**El Camino Real Rapid Transit Policy Advisory Board**

Wednesday, December 16, 2015

MINUTES

# CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the El Camino Real Rapid Transit (ECRRT) Policy Advisory Board (“Committee”) was called to order at 3:04 p.m. by Chairperson Bruins in VTA Conference Room B-104, 3331 North First Street, San José, California.

## 1. ROLL CALL

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attendee Name** | **Title** | **Representing** | **Status** |
| Jeannie Bruins | Chairperson | City of Los Altos | Present |
| Mary Prochnow | Alternate Member | City of Los Altos | N/A |
| Jamie Matthews | Member | City of Santa Clara | Present |
| Theresa O’Neill | Alternate Member | City of Santa Clara | N/A |
| Pierluigi Oliverio | Member | City of San José | Present |
| Chappie Jones | Alternate Member | City of San José | N/A |
| Leonard Siegel | Member | City of Mountain View | Present |
| John Inks | Alternate Member | City of Mountain View | N/A |
| Joe Simitian | Member | County of Santa Clara | Present |
| David Whittum | Member | City of Sunnyvale | Present |
| Jim Davis | Alternate Member | City of Sunnyvale | N/A |
| Cory Wolbach | Member | City of Palo Alto | Present |
| Liz Kniss | Alternate Member | City of Palo Alto | N/A |
| Ken Yeager | Vice Chairperson | County of Santa Clara | Present |
| *Vacant* |  | Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority | N/A |

## A quorum was present.

## 2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Roland Lebrun, Interested Citizen, provided a presentation and handout entitled “Geneva‑Harney Bus Rapid Transit Feasibility Study,” referring to the following: 1) Mode Share of NEW Trips by 2040; and 2) Mode Share of ALL Trips by 2040. He expressed concern regarding taking lanes away on El Camino Real.

Mr. Lebrun commented on the following: 1) asked why VTA has Bus Line 522 when Line 22 is faster; 2) suggested increasing the speed on the El Camino Real in Mountain View to 45 miles per hour; 3) indicated preemptive signaling would be helpful; and 4) suggested VTA consider converting the old Caltrain tracks to rail service.

## 3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

Chairperson Bruins requested **Agenda Item # 5**, 2016 El Camino Real Rapid Transit Policy Advisory Board (ECRRT PAB) Meeting Schedule, be heard later in the agenda.

**M/S/C (Whittum/Siegel)** to accept the Orders of the Day.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

**4. Regular Meeting Minutes of November 18, 2015**

**M/S/C (Whittum/Siegel)** to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of November 18, 2015.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**The Agenda was taken out of order**

**6. Discuss Pilot Project on El Camino Real**

Adam Burger, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a brief presentation entitled “El Camino Real Rapid Transit (ECRRT) Pilot Project on El Camino Real,” highlighting the following: 1) November 18, 2015, Policy Advisory Board (PAB) Meeting Recap; 2) Pilot Project Street Configuration; 3) Step 1 – Define Pilot Project Elements; 4) Step 2 – Project Length and Location; 5) Step 3 - Environmental Analysis & Caltrans Approval; 6) Safety Concerns – Accessing Driveways; 7) Safety Concerns – Parking Car; 8) Step 4 – “Before” Study; 9) Step 5 – Business & Community Outreach; 10) Step 6 – Implementation & “After” Study; and 11) Summary.

Discussion ensued regarding the following: 1) conducting the pilot project for the complete 17 mile length of the corridor; 2) how best to handle lane closure due to construction; 3) coordination and implementation of bike lanes and street parking; 4) right hand lane turning; and 5) street markings.

Members of the Committee made the following comments: 1) expressed concern about the prolonged implementation process; 2) High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane restrictions would be a local decision; and 3) commended graphics presentation noting they are very helpful.

Member Simitian queried about what the full implementation of the right lane option would include compared to the pilot project. Staff indicated full implementation would include enhanced stations that have a unique higher quality of transit service architecture about them as well as real time information. Upon completion of the Alum Rock Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, there would be an increase in frequency that cannot be observed in the pilot project.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Greg Coladonato, Interested Citizen, commented on the following: 1) commended Members of the Policy Advisory Board for their support of a right hand lane designed with peak period mixed flow with HOV use; 2) stated this configuration maximizes the potential benefit to the project while minimizing the adverse impacts; 3) suggested the Committee support a project that runs the full length of the corridor; 4) suggested VTA consider other options such as increasing the minimum number of persons required in a HOV vehicle from two to three persons; and 5) stated if the Committee is comfortable with this project, perhaps they want to recommend implementation or BRT along the corridor and skip the pilot project.

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

Mr. Lebrun commented on the following: 1) there are no cars parked along El Camino Real during peak hours; 2) stated VTA is ending the Day Pass and moving to Clipper Card only and suggested in January, 2016, VTA begin quantifying the impact to Clipper Card users, noting there will be a significant impact of at least five minutes; 3) suggested VTA begin using Global Positioning System (GPS) Bus Tracking to analyze slowing and stopping; 4) noted cities differ in their amount of right of way, and may need a different kind of pilot project; and 5) suggested a corridor study for El Camino Real similar to the one being done for State Route (SR) 85.

**On order of Chairperson Bruins** and there being no objection, theCommittee discussed the Pilot Project on El Camino Real.

**7.** **Define the Components of a Pilot Right-Lane BRT Project on El Camino Real**

Mr. Burger provided a handout entitled “El Camino BRT,” noting the Committee’s first decision is to choose one of the three levels of street markings: 1) minimal is least expensive and would only include signs located on the sidewalk. This option would provide the lowest rate of awareness and driver adherence to the restricted use lane; 2) moderate has a slightly higher cost and a higher awareness; and 3) full implementation bears the highest cost and provides the highest rate of adherence and awareness. He stated option three would be the closest, in terms of street marking, to the right lane recommendation of a full implementation of the project.

Chairperson Bruins requested the Committee switch the order and take the decisions in the following order: 1) decide on everyday restricted use or weekday-only restricted use; 2) decide whether restricted use would be all day or peak period only; and 3) choose minimal, moderate or full notification option.

Member Oliverio suggested a moderate plus option that would include adding red paint on the HOV lane near the intersection, following current standards, to help drivers identify lane restrictions. He noted his preference for everyday restricted use and expressed support for running the pilot project the entire length of the corridor to get the full impact of the pilot project.

Discussion ensued about the following: 1) queried about an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) on the right lane; 2) cost of full right lane permanent implementation versus the cost of the 17 mile pilot project; 3) pilot project will provide data on the direct impact to communities participating; 4) clarification whether two wheel vehicles would be allowed as they are on the freeway; 5) community support would be helpful to the project; 6) moving forward with a recommendation will allow each city the discretion of participating in the pilot; 7) uniform signage design for participating cities will make the Caltrans approval process easier; 8) suggested mirroring US Highway 101 signage for ease of understanding; 9) enforcement issues; 10) consider piloting the right hand turn lane; 11) suggest an educational program of HOV lane rules to help avoid confusion; and 12) defining HOV.

Member Wolbach noted preferences for the following: 1) moderate notification option; 2) conduct the pilot for the full length of 17 miles; and 3) all day, weekday-only restricted use.

Member Whittum noted preferences for the following: 1) moderate-plus approach with red paint at intersections; 2) peak period, weekday-only restricted use; and 3) conduct the pilot project for the full length of 17 miles.

Chairperson Bruins stated the hope is that the Committee can concur on a preferred alternative, and return to their City Council with the reasoning on why each alternative was chosen.

Member Oliverio queried if Members of the Committee could all agree on full length with moderate notification.

Member Simitian noted his preference for full length with local choice.

Member Siegel noted preferences for the following: 1) moderate plus notification; 2) weekday-only restricted use; 3) peak-period only restricted use; and 4) conduct the pilot project for the full length of 17 miles. He stated the Committee should commit to going back to their respective City Councils to advocate that cities take part in the pilot project.

Member Yeager noted preferences for the following: 1) full notification or moderate-plus option; 2) peak period-only restricted use; 3) weekday-only restricted use; and 4) conduct the pilot project for the full length of 17 miles.

Member Matthews noted preferences for the following: 1) moderate‑plus notification with enhanced signage at the intersection; 2) peak-period only restricted use; 3) weekday‑only restricted use; and 4) conduct the pilot project for the full length of 17 miles.

Chairperson Bruins noted preferences for the following: 1) moderate-plus notification with enhanced signage at the intersection; 2) peak-period only restricted use; 3) weekday-only restricted use; and 4) conduct the pilot project for the full length of 17 miles.

Mr. Burger clarified that VTA would need two pieces of buy in from each city: 1) council action volunteering the city to implement the pilot project; and 2) an enforcement agreement with the police department that they would enforce.

**M/S/C (Oliverio/Whittim)** to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors, as amended,to pursue a pilot project along the full length, 17 miles, subject to participation by each individual city.

Mr. Simitian noted he does not support requiring participation, or attempting to impose participation on any individual city. Several members of the Committee concurred.

**M/S/C (Oliverio/Yeager)** to approve submitting a recommendation to the Board of Directors, as amended, to advise VTA staff to implement a pilot project consisting of the following:

1. Moderate plus
2. Peak period-only restricted use consistent with standards currently used on expressways and highways
3. Weekday-only restricted use
4. HOV consistent with current standards

Chairperson Bruins clarified that the implementation of the pilot project was not conditional upon all cities opting to participate, and the pilot project could be implemented with fewer participants. She indicated it is the Policy Advisory Board’s hope that all cities will participate.

**5. 2016 El Camino Real Rapid Transit Policy Advisory Board (ECRRT PAB) Meeting Schedule.**

**M/S/C (Whittum/Matthews)** to approve the 2016 El Camino Real Rapid Transit Policy Advisory Board (ECRRT PAB) Meeting Schedule.

**8. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Chairperson Bruins noted the next meeting is scheduled for January 27, 2016.

## 9. ADJOURNMENT

**On order of Chairperson Bruins** and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 4: 25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Anita McGraw, Board Assistant

VTA Office of the Board Secretary