

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, October 11, 2007

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:36 p.m. by Chairperson Dey in Conference Room B-104, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San José, California.

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Rajeev Batra
Don Dey, Chairperson
Dan Collen, Alternate
Glenn Goepfert, Alternate
Jaime Rodriguez Alternate
Cathy Lazarus, Alternate
Gayle Likens
Kevin Rohani
Jim Rowe, Alternate
Ben Tripousis
Jack Witthaus
Nancy Coss-Fitzwater, Ex-Officio

Representing

City of Santa Clara
City of Gilroy
County of Santa Clara
City of Cupertino
City of Milpitas
City of Mountain View
City of Palo Alto
Town of Los Gatos
City of Morgan Hill
City of San Jose
City of Sunnyvale
VTA

Members Absent

Richard Chen
John Cherbone
Jim Gustafson
Robert Kass
Gordon Siebert
Lee Taubeneck

Representing

Town of Los Altos Hills
City of Saratoga
City of Los Altos
City of Campbell
City of Monte Sereno
Dept. of Transportation (Caltrans)
District 4

A quorum was present.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

There were no Public Presentations.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Chairperson Dey requested that the following Agenda Item be moved to the Consent Agenda: **Agenda Item #9.**, Receive VTA's Financial Update.

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the Orders of the Day were accepted.

4. Committee Staff Report

Jim Lawson, Government Affairs Manager and Staff Liaison, reported the following: 1) The VTA Board of Directors at their August 30, 2007 meeting, approved the Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA); 2) Public Scoping meetings for the BART Extension project will be held in the month of October; 3) Governor Schwarzenegger signed two transportation bills supported by VTA, AB1492 (Laird) and SB264 (Alquist); and 4) VTA has entered into an agreement to support San Mateo County on the operation of a Hydrogen Shuttle Bus.

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

5. Chairperson's Report

Chairperson Dey stated that he attended the Joint Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Workshop on Thursday, September 13, 2007. He commented that the Committees discussed the concept of combining the PAC and TAC Committees. He reported that he addressed the Committees on the issue and it will be agendized for the November TAC meeting.

Chairperson Dey reminded the Committee members that the November 8, 2007 TAC meeting will be held at the City of Gilroy's new police building at 7301 Hanna Street, Gilroy, California.

6. Reports from TAC Working Groups

- **Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

Bill Hough, Transportation Planner III, provided a report regarding the September 2007 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) meeting. The CIP discussed the following: 1) Update on the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) process; 2) Proposition 1B Update; 3) Local Streets and County Roads Recommended Projects Scoring Criteria; and 4) Candidate locations for potential sound wall study.

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

Casey Emoto, Acting Deputy Director, Project Development, reported on behalf of Paul Ma, Transportation Systems Planning Manager, City of San Jose Department of Transportation, and SOM Working Group Chairperson. Mr. Emoto announced that the SOM working group has now a Vice Chairperson, Sam Peiris of the City of Palo Alto.

He provided a report on the following major items the SOM Working Group discussed at its August 2007 meeting: 1) Commencement of work on the Monitoring Program; 2) Coordination efforts with Caltrans; and 3) Coordinating with Metropolitan Transit Commission (MTC) to schedule a ramp metering workshop in Santa Clara County.

Chairperson Dey expressed his appreciation for organizing a ramp metering workshop in Santa Clara County with Caltrans.

On order of 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

7. Minutes of April 12, 2007

M/S/C (Witthaus/Batra) to approve the Minutes of April 12, 2007.

8. Summary Minutes of August 9, 2007

M/S/C (Witthaus/Batra) to receive and file the Summary Minutes of August 9, 2007.

9. VTA's Financial Update

M/S/C (Witthaus/Batra) to accept VTA's Financial Update.

REGULAR AGENDA

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

VTA's Financial Update

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

10. Review and Screening of Candidate Locations for Noise Reduction Projects

Bill Hough, Transportation Planner III, commented that VTA staff recommends that TAC review and discuss the list of potential locations for Noise Reduction Projects on County freeways and expressways.

Member Lazarus commented Attachment A was not included in her packet, and requested a copy be sent to Mountain View.

Member Witthaus requested staff summarize the criteria that have been provided to streamline the project list.

In response to a question from Member Lazarus, Christina Jaworski, Senior Environmental Planner, noted that Steps # 1 and 2 are primarily used to determine whether candidate locations meet the project criteria that have been established through the VTP 2030 process.

Member Collen commented that duplications in the list have been removed in Step #3. He also queried whether locations with existing sound walls meet the criteria. John Ristow, Chief CMA Officer, replied that locations with existing sound walls are not eligible.

Member Witthaus requested a summary of the proposed criteria that will be used to streamline the list of candidate locations. Ms. Jaworski replied that the criteria are based on locations adjacent to a freeway or expressway, land use, age of the development, and noise levels.

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Screening of Candidate Locations for Noise Reduction Projects.

11. Amendment to the Countywide Bicycle Expenditure Plan for the Mary Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge

Marcella M. Renzi, Programming & Grants Manager, provided an update on the Mary Avenue Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge project, which is a component of the Bicycle Expenditure Plan (BEP). Ms. Renzi commented that the project sponsor, the City of Cupertino, has moved forward with the project and is ready to begin construction, but indicated that a funding short fall exists.

Alternate Member Glen Goepfert, representing the City of Cupertino, provided a PowerPoint presentation highlighting: 1) Mary Avenue Bicycle Footbridge; 2) Presentation Agenda; 3) Current Concrete Design; 4) New Structural Steel Bridge Design; 5) Project Cost Estimate for Steel Bridge construction; 6) Cost Comparison; 7) Budget Augmentation Steel Bridge; 8) Budget Augmentation Steel Bridge – Proposal to VTA (50-50 Proposal); 9) Project Funding; 10) Proposed Cost Allocation; and 11) Schedule.

Member Tripousis queried if VTA's allocation for the project would be lowered if bids came in below the estimated amount. Alternate Member Goepfert responded in the affirmative but noted that discussion with VTA would be necessary.

Ex-Officio Member Nancy Coss-Fitzwater queried if cost increases, would the split remain at 50/50, or is the cap at \$3.35 million. Alternate Member Goepfert responded that Cupertino City Council would have to make a determination regarding the \$3.35 million.

Alternate Member Rodriguez queried if the cost of delivered materials was factored into the cost. Alternate Member Goepfert responded in the affirmative. He noted a component of the Value Engineering process included checking with suppliers for price and availability of common steel shapes.

Chairperson Dey commented that he believes in the project, however; he cannot support it. He expressed concern regarding the Valley Transportation Plan.

Member Witthaus commented that he does not support the project and that TAC has a responsibility to deliver cost effective projects. He also expressed concern about using a large amount of VTP 2030 funds for this project, when there is a need for numerous bike projects throughout the County.

Alternate Member Goepfert responded that this project should move forward because it demonstrates a commitment to the bicycle/pedestrian modes of transportation in the County.

Member Tripousis expressed his support and stated regionally, bicycle/pedestrian improvements are under-invested, and commented that this infrastructure is not only a statement, but also serves as an attraction to the public.

Member Batra expressed his support of Member Tripousis' comments however; expressed concern regarding cost control and queried about the funding impact this project will have on future bike projects.

Alternate Member Rowe requested elaboration on pedestrian bike bridge critical connections and jurisdictions that will benefit from this bridge. Alternate Member Goepfert responded the Bridge is located in Bike Corridor #3. He commented the connections are located in Los Gatos, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Cupertino, with connections between the high school, and DeAnza College. He also commented the original traffic study estimated approximately 90,000 bicycle/ pedestrian trips per year on the structure.

Ms. Rensi commented that the Bridge provides a parallel corridor to Highway 85.

Member Rohani inquired about the significant project cost increase. Alternate Member Goepfert responded that the complexity of the construction design was not anticipated.

Alternate Member Lazarus commented the Bridge is an important regional transportation link and stressed the importance of allocating additional dollars to the project. She expressed concern about spending regional dollars to create an architectural statement and queried if a more basic design at a lower cost could be done to achieve that important

regional link. Alternate Member Goepfert expressed concern about re-designing the structure at this stage in the process.

Alternate Member Lazarus agreed re-designing the bridge would not be a feasible option, but she questions the funding split. She asked what it would take to get the regional connectivity versus the increment that is needed to create the architectural statement. Alternate Member Goepfert noted Cupertino is currently contributing \$5.3 million of funding and emphasized the importance of the project not only to the region, but to the City of Cupertino.

Member Rodriguez inquired if costs are less, would the 50/50 split stay the same. He queried if Cupertino is willing to keep its \$3.4 million share even though the VTA expenditure could be less. Alternate Member Goepfert answered in the affirmative.

Member Rohani queried about the impacts this project will have on future projects. Ms. Rensi responded there is a possibility of delay to some projects, but noted VTA is updating the Bicycle Expenditure Program plans and re-evaluating project costs.

Member Batra recommended that the City of Cupertino's Proposition 1B funding be allocated to this project.

Member Lazarus clarified that the allocation of the City of Cupertino's Proposition 1B funding would reduce VTA's commitment to the project.

M/S/F (Batra/Tripousis) on a Roll Call Vote of 8 Ayes to 2 Noes and 0 Abstentions to recommend that Cupertino apply their proposition 1B funding toward the Mary Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Project, and if the project comes in at a lower amount, that the difference go back to The Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) and not a 50/50 share. Members Witthaus and Dey opposed.

12. ABAG Projections 2007 Land Use Dataset Confirmation for Countywide Transportation Model

Chris Augenstein, Transportation Planning Manager, reported on behalf of George Naylor, Principal Transportation Planner. Mr. Augenstein commented that a component of VTA's responsibilities for developing and maintaining a countywide transportation model involve periodic updates to the input socio-economic databases that coincides with development of a new base year model and the release of new Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections datasets.

NOTE: M/S/F MEANS MOTION SECONDED AND FAILED.

Member Rowe queried regarding the timeframe to submit comments. Mr. Augenstein replied that Member Agencies are being asked to review the new data and provide comments to VTA by November 16, 2007, but will accept comments and data through the middle of December.

Chairperson Dey expressed concern with the ABAG control plans for the South County Circulation Studies.

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the Committee discussed the ABAG Projections 2007 Land Use Dataset Confirmation for Countywide Transportation Model.

13. Regional Transportation Plan/Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2030 Briefing

Chris Augenstein, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a handout entitled, "VTP/RTP Timelines." He stated that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and VTA's Valley Transportation Plan (VTP 2035) are dynamic long-range regional planning documents.

Mr. Augenstein discussed the timelines and noted that the VTP and RTP run in a parallel schedule. He noted the VTP provides input to the RTP through the project list and the VTP project list is developed through planning studies as well as the review by principal stakeholders. He reviewed the current schedule and noted that VTA is working on updates to VTP 2030 that was adopted by the Board in 2005. He noted that the updated VTP 2035 may contain carry-over projects that were listed in the original VTP 2030.

Member Tripousis left his seat at 2:43 p.m.

Member Tripousis took his seat at 2:44 p.m.

Member Collen requested clarification regarding the projects that are proposed for mid-December. He asked if a planning document basis would be expected from the agency to identify the project. Mr. Augenstein responded that it is better to submit as much information as possible for the project.

Chairperson Dey requested clarification regarding the staff recommendation that agencies submit the proposed project plan, and not assume that another agency will submit the project. Mr. Augenstein responded in the affirmative and stated that VTA will check back with the local agencies to clarify the understanding of the project(s).

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the Committee received the Regional Transportation Plan/Valley Transportation Plan (VTP) 2030 Briefing.

14. ABAG Focus Our Vision Priority Development Areas (PDA)

Chris Augenstein, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a report regarding the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Focus Our Vision Priority Development Areas (PDA).

Mr. Augenstein commented that the ABAG and MTC are leading an effort, known as FOCUS, to identify the regional blueprint for growth in the region. The purpose of the effort is two-fold: MTC and ABAG will use this as an opportunity for allocation of future yet undefined funding sources. Secondly, the effort will be an integral part in the development of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update, which is currently taking place.

VTA was encouraged to submit the Cores, Corridors, and Station areas-which were endorsed by each of the local jurisdictions as components of the Community Design and Transportation Program – as a PDA. As a result all areas located within ¼ mile of the Cores, Corridor, and Station Areas are eligible for MTC planning grants and technical assistance programs associated with the FOCUS program. In addition, this provides each of the local jurisdictions the ability to apply for future capital program funding; however, it will require signing the MTC's Priority Development Area Designation under the FOCUS Program Resolution.

The FOCUS effort is still very dynamic and changes will likely occur through 2008 as the RTP develops. VTA staff is working with ABAG and MTC staff on the development of this effort, and is participating in the FOCUS Technical Advisory meetings. As new information including funding opportunities becomes more apparent, VTA will inform the committees of these opportunities. A second opportunity to apply for PDA status will occur in spring 2008.

Chairperson Dey inquired about the reference in the staff report, Page 2, Paragraph 1, regarding 100 continuous acres of area. Mr. Augenstein replied that currently ABAG identifies that a PDA project must be located in a developed area, be within ¼ mile radius of transit service with 15-minute or better frequency, include 100 continuous acres of area, and be an area where housing development currently exists or is planned for the future. He further clarified the reference of 100 continuous acres refers to an area a quarter mile in circumference. He noted that keeping that criterion in mind the Downtown Gilroy train station would be considered a PDA area and meet ABAG criteria.

Mr. Dey further requested clarification if all projects submitted on the Plan had been accepted. Mr. Augenstein responded in the affirmative.

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the ABAG focus Our Vision Priority Development Areas (PDA).

15. Revised Scoring Criteria for the Local Streets & County Roads (LS&CR) Program

Marcella Rensi, Manager, Programming & Grants, provided an overview and background regarding the Revised Scoring Criteria for the Local Streets & County Roads (LS&CR).

Ms. Rensi commented that the LS & CR Program goals include: 1) Increase connectivity of Local Streets and County Roads as a means to shorten trips by all modes; 2) Improve pedestrian and bicycle access; 3) Improve transit routing; 4) Keep shorter trips off the regional freeway and express system; and 5) Provide funding for local transportation projects not directly connected to, or fully funded by new development.

Member Batra asked for the reason and rationale for changing the scoring criteria. Ms. Rensi responded that VTA is attempting to clarify the process.

Member Collen commented that he is interested in the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) element that has been introduced and he inquired if the Congestion Management Program has been able to determine a rural roads element of best practices for the CDT. Ms. Rensi responded that has not yet been determined.

Member Collen expressed concern about the Community Design & Transportation (CDT) Best Practices and commented that the rural system has no Best Practices. Member Collen expressed concern that without Best Practices for the rural system he is unsure of the scoring process. Ms. Rensi replied that not all projects would score well in all categories. She commented that some projects would score better in one category and not so well in another, so this criterion provides the best opportunity of scoring for many different types of projects.

Member Collen queried about the reduction of points in the safety category from 25 to 10 points. Ms. Rensi replied 20 points remain in the safety category. She commented that this includes traffic calming elements, which were recognized as a component of the safety elements. Member Collen commented that this appears to be similar to the CDT program and does not seem to be a productive process.

Member Witthaus queried regarding the Community Design and Transportation Category. He expressed concern regarding implementation during the planning phase. He stated that some agencies have not yet designed their projects and further expressed concern with the criterion at this phase of the funding process. Ms. Rensi responded that VTA has received projects in the planning phase, as well as all stages of development. Ms. Rensi commented that receiving a formal commitment from the agency following CDT Best Practices would be appropriate.

Member Collen recommended the consideration of adding a rural roads category that identifies the criterion that sets good rural road projects apart from poor rural roads projects and rates them against themselves. Member Rowe expressed his support and recommended identifying Best Practices for rural roads.

Chairperson Dey expressed concern with the difficulty of projects to meet the CDT guidelines. He inquired if VTA will require agencies to return the funding if the agencies were not able to comply with CDT requirements. He also suggested changes in the allocation of points for Congestion Relief and Transportation Land Use connections.

Member Witthaus recommended changing the point allocation for safety. He recommended 15 points be allocated for safety and 5 points for traffic calming elements.

Ms. Rensi further discussed the Programming Phase, which recommended replacing the Systems Optimization and Geographic Equity criteria with a new criterion to provide additional points based on the agencies ranking in the Planning Phase.

Chairperson Dey expressed concern about the point allocations for the Programming Stage and recommended reducing points for the Planning Phase to 10, noting the importance of allocating points to projects that are ready.

Alternate Member Rodriguez disagreed with the reduction of points for the Planning Phase, noting that large projects are usually identified in the Planning Phase.

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the Committee reviewed the Revised Scoring Criteria for the Local Streets & County Roads (LS&CR) Program.

16. Report on Signal System in Santa Clara County – An Update on Ramp Metering, Traffic Signals and Transit Signal Priority

Casey Emoto, Acting Deputy Director, Project Development, distributed a handout entitled, “Signal Systems in Santa Clara County – an Update on Ramp Metering, Traffic Signals, and Transit Signal Priority.” Mr. Emoto provided a brief update highlighting the following topics: 1) VTA’s Role in Signal Operations; 2) Review of Signal Operations Status including Ramp Meter Signals at Freeways, Traffic Signal Operations on Local Roadways and Expressways, and Signal Priority for Transit Vehicles; 3) Update of SOM Working Group and the identification of \$28 million for Transportation Systems Operations & Management Group; 4) Signal Operations: Freeways; 5) Signal Operations: Local Roadways; 6) Transit Signal Priority (TSP); 7) VTA Rapid 522 Summary-daily ridership as of June 2007 is 5600, and service is 25 percent faster than local service; and 8) Partnership Between Transit Agency (VTA) and Signal Maintainer (Caltrans).

Member Likens arrived at the meeting at 3:28 p.m.

Member Tripousis commented that the spectrum system, initially successful for signal communications later encountered some difficulties with the onset of wireless communications. He queried if VTA foresees encountering the same problem with this system. Mr. Emoto replied that VTA is using Amtrak’s GPS system, a tested system that received positive signal strength.

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the Committee received the Report on Signal System in Santa Clara County – An Update on Ramp Metering, Traffic Signals and Transit Signal Priority.

OTHER

17. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee Report

Chairperson Dey reported that the TAC Subcommittee met on October 11, 2007. He reported the Subcommittee discussed proposed future agendized items.

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the Committee received the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee Report.

18. Committee Work Plan

Stephen Flynn, Sr. Management Analyst, commented that six programming related items are scheduled for the November TAC meeting. He commented that agendized items will include an update on the High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes project; and discussion on the Joint Citizens Advisory Committee/Policy Advisory Committee Workshop.

Member Batra requested an update on the El Camino project.

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

19. Announcements

Alternate Member Rodriguez extended an invitation to the Committee to attend the SVTOA luncheon scheduled for Tuesday, November 13, 2007, at Bella Mia Restaurant in Downtown San Jose.

20. ADJOURNMENT

On order of Chairperson Dey, there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Perez, Board Assistant
VTA Board of Directors