



STATE ROUTE 85 CORRIDOR POLICY ADVISORY BOARD

Monday, May 23, 2016

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Meeting of the State Route 85 Corridor Policy Advisory Board (SR 85) was called to order at 10:01 a.m. by Chairperson Sinks in Community Hall, 10350 Torre Avenue, Cupertino, California.

1. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status
Megan Satterlee	Member	Present
Barry Chang	Alternate Member	Absent
Howard Miller	Member	Present
Burton Craig	Alternate Member	Absent
Rod Sinks	Chairperson	Present
Jeannie Bruins	Alternate Member	Absent
John McAlister	Vice Chairperson	Present
Marcia Jensen	Member	Absent
Paul Resnikoff	Member	Present
Rob Rennie	Alternate Member	Present
Chappie Jones	Member	Present
Mary-Lynne Bernald	Alternate Member	Absent
Walter Huff	Member	Absent
Elizabeth Gibbons	Alternate Member	Absent
Glenn Hendricks	Member	Absent
Tara Martin-Milius	Alternate Member	Present
Pat Showalter	Alternate Member	Absent
Bijan Sartipi	Ex-Officio Member	Absent
Dan McElhinney	Ex-Officio Alt. Member	Absent

A quorum was present.

2. PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS:

Roland Lebrun, Interested Citizen, made the following comments: 1) driving a car is faster than taking transit; 2) expressed concern regarding bottlenecks on SR 85; and 3) analyze traffic patterns to gather information on where passengers are getting on and off transit.

Alternate Member Martin-Milius took her seat at 10:03 a.m.

3. ORDERS OF THE DAY

There were no Orders of the Day.

CONSENT AGENDA

Member Miller referenced Agenda Item #5 – Additional Information on the Transit Lane and Light Rail Alternatives and requested that the following report (Attachment 5.a) be sent to the VTA Board of Directors: Making a Successful Light Rail Transit (LRT)-Based Regional Transit System: Lessons from Five New Start Cities report be sent to the Board of Directors.

Public Comment

Ruth Calahan, Interested Citizen, made the following comments: 1) expressed concern that the April 25, 2016, meeting focused on bus alternatives which is not a clean alternative; 2) bus lanes will not solve the congestion on State Route 85 (SR 85) and mass transit is the answer.

4. Regular Meeting Minutes of April 25, 2016

M/S/C (McAlister/Jones) to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of April 25, 2016.

5. Additional Information on the Transit Lane and Light Rail Alternatives

M/S/C (McAlister/Jones) to receive a report on additional information for the Transit Lane and Light Rail Alternatives.

RESULT:	ADOPTED
MOVER:	John McAlister, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER:	Chappie Jones, Member
AYES:	Jones, Martin-Milius, McAlister, Miller, Rennie, Resnikoff, Satterlee, Sinks
NAYS:	None
ABSENT:	Huff

REGULAR AGENDA

6. Recommendation by the SR 85 Corridor PAB to the VTA Board of Directors on Transportation Improvements in the SR 85 Corridor for Inclusion in Envision Silicon Valley

Steven Fisher, Senior Transportation Planner, provided a presentation titled “Alternative Comparison on State Route 85”, highlighting: 1) SR 85 PAB Alternatives; 2) Comparison Metrics; 3) Transportation Metrics; 4) Transportation Metrics - AM Peak Period Person Throughput (5:30 AM to 9 AM); 5) Transportation Metrics - Vehicle Delay; 6) Transportation Metrics - Transit Ridership; 7) Transportation Metrics - Scoring; 8) Environmental Metrics; 9) Environmental Metrics - Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions; 10) Environmental Metrics - Vehicles-Miles Traveled (VMT); 11) Environmental Metrics

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

- Scoring; 12) Financial Metrics; 13) Financial Metrics - Capital Cost; 14) Financial Metrics - Operating Cost; 15) Financial Metrics - Revenue Generation; 16) Financial Metrics - Scoring; 17) Qualitative Metrics; 18) Qualitative Metrics - Scoring; 19) Overall; and 20) Overall - Scoring.

Member Satterlee took her seat at 10:33 a.m.

Members of the Committee and staff discussed the following: 1) clarification of alternatives; 2) assumption that transit includes corporate buses; 3) companies are reluctant to give information on how many of their employees use private buses; 4) use of dedicated lanes in off peak hours; 5) other funding sources; and 6) carpool occupancy.

George Naylor, Transportation Planning Manager, provided clarification on how modeling was done.

Public Comment

Ron Swenson, Interested Citizen, suggested the study focus on congestion, GHG emissions, and capital operating costs.

Mr. Lebrun made the following comments: 1) expressed support for an express lane and eventually a double express lanes; 2) commented on bus rapid transit (BRT); and 3) using double decker buses instead of articulated buses to accommodate more riders.

Steven Levin, Interested Citizen, made the following comments: 1) boarding numbers count passengers going to and from a destination; 2) in 2040 everything will be electric so GHG will not be a factor; and 3) not all transit riders in this corridor will be new in the future.

Cheriel Jensen, Interested Citizen, made the following comments: 1) fixed guideway was omitted in the analysis; 2) High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lane is not a solution and should not be considered.

Ms. Calahan made the following comments: 1) HOT lanes are the only alternative presented which will generate revenue; and 2) expressed concern that the HOT lane would start out as two lanes and eventually be one lane to make room for light rail.

Committee discussion continued on the alternatives.

M/S/C (McAlister/Jones) on a vote of 7 ayes to 1 nay to relieve traffic congestion and provide a new transit option to connect Santa Clara County residents to high-tech job centers, recommend that the improvement project for SR85, funded through *Envision Silicon Valley*: 1) construct a managed lanes project that includes an express lane on SR 85, in each direction, and a new transit lane on SR 85, from SR 87 in San Jose to U.S. 101 in Mountain View; 2) provide noise abatement along SR 85; and 3) in parallel study alternatives that include, but are not limited to, Bus Rapid Transit with infrastructure such

as stations and access ramps, Light Rail Transit, and other transportation technologies that may be applicable. This study will result in a capital improvement project that will move through State and Federal environmental clearance. Chairperson Sinks opposed.

Member Satterlee left the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

RESULT:	ADOPTED
MOVER:	John McAlister, Vice Chairperson
SECONDER:	Chappie Jones, Member
AYES:	Jones, Martin-Milius, McAlister, Miller, Rennie, Resnikoff, Satterlee
NAYS:	Sinks
ABSENT:	Huff

7. **Progress Report on the SR 85 PAB Work Program**

Mr. Fisher provided an overview of the Work Program, noting the next meeting will be held in Mountain View on Monday, June 20, 2016.

Vice Chairperson McAlister left the meeting at 12:15 p.m.

On order of Chairperson Sinks, and there being no objection, the Committee received a progress update on the State Route 85 Corridor Policy Advisory Board's Work Program.

8. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no Announcements.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

On order of Chairperson Sinks and there being no objection, the meeting was adjourned at 12:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Thalia Young, Board Assistant
VTA Office of the Board Secretary