



# CITY OF PALO ALTO CITY COUNCIL FINAL MINUTES

Special Meeting  
May 13, 2019

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 5:08 P.M.

Present: Cormack, DuBois, Filseth, Fine arrived at 5:11 P.M., Kniss, Kou, Tanaka

Absent:

## Special Orders of the Day

1. Proclamation Honoring Affordable Housing Week.

Mayor Filseth read the proclamation into the record.

Sheryl Klein, Palo Alto Housing Corporation thanked the Council for supporting affordable housing and keeping the community economically diverse. She encouraged the Council to do all it could to expedite the creation of more affordable housing.

Council Member Kniss hoped the Wilton Court Affordable Housing Project could break ground in 2019. She thanked Ms. Klein for leading the effort to make the project possible.

## Study Session

2. Presentation and Discussion With the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain) Staff Regarding the 2040 Caltrain Business Plan.

Ed Shikada, City Manager remarked that Caltrain staff made significant progress on developing a Business Plan. The Study Session was to provide a foundation for the Council's decisions regarding grade separations and land use issues.

Sebastian Petty, Caltrain Director of Policy Development reported the Business Plan was a Long-Range Comprehensive Plan for service and the Caltrain Corridor. The Business Plan focused on service, a business case, the community interface and organizational structure. The first part of the process focused on development of a long-range vision for the Corridor and service. In July, 2019 the Caltrain Board was to consider different options for the long-range vision and adopt one of them. It was estimated that the

# FINAL MINUTES

Business Plan could be complete by the end of 2019. Electrification was to be a transformational project for the Caltrain system. Caltrain was committed to sharing the Corridor with High Speed Rail. The questions were how much growth and what growth would look like. The State Rail Plan envisioned much higher levels of rail service around the State. Projections suggested there could be a 40 percent increase in human density around train stations by 2040. The future Corridor was to be much more connected with other transit. Modeling predicted service levels similar to those of Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) was to result in ridership similar to that of BART. With frequent BART-like service and 2040 projected land uses, Caltrain ridership had the potential to increase to more than 240,000 riders per day. They developed scenarios for baseline, moderate and high growth. Parameters for the scenarios were one hour of peak service in one direction on the Corridor from San Francisco to Gilroy in 2040. The baseline scenario projected two trains per hour per direction and four High Speed Rail trains with one four-track section at the Millbrae station for a High Speed Rail stop. The moderate growth scenario added two Caltrain trains for a total of 12 trains per hour per direction inclusive of High Speed Rail trains. With eight trains, Caltrain was able to offer a 15 minute local service and a 15 minute express service. The moderate growth scenario required four-track sections in Millbrae, San Mateo, Redwood City and northern Santa Clara County. A four-track segment had the ability to be constructed at the California Avenue Station, Palo Alto Station, San Antonio Station or Mountain View Station. The high growth scenario considered 16 trains per hour per direction, a 15 minute local Caltrain, two 15 minute express trains serving different stations, and three extensive four-track segments. The four-track segments were north of the Millbrae Station, around Redwood City/Hillsdale, and in northern Santa Clara County. Projections indicated the baseline scenario were to generate 161,000 riders every weekday, 180,000 riders for the moderate growth scenario, and 207,000 riders for the high growth scenario. The all-day ridership projections for the three scenarios were not dramatically different. The business case for each scenario included the full spectrum of costs and benefits. The primary issue for the Caltrain Corridor was at-grade crossings. Caltrain owned 42 crossings between San Francisco and San Jose. Part of the investment needed to support growth was grade separations. Corridor-wide, an estimated \$8.5-\$11 billion was needed to address at-grade crossings and higher levels of service. All crossings under active study by a City in the Corridor were included in that amount. Caltrain had no intention of telling cities how to handle individual crossings, but a Corridor-wide view of grade separations was beneficial in addressing standards, options, construction sequencing and methodology, continued Caltrain service, community disruptions, and funding. Under the various scenarios, the number of weekday trains and the number of trains per hour per direction at the Palo Alto Station dramatically increased ridership. The

# FINAL MINUTES

California Avenue Station was going to have a 15 minute service in both directions and sizable increases in ridership. Potential gate down times were of concern. Within its projections, Caltrain had included placeholder costs of \$255 million per crossing for Palo Alto grade separations and \$355 million for a four-track segment. The costs were to be updated once the City reached a final decision for grade separation. In July, 2019 the Caltrain Board was going to hold a workshop to consider the analyses of service, costs, economics, the organization, and community interface. Based on feedback from the Board and cities, Caltrain staff was able to recommend a Board action as soon as August, 2019. Once the Board determined the long-range vision, Caltrain staff was going to prepare near-term steps to improve service and analyze first and last mile access to stations and funding and revenue options.

Casey Fromson, Government and Community Affairs Director advised that outreach included regular updates to the Local Policy Maker Group, a stakeholder advisory group and public meetings at sister agencies. The Business Plan was customized for each city through individual booklets. All presentations regarding the Business Plan were available on Caltrain's website at: [caltrain2040.org](http://caltrain2040.org).

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain appreciated Caltrain's regional grade-separation strategy, which had the potential to use existing funding. Caltrain growth was going to provide traffic congestion relief. Feasible alternatives had the potential to use State and regional funding for projects. With more riders and lower electric service costs, Caltrain needed to analyze its fare structure.

Stephen Rosenblum noted the discussion did not include funding sources or freight. Each community was not able to develop plans for grade separations and funding independently. Caltrain needed to decide whether freight trains would be electrified or removed from Caltrain tracks.

Roland LeBrun remarked that more trains could stop at the California Avenue Station if a four-track segment was constructed there. If a Sales Tax was implemented, revenues from Santa Clara County needed to be utilized for Santa Clara County projects. In addition, Measure B funding for Caltrain had the potential to be reallocated if a Sales Tax was approved.

Phil Burton inquired about a plan to get the increased number of riders to and from Caltrain stations.

Megan Kanne noted the presentation contained interesting information regarding existing and projected gate down times for Palo Alto.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kniss understood there was a preliminary analysis of a Sales Tax for the three counties.

Ms. Fromson indicated State legislation allowed Caltrain to place a Sales Tax Measure for the three counties on the ballot. The legislation required seven other entities to agree to Caltrain placing a measure on the ballot. A regional measure was also being discussed. The Caltrain Board requested polling around a November or March, 2020 election. Polling results were available on the website.

Council Member Kniss noted Caltrain had no dedicated funding. She hoped a measure was placed on the ballot and the measure was crafted so that it had a good chance of receiving two-thirds approval from the voters.

Vice Mayor Fine inquired whether the only Palo Alto service difference between the moderate and high growth scenarios was one express service to the Palo Alto Station.

Mr. Petty replied yes.

Vice Mayor Fine requested more detail regarding the four-track segment for north Santa Clara County.

Mr. Petty indicated the segment, a couple of miles in length, was going to be located between Palo Alto and Mountain View.

Vice Mayor Fine inquired whether the growth projected in the high growth scenario originated from growth or existing demand.

Mr. Petty indicated the projected growth was based on projected changes in land use and users' responses to changes in the transportation network.

Vice Mayor Fine asked if Caltrain had considered charging the 400,000 cars per day that use grade crossings throughout the Corridor as a means to fund grade separation.

Mr. Petty did not believe Caltrain had considered such an option.

Vice Mayor Fine requested more details regarding a regional funding strategy that Caltrain would be interested in leading.

Mr. Petty commented that the amount of funding, potentially \$11 billion, would have to come from multiple sources. Caltrain hoped to leverage significantly larger amounts of State funding than was currently available for grade separations. Individually, grade-separation projects had not been

# FINAL MINUTES

competitive for Federal funding. There needed to be some kind of new revenue measure.

Vice Mayor Fine encouraged Caltrain to talk with cities about positioning their grade-separation projects to obtain greater amounts of funding. He appreciated the comparison of Caltrain expansion to freeway expansion. At the baseline scenario, ridership would increase from 7,000 riders to 14,000 riders at the Palo Alto Station. That fact was useful in drafting the Coordinated Area Plan (CAP) for Downtown.

Council Member Cormack requested information regarding Stanford University's role as a partner with Caltrain.

Mr. Petty explained that Caltrain was working with Stanford University to offset the cost of the project and to utilize Stanford University's contracting capacity to hire experts. According to provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Stanford University, contractors were not going to perform certain work.

Council Member Cormack asked who determined the location of the four-track segment in the moderate scenario and how it would be funded.

Mr. Petty indicated there was some flexibility as to the location of the four-track segment in northern Santa Clara County. The segment was needed for High Speed Rail trains to pass Caltrain trains. Caltrain was not likely to proceed with specific planning for passing tracks until High Speed Rail reached some milestones. Caltrain was going to conduct a detailed feasibility and engineering study to review the areas where passing tracks were possible. Improvements were designed to be phased over time so that improved service could occur over time.

Council Member Cormack requested Caltrain's vision for project coordination and sequencing.

Mr. Petty related that Caltrain wanted to plan for the Corridor while supporting cities' projects for grade separation. If a city developed a project with sufficient funding, then Caltrain needed to negotiate with the city to fit the project into plans for the Corridor and other capital projects.

Council Member Kou asked if Caltrain was aware of any State legislation that would eliminate High Speed Rail for a portion of the Corridor and reallocate funding to regional transportation agencies.

# FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Fromson advised that State and Federal legislation had been proposed that would make significant changes to High Speed Rail; however, none of the bills were passed. She was not aware of a bill with the provisions stated.

Council Member Kou inquired whether Caltrain would be willing to support such a bill.

Ms. Fromson agreed to explore the bill.

Council Member Kou inquired about funding available for Caltrain electrification.

Ms. Fromson reported electrification infrastructure was fully funded. Service was scheduled to begin in 2022.

Mr. Petty indicated the major source of funding for Caltrain operations was fares. A small amount of funding was received from local member funding, which was contributions from the three counties that made up the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board. Federal and State funds and smaller local member contributions provided funding for maintenance and small capital projects. Large capital projects were typically funded on an individual basis.

Council Member Kou asked if riders using Clipper cards could be counted in ridership.

Mr. Petty explained that Clipper data was useful but not comprehensive. The most comprehensive data came from annual and triennial surveys of riders.

Ms. Fromson suggested Council Members review the individual booklet for Palo Alto because it contained station-specific information.

Council Member Kou asked if the Go Pass was similar to the Clipper card.

Mr. Petty advised that the Go Pass was in transition from an employee program to the Clipper card.

Council Member DuBois noted traffic at the California Avenue Station would decrease under the high scenario.

Mr. Petty believed the likely cause of the decrease was the significant service increase at the Palo Alto Station.

Council Member DuBois wanted to see more service at the California Avenue Station because Stanford Research Park was growing. He asked if the Business Plan contemplated any changes to the governance of Caltrain.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Petty related that Stanford University was assisting Caltrain with an assessment of Caltrain governance and different options for the system. Information would be provided to the Caltrain Board at its July meeting.

Council Member DuBois inquired whether Caltrain used Plan Bay Area data in its forecasts.

Mr. Petty replied yes.

Council Member DuBois felt Plan Bay Area data was historically overestimated.

Mr. Petty reported Plan Bay Area provided official projections for the region. Caltrain had updated Plan Bay Area data with City data. Ridership within two miles of a Palo Alto station included riders from Stanford University.

Council Member DuBois asked if Caltrain utilized data from the conditions of approval for the Stanford University General Use Permit (GUP).

Mr. Petty answered no. Sensitivity data around demand was to be conducted at some future time.

Council Member DuBois requested the process for the Caltrain Board to choose among the scenarios.

Mr. Petty stated Caltrain staff was going to utilize the benefits and cost information for each scenario to make a recommendation to the Caltrain Board. The Board's decision was going to set a long-range target for the growth of the system. The Board planned on adopting indicative language for target number of trains per hour, style of service, and relative quantity of infrastructure needed.

Council Member DuBois expressed concern about the high scenario and favored the moderate scenario. He inquired regarding the effect of Caltrain planning a four-track segment in Palo Alto when the City was planning for two tracks.

Mr. Petty recommended the City's planning process consider four tracks for each crossing and determine whether a particular style of grade separation was to preclude four tracks. Caltrain did not always construct four tracks where needed but planned a grade separation that would not preclude four tracks in the future.

Council Member DuBois asked if Sales Tax revenues could be used for infrastructure.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Petty advised that an Expenditure Plan for Sales Tax revenue had not been developed because an Expenditure Plan determined the allocation of funding.

Council Member DuBois inquired whether Caltrain was considering other forms of taxes, particularly a Business-Related Tax.

Mr. Petty indicated future discussions of funding would include a broad range of options.

Council Member DuBois understood the Electrification Project had been delayed. A Caltrain representative's participation in City grade separation discussions was useful. He supported an entity such as a construction authority to coordinate grade separation projects in the region.

Mayor Filseth clarified that the Palo Alto Transportation Management Association (TMA) utilized Clipper cards in its programs, and having usage data for Clipper cards helped determine the effectiveness of programs. He asked if Caltrain intended to electrify service to Gilroy.

Mr. Petty disclosed that the High Speed Rail 2018 Business Plan proposed an extension of the blended system to Gilroy, which would help Caltrain. Negotiations between the State and Union Pacific (UP) for that extension were ongoing.

Mayor Filseth inquired whether the Baseline Scenario assumed diesel or electrified trains traveling to Gilroy.

Mr. Petty indicated the baseline scenario was based on all previous planning efforts, which assumed diesel trains. The Baseline Scenario assumed electrified service, but it was a low level of service because of the assumed use of diesel trains. If electrified infrastructure was constructed, Caltrain intended to operate more trains than suggested in the baseline scenario.

Mayor Filseth believed electrified service to Gilroy was of considerable interest. He asked if Caltrain reviewed Stanford University's Expansion Plan and included that in the growth projections.

Mr. Petty reported modeling included only plans that had been adopted or approved by agencies. Caltrain staff was aware of many plans for growth by a variety of entities in the region.

Mayor Filseth felt there was a considerable gap between Caltrain's and the City's estimates of Palo Alto ridership. The gap should be refined.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Petty reiterated that Stanford University growth was likely the cause of the gap.

Mayor Filseth suggested most of the increase could be caused by Stanford University growth.

## Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

None.

## City Manager Comments

Ed Shikada, City Manager reported a record 2,400 bicyclists visited the energizer stations during Bike to Work Day. The Spring Disaster Drill was going to be held on May 18, 2019.

## Oral Communications

Sven Thesen requested the Council adopt strong Building Reach Codes that banned natural gas in new residential construction, a strong incentive program for conversion from gas appliances to electric appliances, and a plan to end the use of natural gas.

Neilson Buchanan asked the Council to agendize an item to review the sale of and demand for residential parking permits.

Chris Storer expressed annoyance with the Business Registry process. He was not able to complete the online process, and the paper questionnaire was considerably longer and contained information different from the online process. He presented his check in payment of Bell's Books' fee.

Kathy Alford shared her difficulties with her landlord and expressed shock that the City had not enacted renter protections. The Palo Alto Mediation Program had informed her that it had no authority to assist her with an eviction. She hoped the City would take action to help renters in Palo Alto.

Rita Vrhel announced a cleanup day for Eleanor Pardee Park was scheduled for May 25, 2019. The Council needed to provide renters with basic human rights.

Roberta Ahlquist, Peninsula Women's International League for Peace and Freedom remarked that tenants in Palo Alto were unprotected. The Council had done next to nothing to help renters and they needed to take action.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mary Sylvester concurred with the comments of Ms. Vrhel and Ms. Ahlquist. A video of Dr. Kristina Hill's environmental presentation was available at [savepaloaltosgroundwater.org](http://savepaloaltosgroundwater.org).

Kerry Yarkin advised the Council that the consolidation of airplane routes had resulted in a concentration of air traffic directly over Palo Alto. The City needed to take action to stop the consolidation of routes.

Roland LeBrun reported hearings held the prior week in the State Assembly and Senate revealed Legislators' desire to allocate funding for Caltrain electrification to the bookend cities, rather than in the Central Valley.

Mark Mollineaux commented that renters systemically had been the victims of economic segregation in Palo Alto. Land was disproportionately being used for luxury single-family homes. Exclusionary zoning meant to victimize renters, which needed to be demolished.

## Consent Calendar

Council Member Kou registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 5.

Council Member DuBois registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 5.

Tina Chow, speaking regarding Agenda Item Number 6 did not want any pending or future applications for wireless facilities to be approved, permitted or installed prior to the updated Ordinance becoming effective. She proposed the City allow citizens to hire a law firm to draft an amended Ordinance on behalf of Staff.

Jennifer Schmidt, speaking regarding Agenda Item Number 6 requested the City delay permitting the recently approved wireless facility in Barron Park until the community was able to appeal the decision approving the application.

Joanna Rashid, speaking regarding Agenda Item Number 6 advised that the Barron Park Executive Board voted to appeal the decision approving the Cluster 2 wireless facility. The Council needed to require the facility to be placed more than 200 feet away from Barron Park Elementary School.

**MOTION:** Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Cormack to approve Agenda Item Numbers 3-7.

3. Acceptance of the City of Palo Alto Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan in Compliance With the San Francisco Bay Area Municipal Regional Stormwater Permit.

# FINAL MINUTES

4. Resolution 9831 Entitled "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Extending the City Manager's Authority to Execute Transactions Under Master Renewable Energy Certificate Purchase and Sale Agreements With Pre-qualified Suppliers in an Amount Not-to-Exceed \$5,000,000 per Year During Calendar Years 2019-2024; and Repealing Resolution Number 9379."
5. Ordinance 5464 Entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto to Amend Title 18 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code to Allow for Minor Increases in Height and Floor Area to Provide Access to Rooftop Decks on Existing Structures in the Commercial Downtown (Community) CD-C Subdistrict. Environmental Assessment: Exempt per Sections 15301 and 15305 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. Zone District: CD-C(GF)(P). (FIRST READING: February 25, 2019 PASSED: 5-2 DuBois, Kou no)."
6. Ordinance 5465 Entitled "Ordinance of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Amending Section 18.42.110 (Wireless Communication Facilities) of Chapter 18.42 (Standards for Special Uses) of Title 18 (Zoning) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) to Update the Code to Reflect Recently Adopted Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Regulations. This Ordinance is Exempt From Environmental Review Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Sections 15061(b)(3) and 15305 (FIRST READING: April 15, 2019 PASSED: 6-0 Tanaka Absent)."
7. Approval of Amendment Number 2 to Contract Number C19172281 With Municipal Resource Group (MRG) to Increase the Not-to-Exceed Compensation by \$50,000 (for a new Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$200,000) to Provide Continued Transportation Support Services for the Office of Transportation.

**MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEM NUMBERS 3-4, 6-7: 7-0**

**MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEM NUMBERS 5: 5-2 DuBois, Kou no**

Council Member Kou opposed the Ordinance because there was no clear enforcement mechanism for excessive noise or the Conditional Use Permit.

# FINAL MINUTES

## Action Items

8. Acceptance of the City of Palo Alto Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) Program Study Report and Direction to Staff on Workplans, Outreach, Stakeholder Process, and Prioritization of Programs, Including Proposed RPP Programs for Old Palo Alto and Green Acres.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, reported residents had provided a significant amount of feedback for the item. Staff initiated the report because of Staff's inability to timely administer the Residential Preferential Parking Permit (RPP) Programs. They retained a consultant to recommend steps that would provide sustainability and stability for the RPP Programs and that ensured the programs fulfilled the goals of the City. Implementation of the programs created layers of complexity that frustrated both the community and Staff.

Wayne Tanda, MRG Consultant advised that an RPP program provided preferential parking privileges to residents and employees within a district and was intended to restore and enhance the quality of life in residential neighborhoods by reducing the negative impacts associated with parking. The boundaries of an RPP district usually coincided with the boundaries of a residential neighborhood. The five RPP Districts in Palo Alto encompassed 28 percent of the City's households. The College Terrace RPP Program exempted residents from weekday two-hour parking time limits and was generally successful. The Crescent Park RPP Program exempted residents from no-parking regulations between 2:00 and 5:00 P.M. and was generally successful. In developing the Citywide RPP Ordinance, the Council attempted to balance residents' desires with adjoining businesses' needs. The provisions of the Citywide Ordinance were relatively complicated. The Downtown RPP, the Evergreen Park-Mayfield RPP, and the Southgate RPP were all established under the Citywide Ordinance and were only partially successful. In an effort to disseminate parking throughout the RPP Districts, Staff divided the districts into zones. In the outlying zones, 81 percent of total parking spaces were available. In other zones, 33 percent of total parking spaces were available. Parking spaces were potentially occupied by residents, employees or business customers. When given a choice, 75 percent of employees chose to park in garages and lots rather than neighborhoods. Approximately 5 percent of spaces in garages and lots remained vacant. About 25 percent of employees parked on the street in neighborhoods. Of the total employee parking permits available, 84 percent were issued to employees. Visitors and customers received preferential treatment through their ability to utilize short-term parking in commercial areas, garages, lots and the RPP Districts. However, the parking areas designated for visitors/customers, the time limit for each area, and the boundaries of each area were confusing for visitors and customers that were

# FINAL MINUTES

new to Palo Alto. The RPP Programs were challenging to administer because each district contained multiple customized provisions, new districts were requested, and parking systems improved, all of which led to Staff turnover and frustration. MRG provided five recommendations for Council action, 21 recommendations for City Manager action, and nine recommendations for community engagement. To reduce the number of employee permits available in the Downtown RPP District, the City Council was able to implement a predetermined annual reduction in the number of available permits, reduce the number of available permits to the number of permits purchased, or reduce the number of available permits by the number of new off-street spaces created. The Council was able to obtain community input through Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) public meetings, a working group convened by the City Manager or a working group established by the City Council.

Neilson Buchanan hoped the stakeholder process would include discussion of each of the 35 recommendations. The community was very interested in participating in the process.

Jeneen Nammar commented regarding the challenges of the RPP Program for 58 residents near Gunn High School.

Mark Mollineaux noted future housing densification could drastically increase parking congestion. Perhaps the City needed to price parking permits high enough to discourage residents from owning vehicles.

Carol Scott understood the purpose of constructing the California Avenue parking garage was to reduce the number of employee permits in the Evergreen Park-Mayfield RPP District. A policy to reduce the number of employee permits needed to be established before the California Avenue garage was ready for occupancy.

William Chrisman asked the Council to direct Staff to study the safety aspects of on-street parking for vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians.

Fred Balin remarked that the College Terrace RPP Program was successful; however, the recommendations were going to improve it.

Ryan Fisher requested extension of free or low-cost residential permits to the Green Acres II RPP Program.

Kathy Alford advised that the Evergreen Park RPP Program was successful and urged the Council to resolve the issues in other RPP Programs.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Cormack preferred community feedback be received during PTC meetings.

**MOTION:** Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Fine to:

- A. Accept the City of Palo Alto Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) Program Review Report by the City's consultant, Municipal Resource Group (MRG), and direct Staff to return to City Council with a workplan to address the items in the report;
- B. Use the Planning and Transportation Commission as the preferred forum for resident and business community engagement in evaluating the recommendations of the MRG report;
- C. Direct Staff to continue the proposed RPP district outreach and stakeholder process for Old Palo Alto and Green Acres, in accordance with the Planning and Transportation Commission's recommended prioritization; and
- D. Confirm that modifications to existing RPP districts (e.g., number of permits, etc.) will be put on hold until potential overall program changes are considered.

Council Member Cormack requested Staff elaborate regarding parking availability standards.

Mr. Tanda indicated a parking availability standard could be based on residents' satisfaction with the amount of parking currently available. The standard was to be subjective.

Mr. Shikada clarified that the standard would be quantified.

Council Member Cormack felt both neighborhoods near the high schools should be treated similarly. Four vehicles may not fit in front of some of the narrower lots in the City. A provision for neighborhood-serving businesses was going to be difficult to administer. The City's annual investment in parking was significant.

Vice Mayor Fine believed the report provided needed information for the Council. The proposed changes rationalized RPP Programs and made them easier to administer and measure. Setting standards was important. Simplifying prices created more flexible periods of use. The quid pro quo model was fair and efficient. The PTC should be the venue for public

# FINAL MINUTES

engagement. He inquired whether the application for an RPP District in Old Palo Alto could be accelerated.

Mr. Tanda reported Staff had accelerated the application by gathering base data.

Vice Mayor Fine requested the goal of evaluating rideshare services.

Mr. Tanda related that an evaluation would determine the number of people who utilized rideshare services rather than parking in neighborhoods.

Vice Mayor Fine inquired regarding the PTC's rationale for narrowing the focus for the Green Acres RPP Program.

Ed Lauing, Planning and Transportation Commissioner related that the PTC encouraged Staff and consultants to consider an interim program because of the length of time before additional RPP Programs could be implemented. The problem with the Green Acres RPP Program was likely to be handled administratively.

Council Member DuBois understood the RPP Programs were revenue neutral once signs were installed.

Mr. Shikada was confident the programs were not revenue neutral.

Council Member DuBois shared a bit of the history of developing the RPP Programs. The Council was always interested in the low-income permits for service workers. Palo Alto appeared to be the only City that allowed office workers to purchase parking permits. The Council attempted to assist the Transportation Management Association (TMA) by reducing the number of employee permits available each year. He expressed concern regarding the effects of increased housing development on RPP Programs. The workplan needed to include evaluation of a residents-only RPP program. A method to allocate employee permits was needed. The number of employee permits in the Downtown RPP had effectively been reduced by 200 permits each year; however, the number of permits was to be reduced by 200 permits annually. Staff needed to remember to reduce employee permits in the Evergreen Park RPP once the California Avenue garage was complete.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to direct Staff to consider as part of the workplan the impacts of residential zoning changes, evaluate a resident-only permit program, and consider allocation mechanisms for business permits.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Cormack noted the Staff Report stated the recommendations did not consider any new development.

Mr. Tanda concurred.

Council Member Cormack felt directing Staff to evaluate the impacts of residential zoning changes would be substantial work for Staff.

Council Member DuBois clarified that Staff would determine the potential impacts of the underlying zoning, not the impacts of development projects. He said the number of RPP zones may need to be adjusted because the Council had re-zoned some parts of the City for higher density housing.

Council Member Cormack requested clarification of a resident-only permit program.

Council Member DuBois understood Staff would develop a standardized and simplified RPP for the City and suggested the standard RPP be resident-only. The Council was then able to craft exceptions for commercial areas within each new RPP District.

Council Member Cormack requested the difference between that and the existing Citywide standard.

Council Member DuBois explained that a resident-only RPP would be the default for future requests for RPP Programs.

Vice Mayor Fine supported allocation mechanisms for business permits. A resident-only RPP as a standard was completely different from the existing standard RPP. He hesitated to include it in the workplan.

Council Member DuBois wanted to know the City's existing standard RPP Program.

Vice Mayor Fine clarified that the current default was a custom RPP for each district, and Staff would streamline them into one mixed model. Using a resident-only model for the standard was going to be a significant change.

Council Member DuBois did not intend to remove the Downtown employee permits. He interpreted the Staff Report as Staff would propose a standardized RPP Program for new RPP Districts and subsequently revise the existing RPP Programs to be similar and standardized.

Mr. Tanda reported the key component of an RPP Program was the boundaries of the district. The RPP Programs for Downtown and California Avenue were challenging because the RPPs included commercial areas.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member DuBois inquired whether the workplan evaluated changing the existing boundaries.

Mr. Tanda replied no because it involved a significant policy issue.

Vice Mayor Fine anticipated Staff and the PTC would consider RPPs with the recent zoning changes.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to remove from the Motion “direct Staff to consider as part of the workplan the impacts of residential zoning changes, evaluate a resident-only permit program...”

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to amend the Motion Part A to state “including consideration of allocation mechanisms for business permits.”

Council Member DuBois noted the Council's history had been to reduce the number of permits based on demand.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether the intent was to reduce the number of employee permits to zero.

Council Member DuBois responded no. The policy to reduce the number of permits each year was good.

Mayor Filseth interpreted the Amendment as the annual reduction would occur automatically rather than the Council determining the reduction each year.

Council Member DuBois wanted to apply pressure for the policy to remain.

Council Member Cormack asked if Council Member DuBois was concerned about the Downtown RPP solely.

Council Member DuBois answered Evergreen Park and Downtown.

Council Member Cormack asked if the Evergreen Park RPP included annual reductions.

Council Member DuBois advised that the annual reductions would begin once the California Avenue garage was complete.

Vice Mayor Fine indicated Staff had offered three policies for making the annual reductions: use it or lose it, a predetermined number, or quid pro

# FINAL MINUTES

quo. He wanted additional information about those policy choices, and that particular decision was not before the Council.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to amend the Motion Part D to change the word "considered" to "decided."

Council Member DuBois inquired whether the policy decisions would return to the Council.

Council Member Cormack responded yes.

Council Member DuBois asked if Staff envisioned continuing the existing process for neighborhoods to request an RPP Program.

Mr. Tanda responded yes, but the City Council could direct Staff at any time to evaluate an RPP Program for a neighborhood. If the Council wished to change the process, it would have to change the Ordinance.

Council Member Kniss requested clarification of "consideration of allocation mechanisms for business permits."

Council Member DuBois reported Staff would craft a process to allocate employee permits to businesses in an RPP when the businesses could not purchase permits via the usual process. A few years ago, a business in Evergreen Park purchased all the allotted employee permits, leaving no employee permits for other businesses in Evergreen Park to purchase. In addition, if permits were sold monthly, a process was needed to ensure businesses could purchase permits as needed throughout the year.

Council Member Kniss recalled in 2012 the Council promised the community it would deal with the parking issue in the Downtown area, and the Council had fulfilled that promise. The RPP process was a work in progress. The PTC's willingness to participate in the process made a difference. She requested additional information regarding the staffing issues.

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Interim Chief Transportation Official (CTO), advised that exit interviews with Transportation Services Staff revealed administering the RPP Program was a heavy burden for a variety of reasons, including the extensive contact with constituents and navigating the different districts and different provisions for each district to ensure each constituent received the desired permits. Also, Staff had other duties to perform along with administering RPP Programs. Changing the RPP Programs helped the organization develop a sustainable team.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Tanda commented that Staff wanted to fulfill the public's expectations, and that was extremely difficult because the RPP Programs were not uniform. Other cities had implemented RPP Programs with uniform standards and clear directions. The Crescent Park and College Terraces RPP Programs were more successful because they followed the traditional model. The City's investments in contracts and a contract administrator would be critical in advancing the programs.

Mr. Shikada stated the discussion had a direct bearing on his ability to hire and retain a Chief Transportation Official (CTO). One exit interviewee revealed that battling the commute was one issue and being ground down every day in the workplace was another issue. The turnover rate for the office had been extremely high over the past few years. Staff could not successfully meet the goals of the RPP Program under the existing circumstances.

Council Member Kniss indicated wayfinding in the parking garages made a big difference when people were trying to determine if there was an available space. She inquired whether the valet program would be expanded.

Mark Hur, Parking Operations Lead clarified that Staff needed to expand eligibility for the California Avenue and Downtown RPP Districts in order to sell permits for the parking spaces created by the valet program.

Council Member Kou inquired whether Menlo Park had an RPP Program or restrictions on parking.

Mr. Tanda needed to check on that.

Council Member Kou did not believe Menlo Park allowed overnight parking on City streets. Menlo Park issued parking permits to residents only in the areas north and south of Menlo Park's downtown area. She asked if Staff wanted the Council to require parking permits in the Downtown commercial area.

Mr. Tanda intended on including the Downtown commercial area in the RPP District, but the map did not show that. An administrative action corrected the map.

Council Member Kou inquired whether permit parking was allowed in the two-hour parking zones.

Mr. Tanda answered no.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou requested the rationale for not including the parking impacts of new residential and commercial developments in the scope of the project.

Mr. Tanda suggested the project was large enough without including those parking impacts. He said they could be analyzed, but it would not be a small effort.

Council Member Kou inquired whether the workplan included an evaluation of the use and effectiveness of mechanical lifts.

Mr. Shikada reported that evaluation would be more appropriate for Code Enforcement and would not be a component of the RPP workplan.

Council Member Kou asked if the use of mechanical lifts was a component of counting parking spaces.

Mr. Shikada indicated a count of spaces was not a part of the workplan. Staff was able to explore including a count in the scope of work.

Council Member Kou inquired whether the City had allocated almost \$1 million toward the TMA over the prior two Fiscal Years (FY).

Mr. Shikada said he would provide the information at a later time.

Council Member Kou inquired regarding enforcement by the Police Department and the Office of Transportation.

Mr. Tanda related that the Police Department was responsible for the enforcement of parking regulations, with the exception of RPP Districts. The Office of Transportation's contractor and the Police Department enforced parking regulations in RPP Districts.

Mr. Hur clarified that the Police Department enforced parking regulations in the College Terrace and Crescent Park RPP Districts because of the age of the districts.

Council Member Kou felt the Staff Report should have stated the root cause of parking issues. The Vehicle Code provided a clear definition of permit parking, and the City had expanded the definition. She disagreed with increasing permit fees for low-income workers. Transportation Network Companies (TNC) or rideshare services increased traffic congestion. She supported an audit of employee parking permits and inquired of the process for the PTC to engage residents and businesses.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Tanda suggested the community provide comments during PTC meetings.

Council Member Kou asked if forming a working group that reported to the PTC was possible.

Mr. Shikada anticipated the PTC would hold workshops to engage the community. Simple public testimony at a meeting was not appropriate for a complex issue.

Council Member Kou preferred formation of a working group that included the Downtown Business Improvement District (BID) and the California Avenue Association.

Mr. Shikada recommended public engagement be conducted informally through the PTC.

Mr. Tanda indicated a working group that reported formally to the City Council could be subject to the Brown Act and conflicts of interest. In which case, everyone in an RPP district had the potential to be excluded from membership on the working group.

Mr. Shikada suggested the proposal for a PTC forum would avoid that.

Mayor Filseth noted the 35 recommendations covered multiple parking issues. Establishing a parking availability standard resolved most of the customizations of RPP Districts and dramatically simplified administration of RPP Programs. He said employee allocation mechanisms could already be in place, but the question was managing the mechanisms.

**MOTION AS AMENDED RESTATED:** Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Fine to:

- A. Accept the City of Palo Alto Residential Preferential Parking (RPP) Program Review Report by the City's consultant, Municipal Resource Group (MRG), and direct Staff to return to City Council with a workplan to address the items in the report, including consideration of allocation mechanisms for business permits;
- B. Use the Planning and Transportation Commission as the preferred forum for resident and business community engagement in evaluating the recommendations of the MRG report;
- C. Direct Staff to continue the proposed RPP district outreach and stakeholder process for Old Palo Alto and Green Acres, in accordance

# FINAL MINUTES

with the Planning and Transportation Commission's recommended prioritization; and

- D. Confirm that modifications to existing RPP districts (e.g., number of permits, etc.) will be put on hold until potential overall program changes are decided.

## **MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 7-0**

9. Connecting Palo Alto Grade Separation Planning: Revision of Alternatives for Further Study and Direction to Staff Regarding Evaluation Criteria Weights.

Mayor Filseth advised that he would not participate in this Agenda Item 9 because he lived within 500 feet of the Caltrain right-of-way. He left the meeting at 9:04 P.M.

Council Member Kniss advised that she would not participate in this Agenda Item because she had an interest in real property located within 500 feet of the Caltrain right-of-way. She left the meeting at 9:04 P.M.

Council took a break at 9:04 P.M. and returned at 9:14 P.M.

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Interim Chief Transportation Official, reported on April 22, 2019 the Council approved a work plan, added more Council check-ins with the new working group, approved additional alternatives for study, and directed Staff to return with an AECOM Contract Amendment and an update regarding the Citywide tunnel. Alternatives for study were a trench, hybrid and viaduct for the Meadow/Charleston crossing, a Citywide tunnel, closure and a vicinity viaduct for Churchill Avenue, and a South Palo Alto tunnel. An option for a Citywide tunnel was the removal from consideration the refining of the description of a tunnel from Channing Avenue to the southern City limit.

Etty Mercurio, AECOM Project Manager, explained that starting a Citywide tunnel at the northern City limit would cause major impacts to facilities, increase construction costs, and disrupt traffic to the Downtown area. The train was going to begin its descent into a trench at the southern end of the Palo Alto Station platform. The train was going to traverse the tunnel between Churchill and Meadow/Charleston and then enter a trench, which was going to terminate at the San Antonio Station platform. During construction, shoofly tracks were going to be needed to maintain Caltrain service. Shoofly tracks had the ability to be constructed immediately east or west of the existing tracks. To the east was Alma Street, the proposed location of the shoofly track. To the west were structures, which had the

# FINAL MINUTES

ability to be impacted. Using the existing tracks for the shoofly tracks and constructing the tunnel on Alma Street increased impacts because the tunnel had to be longer. The initial steps for constructing a tunnel were clearing vegetation, relocating utilities, acquiring rights-of-way, and closing cross streets connected to Alma Street. Next the shoofly tracks were where construction of the trench was to begin. Embarcadero Road required a complete reconfiguration. Ground walls for the trench required the acquisition of subsurface easements on the west side of the trench. During construction of the trench, Churchill Avenue was going to be closed. At Churchill, the portal to the tunnel was going to be approximately 100 feet wide by 40 feet deep. The size of the portal was to be governed by the geometry of the railroad and the geological and geotechnical ground conditions of the site. The shoofly tracks were to be located above the subsurface construction of the tunnel. The California Avenue Station needed to be excavated for access to the train in the tunnel. Elevators and escalators between the station and the surface were going to add to the cost. The tunnel was to be constructed beneath creeks. At the Meadow/Charleston crossing, the shoofly tracks had to be moved to the side so that the trench could begin. South of the Meadow/Charleston crossing, subsurface easements extending into adjacent properties were needed for the ground walls of the trench. Additional rights-of-way were needed to construct the trench across the creek. Finally, Alma Street was to be reconstructed.

Ed Shikada, City Manager, related that construction of shoofly tracks was based on an assumption that Caltrain service was going to continue during construction. The Staff Report contained a general description of value capture and the order of magnitude of value capture.

Council Member Kou noted the popularity of the tunnel alternative in the community. She wanted the total cost of the tunnel alternative broken down into components.

Ms. Mercurio advised that a cost breakdown had been prepared. A Project Study Report considered civil factors and railroad factors and compared them to benchmarks for construction costs. The cost estimate also contained contingencies for unknown factors. Using the costs of other construction projects to estimate the cost of the tunnel alternative was not appropriate because construction costs were extremely volatile over the past year. The costs of other projects were possibly developed several years ago and were not to be compared to 2019 dollars. The costs of other projects were engineering estimates or the bid costs.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou requested the technical assumptions utilized in the proposed design and the simulation.

Ms. Mercurio reported design factors included track geometry, engineering criteria, safety factors, and train speeds for shoofly tracks and permanent tracks.

Council Member Kou asked if the technical information was provided to the working group.

Ms. Mercurio answered yes, at a high level. Engineering exhibits were available at community and working group meetings and on the website.

Council Member Kou inquired whether the simulation was based on the worst-case scenario.

Ms. Mercurio clarified that the simulation was based on engineering drawings developed for the project.

Council Member Kou wanted to perform her due diligence for the community by reviewing all scenarios for the tunnel alternative.

Mr. Shikada reported the team provided representation of the tunnel alternative and its impacts; they were as accurate as possible. The simulation represented the best estimate of the project based on available information.

Ms. Mercurio added that engineers reviewed a track at a 1 percent grade as required by Caltrain, but it was not going to work for a tunnel. The tunnel required a 2 percent grade, in which Caltrain had to approve a variance for the project.

Council Member Kou inquired whether beginning boring at the south end made a difference.

Ms. Mercurio replied no.

Council Member Kou asked if the information explaining the infeasibility of the tunnel alternative was posted to the website.

Mr. Shikada clarified that no one had stated the tunnel was not feasible. The information provided for the meeting was publicly available.

Council Member Kou remarked that a large portion of the community was not aware of the tunnel. Eliminating the tunnel alternative from further study so early in the process raised concern in the community.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member DuBois requested Staff make the cost breakdowns, engineering drawings, technical assumptions and other technical data available to the public. He requested the cost of the Caltrain station.

Ms. Mercurio responded \$400 million.

Council Member DuBois asked if the cost estimate included land acquisitions.

Ms. Mercurio answered yes.

Council Member Tanaka requested the distance between the tracks in the tunnel.

John Maher, AECOM Engineer advised that the track spacing was 49 feet.

Council Member Tanaka asked if the width of the portal was dictated by geotechnical ground conditions.

Mr. Maher clarified that one boring machine was 34 feet wide and the distance between the bores was 15 feet. The distance between bores had the ability to be modified by a few feet following a geotechnical investigation.

Council Member Tanaka estimated a third, or 32 of the 100 foot portal width was going to be dirt surrounding the bores.

Mr. Maher concurred.

Council Member Tanaka asked why the distance between the two bores was not shorter.

Ms. Mercurio explained that the boring machines would bore through clay. If the machines were closer to each other, the boring of one tunnel had the ability to impact the other. If the subsurface material was hard rock, it was possible for the boring machines to be placed closer to each other. A concrete mix was to be injected into the soil to improve the quality of the soil, but that added to the cost of the project. Geotechnical engineers and boring and mining experts recommended the distance used in the drawings.

Council Member Tanaka requested the approximate cost of improving the quality of the soil.

Ms. Mercurio did not have a number, but it was a very expensive process.

Council Member Tanaka asked if the injection cost was contained in the report.

# FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Mercurio replied no, because ground improvements were not considered.

Council Member Tanaka asked if the cost was \$5 billion or \$500,000.

Mr. Shikada advised that studies and tests were going to be conducted in order to prepare accurate engineering drawings for a project. Based on the information available, the estimates were reasonable.

Council Member Tanaka believed the distance between the bores pushed the project outside the existing right-of-way, which affected the feasibility and cost of the project dramatically. If the injection process was able to reduce the distance between the bores, the cost of the injection process was estimated to be less than the cost of eminent domain and community support.

Ms. Mercurio reported the injection process would have to be used over the entire width and length of the area between the two portals, if such a large area was even feasible. The cost was going to be more than a couple of million dollars.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to understand the true costs of a Tunnel Project. Pictures of other tunnel projects showed the two bores much closer than 49 feet. Boring through bedrock was to be considerably easier than boring through clay. Clay was more malleable in terms of being able to bore without disrupting the other tunnel. Stating the injection process was expensive was not helpful when the project as a whole was expensive.

Mr. Maher indicated reducing the 15 foot distance between the two bores was not going to completely eliminate property impacts. The distance between the two bores was 15 feet, and the project was to extend more than 15 feet into adjacent properties.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to reduce the width of the portal as close to 68 feet, which was the combined diameter of the two bores, as possible.

Mr. Maher reiterated that placing the two bores side-by-side reduced the portal width by only 15 feet. Placing the two bores side-by-side was not possible. In addition, the outer walls of the portal were not able to be flush with the bore. The drawings showed 8 feet between the outer portal wall and the bore.

Council Member Tanaka felt the portal width of 100 feet was an arbitrary distance.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Maher indicated the 15 foot distance between the two bores was a minimal distance according to the mining experts.

Ms. Mercurio stated the 100 foot portal width was not arbitrary. A comparison of two tunnel projects was not possible without knowing the design standards and geometry and geotechnical issues of each project.

Council Member Tanaka was not able to accept a portal width of exactly 100 feet.

Mr. Maher clarified that technical information was able to reduce the width by 3 feet on either side. The shoofly tracks impacted driveways for the length of the project.

Council Member Tanaka requested further explanation of the inability to construct the tunnel beneath Alma Street.

Ms. Mercurio elaborated regarding the need to design for train speeds and track geometry. Both of those factors caused a tunnel beneath Alma Street to be longer than the proposed tunnel.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to understand why the geometry for Alma Street was different from the geometry of the existing tracks when they were side-by-side for the length of the tunnel.

Mr. Shikada clarified that a permanent facility located beneath Alma would lengthen the construction zone because the train speed for a permanent facility was higher than the train speed for shoofly or temporary tracks. Also, the construction was to impact the front yards of properties fronting Alma. As proposed, the project was expected to impact backyards.

Ms. Mercurio added that building the portal as proposed and moving the tunnel underneath Alma Street caused the track to curve, which increased the cost of the project. Also, the tunnel was not going to align with the California Avenue Station.

Vice Mayor Fine requested clarification of the proposal for an alternative described as the tunnel from Channing Avenue to the southern City limit.

Mr. Shikada reported the change was intended to define the end points of the tunnel.

Rachel Croft advised that several members of the Mariposa community supported retaining the tunnel alternative, requested access to costs and technical information for the tunnel alternative, opposed the viaduct in the vicinity of Churchill alternative, wanted to understand an Embarcadero

# FINAL MINUTES

alternative that included a viaduct and opposed a viaduct alternative in any area south of Churchill.

Davina Brown remarked that an underground alternative was best for the community.

Neva Yarkin supported eliminating the Citywide tunnel alternative because of its cost and the amount of real property affected by the alternative. She opposed a viaduct alternative for Churchill.

Chandru Venkataraman wanted clarification of the cost of the tunnel alternative. The community was likely to oppose any viaduct alternative.

Manish Baloua requested any alternative that resulted in the use of eminent domain for any property be removed from further consideration.

Carolyn Schmarzo supported removal of the tunnel alternative because of its cost and impacts to real property and streets.

Nadia Naik felt AECOM provided reasonable information and designs. Given the engineering information and the concerns about eminent domain, removal of the tunnel alternative was logical. The Staff Report states the Council moved the freight tracks into the South Palo Alto tunnel; however, the Motion did not reflect that. During the meeting, Council Member DuBois and Council Member Kou opposed the idea.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain questioned the logic of one city in the Caltrain Corridor spending \$2 billion to \$4 billion for grade separations when Caltrain estimated the cost of all grade separations in the Corridor at \$8 billion to \$11 billion. Value capture funding was feasible, but the scale of development had to be similar to development planned in San Francisco and San Jose.

Rob Levitsky did not believe the City had the expertise or funding for a tunnel alternative and supported removing it from further study.

Megan Kanne supported removal of the tunnel alternative due to its cost and construction impacts. Staff's recommendation to weight the criteria was tantamount to making a decision; therefore, the Council should select a different process.

Stephen Rosenblum remarked that City Staff was biased against the tunnel alternative, as indicated early in the discussions. The cost of the tunnel was not out of the question.

# FINAL MINUTES

Roland LeBrun advised that a tunnel bore with a diameter of 34 feet was appropriate for a train traveling 220 miles an hour. Trains were not going to travel that fast through Palo Alto. The portals and two shoofly tracks were able to be constructed within the existing 85 foot right-of-way. The only construction impacts were the loss of the footpaths between the stadium bleachers and the tracks.

Mindy Anderson felt the discussion of grade separations had reached a state of analysis paralysis. She offered to help the Council obtain the information it needed in order to end the discussion and reach a decision.

Vice Mayor Fine advised that all City Council Rail Committee meetings were open to the public. As far as community engagement, the Council needed to hear from everyone in the community. He requested clarification of the public comment regarding the South Palo Alto tunnel alternative.

Ms. Gaines reported during the April 22, 2019 meeting, a Council Member inquired whether the alternatives proposed by the working group were in addition to the Staff recommendation; the response was yes.

Vice Mayor Fine noted the City Council Rail Committee discussed the tunneling white paper, and it was available online along with other tunneling documents. More details of cost estimates, property impacts, utility impacts, and the assumptions utilized in the simulation were needed. The Central Subway was a new rail line and did not require shoofly tracks. He questioned whether Council Members needed to submit their comments regarding weighting criteria to Staff by email.

Mr. Shikada suggested the fundamental question was whether the Council wished to weigh the criteria. If the Council preferred, Staff was able to agendize the topic for a future meeting.

Council Member Cormack supported Part A.i of the Staff recommendation because of the cost, the potential use of eminent domain, and the permanent narrowing of Alma Street. Alternatively, she supported Part A.ii. The website was not yet updated. She requested more information regarding the expanded working group.

Mr. Shikada promised to provide the information at a later time.

Council Member Cormack suggested grouping the criteria into actual design criteria, community impacts, funding, and effects on the environment and climate change.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member DuBois stated the tunnel alternative with freight on the surface during the April 22, 2019 meeting was not yet eliminated. Several Council Members clearly indicated they would not support the Motion if that alternative was eliminated. He supported changing the name of the longer tunnel to the tunnel from Channing Avenue to the southern City limit. He wanted each Council Member to rank and sort the projects instead of the Council agreeing to a single ranking. Closure needed to be an alternative that would be scored. He did not know the source for Criteria K. There appeared to be duplicate criteria for cost.

Vice Mayor Fine interpreted finance with feasible funding sources as: the City was able to gather the multiple sources of funding needed for grade separations. In one of Staff's presentations, order of magnitude of cost was defined as low, medium, and high.

Council Member DuBois did not believe the Council had approved Criteria K.

Ms. Gaines advised that Criteria K was placed on the final line to ensure the cost was reflected somewhere. It should not be a criteria.

**MOTION:** Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Vice Mayor Fine to:

- A. Make public the cost estimates and technical assumptions for the city-wide tunnel;
- B. Refine the description of the city-wide alternative that will continue to be studied and considered to "Tunnel from Channing Avenue and the southern City limit;" and
- C. Reaffirm consideration of both options for South Palo Alto tunnel.

Vice Mayor Fine related that the Council reduced the number alternatives but was currently expanding the number of alternatives. The Council needed to discuss the criteria evaluation.

Council Member DuBois suggested Council Members and members of the working group individually score the alternatives, that way Staff was able to average the scores. The Council did not need to discuss and agree to a score for each alternative.

Vice Mayor Fine suggested removing the relative weight column and using a 0-10 or 0-100 scale to rank the alternatives. He inquired whether four Council Members supported removing the Citywide tunnel alternative .

Council Member Tanaka did not support the use of eminent domain. The design of the Citywide tunnel was incredibly biased. The Citywide tunnel

# FINAL MINUTES

alternative needed to be placed on a ballot so that the community could either support or oppose it. He requested to know the speed of Caltrain trains as they traveled through Palo Alto.

Ms. Mercurio reported trains in the blended service traveled at 110 miles per hour. Currently, trains were able to travel up to 79 miles per hour.

Council Member Tanaka reiterated his request for an explanation of the use of a bore that was 34 feet in diameter.

Ms. Mercurio indicated the engineers used the Caltrain design criteria for blended service to determine the inside diameter of the bores.

Council Member Tanaka inquired whether Caltrain or High Speed Rail utilized stricter criteria. He wanted to know the required diameter of a tunnel for trains traveling through Palo Alto.

Ms. Mercurio explained that the locomotive selected for the Corridor would be a factor in the design of the tunnel. High Speed Rail had not selected a locomotive.

Council Member Tanaka shared a diagram depicting the diameters of tunnels for trains traveling 200, 220, and 250 miles an hour. The diameter for a train traveling 250 miles an hour was the largest of the three. The inner diameter of a tunnel for a train traveling 200 miles an hour was 28 feet. The surrounding concrete wall was 3 feet thick for a total diameter of 31 feet. The tunnel for High Speed Rail was much smaller than the proposed Citywide tunnel.

Mr. Maher clarified that the diameter of the proposed Citywide tunnel was not dictated by the speed of the train. The diameter was dictated by the size of the train cars and the 17 foot vertical clearance to the wire for the train. Caltrain required a 10 foot minimum clearance from the centerline of track to any edge.

Council Member Tanaka advised that vertical dimensions of the tunnels for High Speed Rail were the same as those for the Citywide tunnel. He inquired whether Caltrain had beefy standards for tunnels.

Mr. Maher indicated the tunnel dimensions were based on Caltrain standards and the opinions of mining/tunneling experts.

Council Member Tanaka understood the cost increased as the tunnel size increased. Based on information he found on the internet, Council Member Tanaka doubted the size of the tunnel was appropriate. Value capture was

# FINAL MINUTES

probably the only viable way to fund a Citywide tunnel. He inquired whether Staff had conducted a survey of the community.

Mr. Shikada answered no. A poll was not informative because the public did not have sufficient information to form an opinion.

Council Member Tanaka remarked that the community had to accept the scale of value capture development in order to fund a Citywide tunnel. He inquired whether anyone had explored the possibility of beginning the tunnel in Menlo Park with the City of Menlo Park, assuming the City agreed to pay for it and the tunnel would not create eminent domain issues.

Mr. Shikada requested the rationale for assuming eminent domain issues were not going to exist in Menlo Park.

Council Member Tanaka asked if Staff had explored the option.

Mr. Shikada reported Staff had not suggested placing a portal in Menlo Park.

Vice Mayor Fine advised that the City spoke with adjacent cities and reviewed their work. In Mountain View, part of the issue was the location of a station. Menlo Park was considering a berm on that side of the creek.

Council Member Tanaka had not received answers to his political and technical questions.

**MOTION PASSED:** 5-0 Filseth, Kniss recused

**MOTION:** Council Member DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Cormack to remove the city-wide tunnel alternative, or the "Tunnel from Channing Avenue and the southern City limit."

**MOTION PASSED:** 4-1 Filseth, Kniss recused, Tanaka no

Molly Stump, City Attorney asked if the intention of the second Motion was to remove all tunnels from further study.

Vice Mayor Fine responded just the Citywide tunnel alternative.

Ms. Stump asked if the tunnel beginning at Channing Avenue would remain as an alternative for study.

Vice Mayor Fine replied no. Essentially Parts A and C were approved, and Part B was replaced with "remove the Citywide tunnel." The South Palo Alto tunnel remained an alternative.

# FINAL MINUTES

Council Member DuBois clarified that the Council renamed the Citywide tunnel in the first Motion and then eliminated it as an alternative in the second Motion.

Ms. Stump asked if the City would continue to study a tunnel from Channing Avenue to the southern City limit.

Vice Mayor Fine answered no. The South Palo Alto tunnel remained an alternative.

Mr. Shikada added that the South Palo Alto tunnel began south of Oregon Expressway and ended at the southern City limit.

Ms. Stump asked if the South Palo Alto tunnel was the only tunnel remaining on the study list.

Vice Mayor Fine replied yes.

## State/Federal Legislation Update/Action

None.

## Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

None.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 P.M.