOURNMENT**

**On order of Vice Chairperson Dey**, there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tracene Y. Crenshaw, Board Assistant  
VTA Board of Directors