

## Technical Advisory Committee

Thursday, February 12, 2009

### MINUTES

#### CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at 1:30 p.m. by Chairperson Witthaus in Conference Room B-104, Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), 3331 North First Street, San Jose, California.

#### 1. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Greg Armendariz	City of Milpitas	Present	
Rajeev Batra	City of Santa Clara	Late	1:35 PM
Todd Capurso	Town of Los Gatos	Present	
Richard Chen	Town of Los Altos Hills	Absent	
John Cherbone	City of Saratoga	Present	
Dan Collen	Santa Clara County	Present	
Kevin Connolly	Alt. Ex Officio VTA	Absent	
Don Dey	City of Gilroy	Present	
Sylvia Fung	Alt. Ex Officio Caltrans	Absent	
Joan Jenkins	City of Mountain View	Late	1:38 PM
Robert Kass	City of Campbell	Present	
Gayle Likens	City of Palo Alto	Present	
Larry Lind	City of Los Altos	Present	
Ed Slintak	City of Monte Sereno	Absent	
David Stillman	City of Cupertino	Present	
Lee Taubeneck	Ex Officio Caltrans	Absent	
Ben Tripousis	City of San José	Present	
Jack Witthaus	City of Sunnyvale	Present	

**A quorum was present.**

#### 2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

There were no Public Presentations

#### 3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Chairperson Witthaus welcomed TAC's newest member, Larry Lind from Los Altos.

Chairperson Witthaus announced **Agenda Item 8**, Receive an update on Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives, would be discussed between Item 11 and Item 12.

#### 4. Committee Staff Report

Chris Augenstein, Deputy Director, Planning, reported on development of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2009.

Mr. Augenstein noted Sunnyvale and Milpitas were the only members to respond to the ABAG information sent to the TAC members for comment and review.

Mr. Augenstein stated by the year 2035 the cities within Santa Clara County will be considered bedroom communities to San Francisco and Oakland, with 100,000 jobs being shifted out of Santa Clara County into San Francisco County. Projections will show Santa Clara County with fewer jobs than San Francisco County, which does not match the trending. He noted this was a paradigm shift from how employment was looked at within ABAG Projections 2007. ABAG is taking a more aggressive, policy-based approach and not looking at the planning work Santa Clara County has performed. Many questions regarding the methodology ABAG is using need to be answered. VTA's efforts to work with ABAG have resulted in only pieces of raw data.

Mr. Augenstein noted Milpitas has a significant amount of job growth not reflected in ABAG Projections 2009. Their job growth is shown as declining in 2035 as compared to their data in ABAG Projections 2007. ABAG appears not to look at the specific plans, including BART and High Speed Rail (HSR).

ABAG has yet to provide the Employee Residence Value. A shift in Employee Residence Values was a major impetus in ABAG Projections 2007 and it appears it will shift more in 2009. Santa Clara County will be considered an out-commuter county rather than an in-commuter county, with the report showing people living in Santa Clara County going out of Santa Clara County for jobs.

ABAG has requested comments by February 20. A decision is to be made in March. With so many unresolved questions, staff would like ABAG to postpone the decision to June to allow preparation of more rational numbers. A form letter is being prepared and will be provided to the cities, for them to adjust as necessary, requesting ABAG delay the March decision until June. Member Dey questioned if the form letter will be sent to the TAC members, or to the cities. Mr. Augenstein stated the letters would be sent to the TAC members who should then follow-up with their city staff members.

Mr. Augenstein noted: 1) the city control totals had just been received and will be sent out to the cities on February 13; 2) the employee residence numbers will not be calculated by ABAG until after the households, total populations and jobs for the cities are approved; and 3) staff wants to see what those numbers are before they go to the ABAG board for discussion.

John Ristow, Chief Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Officer and Staff Liaison, stated the importance for the cities to review the ABAG documentation, noting the amount of housing, jobs and redevelopment land available will impact regional project funding.

Member Tripousis reported the City of San José's Transportation, Economic Development and Planning Staff were meeting with ABAG that date. Chris Augenstein requested to be included in future meetings San José has with ABAG.

Member Tripousis noted ABAG's apparent belief San Francisco has more transit infrastructure currently in place. ABAG has not taken into account the planning Santa Clara County has in place to address densities more effectively than San Francisco County.

Member Jenkins took her seat at 1:38 p.m.

Member Dey questioned if the same presentation would be given at the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting. Mr. Augenstein stated it would.

Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, distributed a letter from the California Department of Transportation, dated January 27, 2009, requesting VTA provide a comprehensive, prioritized list of Project Study Reports (PSRs) to be worked on during FY 09/10. Mr. Maeda requested the members review the attached listed entitled "VTA 8/9 STIP (Non-SHOPP) PID Work Plan" to see if any additional projects should be included on the list. Members were asked to provide their comments, or list of recommendation projects, directly to Eugene Maeda by noon on Thursday, February 26.

Member Likens questioned if the current list was prioritized and if a prioritizing process had been established for newly-submitted projects. Mr. Ristow stated there will be a process established.

**5. Chairperson's Report**

There was no Chairperson's Report.

**6. Reports from TAC Working Groups**

• **Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

Celeste Fiore, Transportation Planner II, provided the following highlights from the January 20, 2009, Special CIP Session and January 27, 2009, Regular CIP Meeting: 1) Both meetings focused on the Economic Stimulus Package; 2) Matthew Jue, City of Campbell, was nominated Subcommittee Chair and Dawn Cameron, from County of Santa Clara, Roads and Airport Department, was nominated Vice Chair; 3) Community Design and Transportation Program Planning Grant was discussed and the Scoring Committee provided a scoring project list to be presented as an action item at the March PAC meeting; and 4) the next CIP meeting will be February 24, 2009.

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

Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, provided the following highlights from the January 28, 2009, SOM meeting: 1) The SOM Working Group finished updating the TIA Guidelines of the Technical Standards and Procedures and is currently working on updating the Model Consistency Guidelines; 2) Deficiency Requirements Plan Guidelines will be coming to TAC in April.

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

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

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**7. Minutes of January 8, 2009**

M/S/C (Tripousis/Dey) to approve the Minutes of January 8, 2009.

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

## REGULAR AGENDA

**The Agenda was taken out of order.**

### 9. **Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) Cleanup of Allocations and Programmed Amounts**

Michelle DeRobertis, Senior Transportation Planner, noted this item is a cleanup of the existing allocation list in preparation for scoring the new projects submitted in response to the VTP 2035 call for projects and gave a brief update of the list from conception.

The adoption of the VTP 2035 Plan allows for the addition of new BEP projects. The revised BEP list will be submitted for adoption by the Board at its April 2009 meeting.

Staff recommended updates to the current list are: 1) Removal of six projects completed using the exact amount of allocated BEP funds; 2) Removal of five projects completed without using BEP funds; allocations amounts will be returned to the BEP funding pool; 3) Reduction of allocation amounts to actual-amounts programmed for seven projects; and 4) Increase of allocation amounts to actual-amounts programmed for three projects.

Mr. DeRobertis noted approximately eight million dollars of BEP allocated money will be returned to the fund for reallocation. With the proposed changes, the current program list of 46 projects will be reduced to 29 projects.

Member Kass questioned how this list relates to receiving programmed money. Chairperson Witthaus stated the list is a priority request for funds for eligible projects.

Member Dey, noting the City of Gilroy's plan to submit projects to the BEP, requested clarification on the process involved and the length of time a project can remain on the BEP Allocation List. Ms. DeRobertis stated projects remain within the BEP unless the scope has changed, the cost has significantly increased, the project has been completed, or the submitter requests the item's removal. Projects requiring significantly more money than originally requested will be reevaluated.

Mr. Ristow reported funding is received in many different cycles and not as one lump sum. Staff's goal is to prioritize based on projects ready to move forward.

Ms. DeRobertis noted staff is waiting for the reauthorization of the federal transportation funding bill.

Member Collen referenced on Table 3, VTP 2030 ID# 30-B07, the Foothill Expressway at Loyola Structural Improvements Project has not yet been completed. He stated the project was divided into two parts for convenience and timeliness. Phase 1, at a cost of \$370,000, dealt with the understructure. Phase 2, at a projected cost of \$1 million, deals with the upper structure. He requested staff review and ensure the decision on this project is consistent with other projects.

Member Batra referenced Attachment B "Proposed 2009 BEP Project List" and requested staff change the project title from "San Tomas Aquino / Saratoga Creek Trail Reaches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (Hwy 237 - southern city limit)" to "San Tomas Aquino / Saratoga Creek Trail Reaches 1, 2, 3 and 4 (Monroe - southern city limit)."

Chairperson Witthaus referenced Table 2, VTP 2030 ID# 30-B45, Sunnyvale Train Station Northside Access, and noted the project is listed as completed. He stated the project

proposal was for a grade separation. An at-grade access to the north was completed. These are two different projects. Sunnyvale would like this project to stay on the list and be reevaluated along with the other projects.

**M/S/C (Batra/Collen)** to recommend adoption of the revised Bicycle Expenditure Program (BEP) Project list and allocation amounts as shown in Attachment B, with the clarifications as requested by TAC Members Collen, Batra and Witthaus.

**10. (Deferred to March 12, 2009, Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting)**

Congestion Management Program (CMP) Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines Update.

Chris Augenstein, Deputy Director, Planning, reported the CMP Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines were reviewed by the Systems Operation Management (SOM) Working Group who posed the following questions with regard to model consistency issues: 1) How is consistency defined?; and 2) Must internal trip-movements in a city model be wholly consistent with the regional model? Staff will address these questions and revise the guidelines.

Member Dey stated the VTA model should be used for deficiency planning. He noted Gilroy, because of local conditions, has made a series of changes to the VTA model.

Chairperson Witthaus noted his belief the original CMP legislation included model consistency and recommended staff review the statute. He expressed concern with a city-wide model significantly different from the VTA model, noting it might be in conflict with the original statute.

Chairperson Witthaus stated how a city models regional-roadway networks as they pass through the city could lead to inconsistent decision-making between regional agencies and the city.

Mr. Augenstein stated most of the issues will be resolved by addressing the cross-jurisdictional boundaries. The cross-border trips are where the inconsistencies between the city models and the regional model lie. Through a calibration exercise, the models can be made consistent for cross-border volumes.

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Committee deferred adoption of the updated Congestion Management Program Local Transportation Model Consistency Guidelines.

**11. Congestion Management Program (CMP) - Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines Update**

Eugene Maeda, Senior Transportation Planner, reported staff presented the draft version of the TIA Guidelines Update at the December BPAC and January TAC meetings for their review. Among the requested revisions, the Study Scenario section was revised to allow an agency to use a wider range of cumulative conditions analyses to satisfy the CMP requirement for near-term cumulative conditions analysis.

Member Batra pointed out a numbering error in the summary of the key proposed changes within the memo, noting an absence of an item number three. Mr. Maeda acknowledged the error, stating the key proposed changes were summarized within the six items listed.

Member Batra noted cumulative impacts are not normally mitigated. Member Dey commented from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) standpoint, projects must mitigate cumulative impacts based upon their fair share.

Chairperson Witthaus referenced CEQA versus CMP requirements, stating most agencies use TIA Guidelines to scope traffic portions of environmental analysis. He noted subtle differences between the two: The current TIA Guidelines do not require mitigations for the long term cumulative analysis as CEQA would.

Member Batra referenced cumulative impact on county expressways, noting each development may submit their share until the total is achieved. The requirements of California Assembly Bill 1600 – regarding administration of development impact fees - limit the amount of time funds may be held. He questioned regarding management of the money and the amount of time it can be held. Chairperson Witthaus referenced Sunnyvale's fee program, with its six-year analysis update, noting by updating the analyses cities are allowed to hold funds.

**M/S/C (Dey/Tripousis)** to recommend adoption of the updated Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) Guidelines as described within this memorandum and per the attached document.

## **8. Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives**

John Ristow, Chief Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Officer and Staff Liaison, provided a handout entitled American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 - San Francisco Bay Area Strategy February 6, 2009. Mr. Ristow reported: 1) The House and Senate reached a compromise on the Federal Stimulus Package; 2) In addition to the Stimulus Package Funds, \$5.5 Billion Senate discretionary funds were assigned to High Speed Rail (HSR) for a total of \$8 Billion for HSR; \$27 Billion for highways; and \$8.4 Billion for transit; and 3) The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) held a partnership meeting with all Bay Area transportation agencies.

Mr. Ristow reported MTC staff is suggesting regional discretionary funding assignments of: 1) \$140 Million for roadway; 2) \$175 Million to \$350 Million for transportation; and 3) \$2 Million for transit rehabilitation.

Discussions are ongoing over the \$145 Million discretionary funding set aside for Oakland Airport Connection and Transbay Terminal Box.

The next item requiring conversation with MTC will be projects submitted to MTC for local road rehabilitation. We will wait to see the total amount targeted for each county.

Mr. Ristow noted the assignment of the State Discretionary Transportation Funds and what the State will do with those funds has yet to be determined. Member Collen suggested the State may assign a portion of its discretionary funds to MTC.

Mr. Ristow noted a deal purportedly reached between CTC and Caltrans, on how the State funding would be distributed, suggests two-thirds of the State funding would go to MTC and 1/3 to the State, which could change the local-agency formulation.

Mr. Ristow noted what is being discussed as part of the CTC/Caltrans deal is the Proposition 1B distribution formula would be the formula used for local roadway distribution. Member Collen stated the Proposition 1B distribution portion is Federal money and would not be free

from expectations of being in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He noted VTA needs to have flexible, variable project-amounts that can respond to funds received.

Member Dey requested confirmation “Prop 1B Backfill” on the handout did not suggest “cleaning” the money. Member Tripousis noted even if the state passes a budget it won’t have the bonding capacity or the ability to pass enough bonds to raise enough revenues.

Member Batra referenced the MTC 60-day delivery timeframe.

Mr. Ristow recommended this discussion continue following staff’s presentation of **Item 12, Economic Stimulus Funds; Distribution for Local Road Projects.**

Mr. Ristow referenced the MTC subcommittee meeting held on February 11, 2009, and noted the CMAs expressed concern over the level of funding for local streets, transit agencies and other projects.

Mr. Ristow referenced the VTP 2035 Plan and encouraged committee members to review the plan and submit any comments to staff.

Chris Augenstein, Deputy Director, Planning, referenced unresolved issues with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) noting staff is currently working on the Santa Clara County Project. Mr. Augenstein noted outstanding issues include: 1) RTP Language referencing “MTC Programs,” especially with the Express Lanes Program, which should reflect the Santa Clara County Projects as Santa Clara County Projects submitted by VTA; 2) The Regional Bike Program and how money is divided and distributed; 3) Transportation for the Community Project Development Areas (PDA) issue; and 4) Countywide Bike Plans eligible for regional money do not have to be in the Regional Bike Plan. MTC has stated these items are not going to be dealt with until after the RTP is adopted. Mr. Augenstein noted time is of the essence.

Member Tripousis referenced the PDA issue and stated: 1) Language regarding the PDAs was included within MTC’s recommendation to the Commission; and 2) MTC local streets and roads staff spent the past 2 years debating ABAG staff funding for these project development areas, with ABAG still wanting to take money out of the local streets and roads fund. Member Tripousis noted this was included in the recommendation to the Programming and Allocations Committee going before the Commission. Mr. Tripousis suggested comments be sent noting the idea is not viable.

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the committee received an update on Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Activities and Initiatives.

## **12. Economic Stimulus Funds: Distribution for Local Road Projects**

Marcella Rensi, Transportation Planning Manager, noted a meeting was held with the City Managers on February 11, 2009. MTC has established a 60-day advance deadline allowing time to deprogram and reallocate funds for failing projects.

Ms. Rensi provided a handout entitled “Federal Economic Stimulus Bill Process Delivery Milestones,” a schedule developed for the February 11, 2009, City Managers meeting. She referenced the list of milestones, noting the Final Modifications for Local Streets & Roads projects are due at MTC on February 20, 2009.

Ms. Rensi noted the MTC acceptable modifications have project listing amounts. Staff consolidated project listing by project types. The cities have one project listing for street rehabilitation with the exception of the City of Santa Clara and the County of Santa Clara,

which now has two project types per discussion with their staff members. The dollar amounts or street names may change, but the project type may not be changed.

Member Batra questioned if ADA requirements must be met whenever federal money is involved. Member Dey stated if a project needs ADA ramps it cannot be included, because the need for clearance will not be issued in time to meet all of the deadlines.

Ms. Rensi noted the signing of the Federal Stimulus Bill will trigger a time-line for state apportionments, which in turn triggers the delivery timeline. MTC is taking their final commission action on the Economic Stimulus Program.

Ms. Rensi referenced Mr. Ristow's handout entitled "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 - San Francisco Bay Area Strategy February 6, 2009" noting the limited time for programming Streets & Roads money does not allow time for debate.

Ms. Rensi provided a handout entitled "Comparison of Local Streets Roads Rehabilitation Funding Santa Clara County: 1999 - 2009" showing fund division methods by MTC and VTA over a 10-year period. She noted the new MTC formula has evolved to a viable point and is a formula staff would like to look at in the future, but serious concerns with the formula preclude its use at present time.

Ms. Rensi provided a handout entitled "Federal Economic Stimulus Intra-County Road Rehabilitation of Funding Distribution," presenting a breakdown of methods used by responding counties.

Ms. Rensi provided a handout entitled "Santa Clara County Local Road Rehabilitation Economic Stimulus Package 2009 Distribution Method Comparison" a comparison of a current target using the needs based percentages previously developed by VTA and a somewhat corrected version of MTC's 2009 Local Streets & Roads formula.

Ms. Rensi noted the original version reviewed by TAC contains at least one very large error sufficient enough to alter the distribution of funds, not just between cities within this county but between counties within the region. This illustrates why staff has concerns with using MTC's formula. Staff requires time to scrub the data to ensure accurate reporting. Not enough jurisdictions have reported back to MTC regarding their usage of MTC's basis of calculation.

Mr. Ristow stated staff cannot recommend using this process until VTA validates MTC's formula. The basis for staff's recommendation is knowing one process is accurate and not having time to validate the other. For the 2010 federal-funding cycle staff wants TAC to select the methodology used, whether it is need-based or a new method.

Member Collen thanked Ms. Rensi for the efforts she put into this process, especially with all of the information changing and targets moving. He noted each time there has been a new formulation the County's share has been reduced, with the 2009 version providing the lowest percentage yet. He recommended the TAC move forward and focus on how to respond to an even larger allocation amount than already anticipated and have projects prepared, ready and able to use the stimulus dollars.

Member Dey noted TAC discussed MTC's formula several years ago and his understanding was TAC wanted to move to the MTC process. Staff reported the MTC formula could not be used at that time. Member Dey commended Member Tripousis' efforts in working with MTC to develop a more equitable distribution, encouraging VTA to also develop a more equitable distribution.

Member Tripousis stated VTA had been hamstrung by MTC policy, noting MTC fell back on federal restrictions preempting VTA from acting sooner. He referenced his role as a MTC member and former chair of the Local Streets & Roads Working Group at MTC who worked on crafting the MTC policy, and suggested given the time constraints TAC should go forward with the staff recommended needs-based formula. He recommended VTA embrace the MTC strategy for future allocations.

Member Kass referenced the creation of the first distribution formula developed for Measure A, which he deemed a success. He noted from past discussions TAC was concerned with MTC's needs based approach, because it differentially affected recipients based upon PMI reporting, monies invested, and penalized for good road conditions. He recommended staying as close to the original Measure A formula as possible, with equitable allocations based upon the size and population of cities.

Member Kass questioned regarding the County's discretionary role. Mr. Ristow noted it is still at the County's discretion as to what formula is used as long as it meets federal requirements and does not use population.

Mr. Ristow stated of the \$140 Million stimulus funds MTC is scheduled to receive, MTC will allocate \$43 Million to other projects thereby reducing Santa Clara County's allotment of \$30.4 Million by one-third. This change in the allocation amount received will not support the \$30 Million in projects the cities have submitted. Staff wants to ensure the County receives its portion of any additional stimulus funds the State allocates to MTC.

Member Batra questioned regarding the inclusion of an MTC column on the handout. Mr. Ristow noted various members of the TAC had been circulating this as an issue they want to revisit and staff is trying to provide information to clarify staff's recommendation to stay with the VTA formula.

Mr. Ristow referenced Member Dey's comments stating at its discretion staff had fully intended, on the schedule of the new federal bill, to revisit the discussion with TAC whether to use the MTC or VTA procedural formula, because staff's process has been to make this decision on a consensus approved by TAC. The current timeframe allotted by the Federal Stimulus Package does not provide staff with enough time to ensure the accuracy of the MTC formula.

Member Batra recommended using any additional funding to make whole any submitted projects deemed incomplete. Chairperson Witthaus stated projects should be submitted 100 percent design ready. Any funds from projects removed from the list by Caltrans or MTC should be apportioned to the projects which fully met the qualifications.

Member Tripousis noted there are certain assumptions, such as ADA requirements, which must be met when making changes to roadways and when a project quote is missing those assumed elements there should be a marriage of the two.

Member Dey recommended future project questions from the cities to MTC be funneled through VTA with the responses shared by all.

Member Lind reported a flaw in the VTA formula with respect to Los Altos. Los Altos is being penalized because they spend money on their streets. MTC rewards cities spending money on their streets. By using the VTA formula, Los Altos loses 116 percent of its funding. Ms. Rensi stated the VTA formula calculates the cost of maintaining the street and road system over 25 years relative to the total cost of doing that within the County.

Member Dey noted Gilroy and Morgan Hill's dissatisfaction with the needs based approach. With the majority of funds allotted to the North County the South County is short almost \$1 million, which is significant for cities the size of Gilroy and Morgan Hill. Mr. Ristow noted in the future VTA will ultimately use the process TAC deems as the best, most equitable process.

Member Batra requested staff come back with a plan for the distribution of any excess funds.

Chairperson Witthaus stated his support of the VTA staff recommendation. He noted the cities are all at a distinct disadvantage with the uncertain funding schedules and a new consensus must be reached on distribution formulas.

**M/S/C (Tripousis/Jenkins)** on a vote of 11 Ayes to 2 Noes to 0 Abstentions to recommend the VTA Board adopt the distribution strategy for Federal Economic Stimulus local streets and roads funding as described in the following memorandum, and adopt the list of Local Streets and roads projects shown in Attachment A. Members Dey and Lind voted No.

Member Likens left her seat at 3:15 p.m.

Member Armendariz left his seat at 3:15 p.m.

Member Collen left his seat at 3:15 p.m.

**13. Advisory Committee Enhancement (ACE) Update: February**

Stephen Flynn, Senior Management Analyst, noted the first ACE Task Force meeting was held at the end of January. The Task Force raised several issues and made two major requests: 1) to better define or clarify the problem they have been entrusted to fix; and 2) for the Board Chair to appoint a Board member to serve as the chair or facilitator for their committee.

Staff will provide the committee with a copy of the Bureau of State Audits Organizational and Time Management Assessment.

The next ACE meeting will be held at 11:30 a.m. on February 25, 2009.

Member Dey reported attending the ACE meeting on behalf of TAC. He noted the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), and the Committee for Transit Accessibility (CTA) are all struggling to determine what is required. The Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the TAC have charge, direction and are producing.

Mr. Flynn noted a concept was brought up during the ACE meeting that only the two primary members sitting at the table would provide input and the alternate would remain silent. Within the next email staff will make the recommendation that both members and alternates will participate in the meetings and if a vote is required only members will vote.

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Committee received a Brief Update on the Status and Progress of the Advisory Committee Enhancement Process to Date.

**14. Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for October to December 2008**

**On order of Chairperson Witthaus** and there being no objection, the Committee received the Programmed Projects Quarterly Monitoring Report for October to December 2008.

## OTHER

### 15. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Subcommittee

Member Dey reported on the Transportation System Monitoring program, requested and supported by VTA. The Subcommittee met with the consultant and felt the information was important enough to bring before the TAC.

Steve Decker of Cambridge Systematics, Inc. provided a handout entitled "Transportation System Monitoring Program for Santa Clara County - Business Plan Summary." Mr. Decker stated the project objective was to develop a comprehensive monitoring program that provides current information on the performance of transportation systems in Santa Clara County. Highlights of this presentation included: 1) Components of the Program; 2) Recommended Performance Areas; 3) Portions of the Overall Network to Include in Initial Program; and 4) Schedule.

Member Kass left his seat at 3:19 p.m.

Chairperson Witthaus left his seat at 3:20 p.m.,  
the quorum was lost, and a Committee of the Whole was declared.

**On general consensus** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole appointed Member Tripousis as Chairperson Pro Tempore.

**On order of Chairperson Pro Tempore Tripousis** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole received an update from the TAC Subcommittee.

### 16. Review the TAC Committee Work Plan

**On order of Chairperson Pro Tempore Tripousis** and there being no objection, the Committee of the Whole reviewed the TAC Committee Work Plan.

### 17. ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Announcements.

### 18. ADJOURNMENT

**On order of Chairperson Pro Tempore Tripousis** and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 3:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan E. Garcia, Board Assistant  
VTA Board of Directors