Purpose and Recommendation
The purpose of this report is to inform the Council about the status of the Rail Corridor Study effort and progress of the Rail Corridor Task Force. Staff recommends that the Council discuss and provide input to staff, the task force, and the consultant regarding the effort.

Executive Summary
The City Council initiated a Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study on June 12, 2010 to evaluate land use, transportation, and urban design elements of the corridor. The purpose of this agenda item is to provide a progress report on the Study, including Planning and Transportation Commission feedback from the June 8, 2011 hearing and to receive input from the City Council. The study, proposed to be completed in three phases, is currently in Phase I, developing context and a preliminary vision for the corridor.

A Rail Corridor Task Force, authorized by Council and consisting of 17 representatives from various stakeholder groups, representing a variety of interests (residents, businesses, civic organizations, etc.), has also been convened to provide input into the process. The Task Force is to provide input to the study and solicit information from the broader community, as well as helping design study processes to insure maximum community engagement throughout the study. The first of two community workshops scheduled for this phase was held on May 19, 2011, at which about 20 members of the public identified issues and priorities for the rail corridor.
Background
The City Council initiated the Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study to evaluate land use, transportation and urban design elements of the rail corridor, particularly in response to potential improvements to fixed rail services along the Caltrain tracks. The study will analyze those elements in light of Caltrain upgrades, such as electrification and/or grade separations, and/or the potential options for the High Speed Rail project. Although the High Speed Rail project provides important context, it was not intended to be the focus of this study. It is unknown at this point what the future holds for either High Speed Rail or Caltrain. The intent of the study effort is to generate a community vision that would provide land use and transportation policies to guide development under a variety of scenarios, allowing Palo Alto to be proactive in advance of changes to the rail system.

The boundaries of the corridor include, at a minimum, the area between Alma Street on the east to El Camino Real on the west, from the Menlo Park city limits on the north to the Mountain View city limits on the south. The study area also includes sufficient adjacent land to encompass those areas most directly affected by potential land use, transportation and urban design changes. The plan and implementation measures will ultimately be incorporated into the City’s Comprehensive Plan, either as part of the document or by reference.

Council authorization was granted on July 26, 2010 for the formation of a Task Force to assist in the preparation of the study and to provide a forum for public input. The 17-member Task Force is made up of several different stakeholder groups, including residents and business owners, and representatives of the school district, a non-profit housing venture, environmental groups, and Stanford University, as well as a Caltrain rider.

BMS Design Group
The City Council authorized the selection of BMS Design Group on February 14, 2011 as the consultant for the preparation of the Rail Corridor Study. BMS Design Group has had extensive experience in rail corridor planning and transit oriented development across the Bay Area. The
firm has also been recently hired by the City of Sunnyvale to prepare a station area plan for the Lawrence Area Station Plan. The BMS team also includes two subconsultants: EPS as the economic subconsultant and Fehr and Peers as the transportation subconsultant.

Scope of Work
The Rail Corridor Study is comprised of three phases and is expected to be completed in approximately twelve to fourteen months, likely during the first quarter of 2012. Following the completion of the document, it would be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process as appropriate. The adopted Scope of Work is included as Attachment D. The phases outlined in the scope consist of the following components:

1. Phase I: “Context and Vision” will establish the constraints, opportunities and a preliminary vision for the Corridor.
2. Phase II: “Alternatives and Analysis” will focus on the development and analysis of two or three alternatives and an urban design framework.
3. Phase III: “Plan Preparation” will involve the refinement of the alternatives and feedback from the Task Force, Commission, Council and the public. The ultimate goal is to develop a document that would be implemented and become part of the Comprehensive Plan.

Multiple public meetings are proposed to maximize public outreach. Each phase includes three to four Task Force meetings, two community meetings, two Commission hearings and two City Council hearings. The consultant will also attend any Council Rail Committee or similar committee meetings as needed.

Discussion
The format of the study session will include a presentation by BMS consultants of the primary activities and findings to date of the project (Attachment G), comments from some of the Task Force members, and then questions and comments from the Council. Staff and the consultants and the Task Force ask the Council for guidance regarding: 1) Council input on the key issues or opportunities identified to date (connectivity and land use), 2) key issues or opportunities that have not been included in work to date, and 3) input on the scope and process as the study moves forward.

Task Force
Since its formation, the Task Force has met eight times since February. The Task Force, which is subject to the Brown Act, has met once to twice a month with staff and the consultant. Meetings are scheduled for the first and third Thursdays of the month. The focus of the first five meetings was to provide the Task Force members with background information, including an introduction to the consultant, BMS Design Group, a review of the status of High Speed Rail and Caltrain planning efforts, and overviews of the Comprehensive Plans and related area plans, bicycle and pedestrian planning, and the Grand Boulevard Initiative. The sixth and seven meetings provided an opportunity for the members to identify specific issues and ideas regarding corridor connectivity and transportation/circulation.
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Community Workshop
The first of the two community workshops planned for the first phase was held on May 19, 2011 at the Lucie Stern Community Center. The purpose of this workshop was to provide an introduction to the public and to identify the audience’s issues and priorities for the study area. The turnout was light (about 10-12 public plus most of the Task Force), but the interaction was still informative. Questions outlined to participants are included as Attachment F. The second workshop was scheduled for July 7, 2011, to discuss the preliminary vision statement, but has now been postponed until September. The Task Force and staff believe this will allow for a) the development of preliminary alternatives that may elicit greater citizen engagement, b) better attendance given the workshop will occur after the summer recess, and c) more opportunity for public outreach in advance of the meeting.

Planning and Transportation Commission Study Session
The first Planning and Transportation Commission study session on the Rail Corridor Study was held on June 8, 2011. Staff and the consultant, BMS Design Group, provided a detailed introduction and an update on the Rail Corridor Study and Task Force. Following the presentation, three members of the Task Force, Tom Vlasic, Irwin Dawid and Phil Burton, spoke to the Commission about their thoughts on their efforts. The three members agreed that the Task Force meetings had been very productive and felt that the members would have a lot to contribute to the process. Beth Bunnenberg, the Historic Resources Board liaison to the Task Force, spoke next. She requested that the Task Force and Study also identify and study the potential impacts to the historic structures, such as El Palo Alto, within the study area. The last speaker, a Palo Alto resident, expressed his concern about public outreach.

The Commission provided extensive input regarding the study. The following are the items raised by the Commission:

- Increase public outreach to encourage participation, especially at the Community Workshop
- Explore relationship of and coordinate the study with the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process, including California Avenue Concept Plan.
- Consider connectivity within and connections to the corridor from the outside.
- Discuss more about density.
- Consider needs for services.
- Consider importance of Alma Street.
- Consider both increasing density and lower density development pattern.
- Alma Street needs more neighborhood supporting uses, such as retail.
- Would like more certainty about scenarios being studies, like whether Bus Rapid Transit would be implemented.
- Consider use of conditional language to cover the various possible scenarios.
- Study how to increase cross connectivity and slow down traffic on Alma Street.
- Connectivity in south Palo Alto is very important.
The Commission staff report and minutes of the June 8 meeting are enclosed as Attachments B and C.

**Next Steps**
Upon direction from the Council, staff will proceed to work with the Task Force and consultant to complete Phase I of the Study. A second Community Workshop is tentatively scheduled for July 21st. The Task Force will continue its evaluation and identification of issues and opportunities, the development of a preliminary vision, and further engagement with the community. Subsequent sessions will be held with the Planning and Transportation Commission and the City Council to discuss the vision prior to moving on to the development of alternatives in Phase II.

**Resource Impacts**
The City Council authorized $200,000 for consultant services for this study. A total of $90,000 was included in the current fiscal year (2010-11) and the remaining $110,000 was to be allocated in the 2011-12 budget. This funding appears adequate to accommodate the consultant costs through the project, unless additional public meetings are required. Staff resources have also been devoted to the effort so that one Senior Planner is spending approximately 20% of her time on the effort. Some staff hours for the Planning Director and support services have also been required. The study will include some basic economic analysis regarding the potential fiscal implications of the various alternatives and the preferred plan.

**Policy Implications**
The study will rely on the City’s Comprehensive Plan and other land use transportation policies to guide the effort for the corridor. The other work components of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, including the California Avenue/Fry’s Area Plan and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, will be considered in coordination with this study.

**Environmental Review**
The Study proposal and scope of work do not constitute a project requiring environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act. Staff anticipates that environmental review for the Rail Corridor Study will be completed as part of the Comprehensive Plan.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
- Attachment A: Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study Area  (PDF)
- Attachment B: June 8, 2011 Planning and Transportation Commission Staff Report  (PDF)
- Attachment C: Planning and Transportation Commission June 8, 2011 Draft Excerpt Minutes  (PDF)
- Attachment D: Scope of Work  (PDF)
- Attachment E: Project Schedule  (PDF)
- Attachment F: Community Workshop 1 Open House Questions  (PDF)
- Attachment G: Study Session Presentation Slides by BMS  (PDF)
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STAFF REPORT

TO: PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

FROM: Elena Lee, Senior Planner

DEPARTMENT: Planning and Community Environment

AGENDA DATE: June 8, 2011

SUBJECT: Study Session to receive Commission input on the preparation of the Rail Corridor Study.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff recommends that the Planning and Transportation Commission (Commission) discuss and provide input to staff and BMS Design Group on the work progress for the Rail Corridor Study. No action is requested or may be taken.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE:
The City Council initiated the Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study to evaluate land use, transportation and urban design elements of the rail corridor, particularly in response to potential improvements to fixed rail services along the Caltrain tracks. Those improvements may include any or all of the following: Caltrain upgrades, such as electrification and/or grade separations, and/or High Speed Rail service. Although the High Speed Rail project provides important context, it was not intended to be the focus of this study. The rail corridor is a significant physical component of Palo Alto. It is still unknown at this point what the future holds for either High Speed Rail or Caltrain. The intent is to generate a community vision that would provide land use and transportation policies to guide development under a variety of scenarios, allowing Palo Alto to be proactive to changes to the rail system.

The boundaries of the corridor include, at a minimum, the area between Alma Street on the east to El Camino Real on the west, from the Menlo Park city limits on the north to the Mountain View city limits on the south. (See Attachment C.) The study area also includes sufficient adjacent land to encompass those areas most directly affected by potential land use, transportation and urban design changes. The plan and implementation measures will ultimately be incorporated into the City’s Comprehensive Plan, either as part of the document or by reference.
To provide a broad range of public feedback and input, the City Council authorized the formation of a Task Force for the Rail Corridor Study. The 17-member Task Force is made up of several different stakeholder groups including residents and business owners, representatives of the school district, a non-profit housing venture, environmental groups and Stanford University, as well as a Caltrain rider.

Scope of Work
The Rail Corridor Study is proposed to be completed in three phases and over an approximately twelve to fourteen month timeframe. It is anticipated that the project would be completed in the first quarter of 2012. Following the completion of the document, it would be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan Amendment process as appropriate. The adopted Scope of Work is included as Attachment A.

The first and current phase is the “Context and Vision” component. The goal of this phase is to establish the background and context for the rail corridor in order to begin developing a preferred vision. Phase I would identify the constraints, opportunities and vision for the study area. The consultant will study the land use, transportation, design and economic parameters. This phase includes the first step towards updating goals and policies and identifying the desired land use and transportation changes. BMS would also consult with other agencies, such as the High Speed Rail Authority and Caltrain, as needed.

Phase II of the Rail Corridor Study is the “Alternatives and Analysis” section. After obtaining information in Phase I, BMS will prepare urban design, land use and transportation concepts for the study area. Phase II will center on the analysis of these different alternatives. The intent is to narrow the focus to two or three alternatives and to develop an urban design framework. This phase will also include preliminary evaluation of potential environmental impacts and economic costs/benefits associated with the alternatives.

The final Phase III of the study is “Plan Preparation”. BMS will continue to refine the alternatives and obtain feedback from the Task Force, Commission, Council and the public. The goal is to develop a document that would be implemented and become part of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Scope of Work includes multiple public meetings. Each phase includes three to four Task Force meetings, two Commission hearings and two City Council hearings. The consultant will also attend any Council Rail Committee or similar committee meetings as needed. As discussed above, there are also two community workshops planned for each phase.

The purpose of this study session on the Rail Corridor Study is to provide information on the progress during this first phase and obtain input and comments from the Commission. The format of the study session will consist of the following:

1. Staff introduction
2. Presentation by BMS Design Group, including the findings of the first community workshop
3. Comments from the Task Force members,
4. Commission comments and questions.
DISCUSSION

BMS Design Group
Following the Council’s authorization to begin the process of hiring a consultant, BMS Design Group (BMS) was awarded the contract to assist staff and the Task Force in the preparation of the study. BMS is a Bay Area planning consulting group that provides professional services in urban design, land use planning, landscape architecture and community outreach. The firm is headed by two partners, Barbara Maloney and Michael Smiley, who each have over 30 years of urban design and planning experience for both public and private sector clients. BMS has extensive experience across the Bay Area on a variety of rail and transit oriented development projects and plans. Their list of relevant projects include the Diridon/Arena Strategic Development Plan in San Jose, the San Leandro BART Station Pedestrian Interface Plan, the San Francisco Embarcadero Waterfront Transit and Streetscape Improvements, the San Francisco Third Street Light Rail Urban Design Improvements, the San Mateo Hayward Park Station Area Improvements and most recently, the Sunnyvale Lawrence Area Station Plan. BMS also has two subconsultant groups working with them on this project. EPS is the economic consultant. EPS was also hired by the City to provide economic analysis for the City’s High Speed Rail efforts. The proposal originally included Kimley Horn as the transportation subconsultant. However, changes in personnel at Kimley Horn have resulted in Matthew Ridgway of Fehr and Peers taking on the transportation consultant role.

Rail Corridor Task Force
A seventeen member Task Force was appointed by the City Council to provide input and serve as a voice for the community. The Task Force group represents a broad array of interests that would be directly impacted by land use and transportation decisions along the corridor. The members are intended to reflect a variety of personal interests, professional skills, as well as a broad geographic distribution throughout the corridor and City. The members were chosen to serve as a conduit and a voice for not only their specific stakeholder groups, but also for other interested members of the public. The Task Force will act as an additional and very important channel for the public to get involved in the process, including those who cannot or prefer not to participate directly. The Task Force members consist of the following groups:

1. **Neighborhood Representatives**
   - Southgate (Tom Vlasic)
   - Downtown North (Martin Sommer)
   - Charleston Meadows (Ellen Hartog)
   - Greenmeadow (Carolyn Dobervich)
   - South of Midtown (Phil Burton)
   - Palo Alto Neighborhood (PAN) group (Norman Beamer/Crescent Park)

2. **Business Representatives**
   - Chamber of Commerce (Jim Rebosio/Sheraton)
   - Silicon Valley Board of Realtors (Leannah Hunt)
   - Property/business owner (John Tarlton/owner, developer and Feeta Bishop/CAADA)
   - Architect/Designer (Tony Carrasco)
3. **Other Agencies and Interest Groups**

- Stanford University (Charles Carter)
- Palo Alto Unified School District (Barb Mitchell)
- Environmental Organization (Tom Jordan and Irvin Dawid/Sierra Club)
- Social Service/Affordable Housing (Candice Gonzalez/Palo Alto Housing Corp)
- Caltrain rider (Evan Goldin)

Staff has also requested various City boards and commissions to appoint a liaison to attend and represent their respective groups, including the Planning and Transportation Commission, the Architectural Review Board, Utilities Advisory Commission, the Historic Resources Board and the Bicycle Advisory Committee. The role of the liaisons is to attend these meetings on behalf of and provide updates to their representative boards. Liaisons are not participating as task force members. Additionally, staff has invited representatives from the adjacent cities of Mountain View and Menlo Park and Caltrain to appoint liaisons to attend the meeting.

**Task Force Meetings**

The Task Force has met seven times since November 2010. Meetings, which are subject to the Brown Act, are scheduled on the first and third Thursdays of the month at the Lucie Stern Community Center. The Task Force has met once to twice a month, depending on the need. The focus of the first three meetings (November 9, December 9 and January 20) was to provide the Task Force with background information, including the status of the various rail projects and to discuss organization and logistics. Staff presented information on the Brown Act and other City endeavors. Rob Braulik and Richard Hackmann of the City Manager’s office spoke on the High Speed Rail project and on the City’s participation in those efforts. Sara Armstrong of Californians Advocating for Responsible Rail Development (CARRD) also spoke to the Task Force about the group’s efforts and the role of public participation in the High Speed Rail project.

The February 17 meeting was the first Task Force meeting with BMS Design Group, the project consultant. The Task Force was provided with an introduction to BMS and a review of the scope, schedule and outreach process at the fourth meeting. The Task Force also discussed the goals and issues of the study area. The fifth meeting was held on March 17. Staff presented other City efforts relevant to the Rail Corridor Study, including the Comprehensive Plan Amendment, the California Avenue Concept Plan, the Grand Boulevard Initiative and the Bike and Pedestrian Plan Update. A process and schedule update was also outlined.

The sixth and seventh meetings included small working groups to identify specific issues and ideas. The sixth meeting, held on April 7, focused on corridor connectivity. BMS offered a presentation on existing, potential and additional connections across the rail lines and impacts on neighborhoods. High Speed Rail and Caltrain alternatives were reviewed. The Task Force was divided up into several small groups to discuss concepts for destinations and possible connections, including bike lanes. A Caltrain representative attended the meeting and gave an update on the Caltrain budget and operations status. The seventh and latest meeting, held on May 5th, focused on transportation and circulation analysis. The consultant spoke about land use and urban design and transportation and circulation issues in Palo Alto. The Task Force was
then divided up into small groups to discuss and identify land use and transportation/circulation issues and priorities. The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for Thursday, June 16.

First Community Workshop
The project will include six Community Workshops, two in each of the three phases of the project. The first Community Workshop was held on May 19, 2011 at the Lucie Stern Community Room. Approximately 25 people attended (most of whom were Task Force members). The meeting began with a project overview, including the schedule and process. BMS reviewed land use, transportation and circulation issues, previously discussed with the Task Force. The remainder of the meeting was held in an open house format. Fourteen stations were set up along the perimeter of the room to solicit the attendees’ issues and priorities related to the corridor area. The questions focused on the individual’s vision of the future of the corridor, preferred uses in specific areas, view of the role of the corridor and priorities regarding transportation improvements. The list of questions is provided as Attachment D. The public was also able to provide other comments that did not necessarily fit into any of the preset categories. The second Community Workshop is tentatively scheduled to be held on July 7, 2011. The purpose of this workshop is to discuss the public’s initial visions for the project area building upon the information obtained from the first workshop. BMS will present the findings from the workshop at the June 8th Commission hearing.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS:
The study will rely on the City’s Comprehensive Plan and other land use transportation policies to guide the effort for the corridor. Current Comprehensive Plan and area plan efforts, including the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan update, will be considered in conjunction with the Rail Corridor Study.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:
A study session is not considered a project under the California Environmental Quality Act. Environmental review for the Rail Corridor Plan will be completed, likely, as part of the Comprehensive Plan Environmental Impact Report.

PUBLIC OUTREACH:
To solicit public feedback, a website and email address has been established for the project. Notices for all meetings are posted on the City’s website in the Know zone (http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/knowzone/agendas/rail_corridor_task_force.asp) and the City Hall Notice Board. Additional background information is also provided on the webpage. Staff has been maintaining an email distribution list of interested individuals and has used the list to send out meeting notices and updates. An email address, railcorridorstudy@cityofpaloalto.org, has been established for public outreach purposes. A separate detailed website, www.paloaltorailcorridor.org, has been made available to provide as much information as possible for the public, similar to the one developed for the Comprehensive Plan Amendment. The Task Force meetings are also recorded and available for viewing at the Community Media Center website. Members of the public have attended and participated in the Task Force meetings.
ATTACHMENTS:
A. Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study Scope of Work
B. Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study Project Timeline.
C. Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study Boundary Map
D. Community Meeting #1 Questions for Open House Segment

COURTESY COPIES:
BMS Design Group
Rail Corridor Study Task Force

Prepared by: Elena Lee, Senior Planner

Department/Division Head Approval: Curtis Williams, Director
With that we will go to our second order of business which is the Rail Corridor Study Session. It is a study session to receive P&TC’s input to staff and consultants on the preparation of the Rail Corridor Study.

Elena Lee, Senior Planner: Thank you Chair Lippert members of the commission. We are here tonight to provide an introduction and an update to the Rail Corridor Study Project. The Rail Corridor Study was initiated by City Council last year to develop a land use urban design and transportation division along the Rail Corridor. To facilitate the project, an urban design consultant, BMS Design Group, has been hired to help prepare the study. The consultant will make a presentation following the stats report. BMS has had extensive experience with transit oriented development as well as transit planning in various Bay Area cities including San Francisco, San Jose, San Mateo and San Leandro, and most recently the city of Sunnyvale.

Public process is an important component of this Rail Corridor 3 phase project. The Rail Corridor Work Study program is proposed to be completed in three phases to be completed in the first quarter of 2012. The study is currently in Phase 1, the vision and context phase. This project will include multiple hearings before the commission, the City Council as well as community workshops. A task force was also formed to provide feedback to the staff in development of the study. The task force is made up of various stakeholder groups including residents, business owners, property owners, non-profit groups, as well as a transit writer. The task force was intended to be a voice for the community at large. Task force meetings are open to the public and held once or twice a month depending on need. Each phase will also include multiple public hearings and two community workshops per phase. The first community workshop was held on May 19th requesting feedback from the public about what they thought the priorities were in context of the area. The next workshop is tentatively scheduled for July 7th. A website, paloaltorailcorridor.org, and a task force page on the city’s website have been set up to provide information to the public. As for places for the commissioner and the public, staff has provided copies of the map and work products of the work groups held at the 6th and 7th task force meeting as well as a community workshop. Also emailed earlier today and put at places was an email from Commissioner Keller with his questions about what he thought should be the
focus of some of these alternatives. That information will also be forwarded to the task force members. Again, all of this information will be available online as well as the maps you see on the board. BMS will now make a presentation and discuss the outcome of both the workshop and task force meetings in detail and so BMS for this project consists of Barbara Maloney and Michael Smiley, principals of BMS Design Group.

Barbara Maloney: Thank you Elena and thank you Commission for inviting us to talk to you today. What we would like to do today is quickly go through an overview of the project how we see it. We are going to talk a bit about our thoughts about how we are approaching this with the task force and the community because it is a unique project and its complexity and many serious issues warrants a particularly careful and thoughtful approach. We will also talk about what we have heard from the task force and the community thus far, we’ll share that with you. And then we have some questions we would like to entertain, any discussion and questions you have and we specifically have a few questions that we would love to get some feedback on.

As Elena mentioned, we are leading the project, BMS Design Group, in San Francisco. My partner and I have had this business for 15 years now and we specialize in transportation related projects including TOD projects, streetscape, public environment projects, as well as a number of other kinds of work. Joining us on the team is Fehr and Peers for transportation planning out of San Francisco and EPS who are real estate economists out of Berkeley.

When we began the project we looked at the various background information that we could get our hands on and we were particularly interested and paid note of the council’s direction to staff upon authorizing and initiating this project and that has been something that has been guiding us as we go forward on this. It is noted on here, and I won’t read all of it, but what we took away from this is this is a plan for the corridor. It is not just about high speed rail. In fact it is not first and foremost about high speed rail, it is about a rail corridor and what the future for land use, transportation, and urban design for that corridor should be and of course we know there are a number of possible futures for that corridor but we want to look first at the corridor itself and really focus on what it could be and on what the vision for that place should be. As was reiterated in the staff’s direction to us of what they wanted to see, they wanted a vision for land use, transportation and urban design for the corridor. The outcome of this process will be to develop a rail corridor plan, a plan for that corridor which will be incorporated into the comprehensive plan for the city so we’ve made part of that policy document. As Elena mentioned, this is a three phase project and we are actually getting fairly close to the end of the first phase so it’s an opportune time to be speaking to you about this. There are essentially three primary components to this phase of this work. The first was the analysis which has been in large part an opportunity for us to get up to speed and understand the background documents, what other projects are going on in the area that we need to be aware of and that should inform what we’re thinking, obviously learning more about high speed rail in Palo Alto and the policy and political issues relating to that, but also generally what other issues are that relate to the corridor – traffic problems, land use issues and all the things the community and task force has been able to advise us about.

What we are embarking on now, and we have two meetings scheduled to discuss this, is encouraging the task force in the community to work with us to articulate a first vision for the corridor. That’s not a specific plan, not specific solutions to individual issues or problems but it
is a first articulation of what the vision, what the future of the corridor could be within the next 5, 10 or 25 years. So that is what we are hoping to get some additional guidance from you about. Phase 2, once we complete that, and that will start in July, will actually develop alternative plans for the corridor and we’ll evaluate those and then the final phase of the project will be to develop the actual plan document itself.

We’ve had 7 task force meetings. For some reason there are only 6 listed on this. There were 3 task force meetings that occurred before we were actually involved in the project. They started in November and the third was in January and it was getting the task force up to speed on what their role was, what the project was and also the status of the high speed rail project. When we became involved in February, and there had been four meetings subsequent to that, we explained our approach to the project. We asked the city staff and they gave us a briefing of other projects going on that were relevant such as the California Avenue Study and studies of El Camino and so on. The third meeting we had we had a first working session with the task force about connectivity and we’ll talk to you a little more about what we got out of that and then we had the 7th meeting relating to some initial land use and transportation discussions. That last meeting was in May. We’ve also had one community meeting as Elena mentioned and that was on May 19th. We’ve got some exhibits on that and we’ll tell you what we heard at that. We have two meetings coming up as I mentioned. There is a final task force meeting for this phase that’s going to be held on June 16th and a second community meeting that will be held on July 7th and those as I said are going to be about vision. So with that I will hand it over to my partner Michael Smiley. He is going to talk about how we’ve been handling the project and our approach to it.

Michael Smiley: Thank you very much. What I’d like to do is talk just a little bit about how we’ve sort of viewed the project really from the beginning. To a certain extent there has been, as Barbara and Elena mentioned, there has been a considerable amount of input that we are receiving that helps us get up to speed from the task force and the community. There are also certain factors, sort of a planning approach and I’d like to talk to you about some of the thoughts we’ve had about the planning approach to this. We were asked to share this with you because this really goes back to one of the first discussions we had with the task force about how to think about this corridor and again reminding everyone if it is not entirely clear, the corridor includes all the land across the entire city from Menlo Park to Mountain View and from El Camino to Alma so it is much more than just the rail tracks. It does affect things like El Camino, the cross town streets that cross across these areas as well. So when we think about this we need to start thinking about this as much as any other kind of urban design plan we would do for a district, as just about a plan that happens to have high speed rail or happens to have Caltrain and some of the other things in it. So, here you see a reference to 8 key considerations as we think about planning and urban design for the corridor. In some ways they overlap and in other ways they are different.

There are different ways of thinking about and planning for an area that is really quite large and really quite complex as an urban place. One of the first things that we feel is very important is to get our arms around what is the role of this corridor, this very large area in the city, and we will go through that in a minute. Also, the whole question defining the difference between conservation and development areas. We know that there are some areas that we want to
conserve and protect. We know there are other areas that could be opportunity areas in various ways and we need to get to that working with the community. Then there is a whole other way of thinking about this and that is as you break an area this large down breaking it down into various districts. We have residential districts, commercial districts. Another way of thinking about it is you also have transit districts. Now transit districts can be both a residential district and a commercial district and if you think of the California Avenue area for instance that is both a residential district, a commercial district and a transit district, so thinking about it as districts or sub districts, it is just another way of putting a different set of goggles on in the way we look at it. Then there is the whole question of transit oriented development. Now with the assumption that there is no high speed rail station here then transit related components of a station for high speed rail isn’t an issue but we still have three stations that affect Palo Alto that are places that we need to think of as transit oriented development areas and of course you have within your zoning a very clear pedestrian transit oriented development type district where you’ve already started to address that. Then we break down into what are the elements of the plan specifically.

Caltrain and high speed rail are very definitely a component of this. They are kind of the elephant in the living room but the way we need to think about it is they are a piece of the plan, not the plan itself. And then of course assessing how we deal with the various impacts of which there are many different types and finally implementing the vision meaning how do we implement all of this. I would like to touch on some of these things in a little more detail.

The role of the corridor in the city, one of the things I find very fascinating about this is that when you map out the existing land uses in this area which is what this map shows, yellow and as you know, the yellows and browns tend to be residential at lower to high densities and reds and purples tend to be commercial type uses and blue are more civic and educational. One of the things that really strikes about this area is compared to other parts of the city it has amazing amounts of diversity. Its got the kind of diversity, particularly right in this corridor bound by Alma on this side and El Camino on this side, an incredibly diverse area and it raises questions about how we think about this and the kinds of services, the kinds of things that happen in this very diverse area. It presents a lot of opportunity to do things that would be a little different from the way you would think about an area that really has a common kind of use and purpose, the single family areas and even the vast areas where we have a university and that sort of thing. That kind of diversity is what we really need to think about as we go forward. Are there things that can make it more diverse, more interesting, and satisfy a lot of things that make for a very interesting and diverse core of the city? Your comprehensive plan reinforces that in the way it speaks to that diversity as well and it’s not surprising that the comprehensive plan and the existing uses tend to mirror each other and strengthen each other.

The question of course after we get finished with all this study is are there things that can be done to make this an even more interesting place and consequently the comprehensive plan would be reformulated or amended to reflect the kinds of things we would like to see there. The assumption is that no place in any city I’ve ever worked, particularly in an area this large, is perfect the way it is. We know there are things that we can always do to improve it and that is really what we need to be thinking about.

Now one of the first things that we did and one of the things to think about as we plan an area like this is defining conservation areas. This happens to be a very early sketch so its not as
accurate as some of the mapping we’ve been doing more recently but it was an effort to identify
in a very conceptual way a few factors, yellow being residential areas under the assumption that
residential areas are places we want to conserve and protect. What that does is when you think
of it from a yin and yang point of view that then the areas that are non-residential and perhaps
they aren’t things such as a hospital or a high school might be opportunity areas where we can
start to think about opportunities for land use change or improvements that could better serve the
district and those tend to be certainly the white areas and also could be the red areas where we
are identifying some of the major pedestrian destinations, the major attractors that exist along
this corridor. So it is really simplified down, the ideas of what this corridor is to conservation
and non-conservation areas if you’d like to put it that way. By the way we did add a couple of
these. This was done way back at the beginning. In fact, we prepared this for the interview
when we interviewed for this project and began to talk about it. We also showed opportunities to
cross the existing Caltrain tracks. As you know, there aren’t many.

Let’s talk about districts. I mentioned there are a variety of ways to think about districts and I
won’t repeat that but I think that this is something that we really do need to, as we go forward,
think about how the districts are arranged. Do they have boundaries, gateways, edgers, buffers?
There are of course single use districts and mixed use districts and one way to think of this is to
say, well, California Avenue for instance that area is a mixed use district and the residential area
next to it is not. Another way to think about it is to raise ourselves up about 500 feet and say the
whole area is a mixed use district. It is a mix of residential of various densities, it’s a mix of
various commercial services to serve that residential, its got parks, its got educational facilities,
it’s got one of the best museums in the entire Bay Area that is just across the street, its got great
transportation opportunities, so the entire corridor really is this bottom line here. And how do
you create a really diverse mixed use district while you’re also making sure you’re protecting the
neighborhoods that are within and adjacent to that district and make them an effective part of it?
We also have these transit districts I mentioned to you and of course I know we have the three
stations, Downtown University, California Avenue and San Antonio on the Caltrain line but we
also have the germ of an idea right now, the planning for bus rapid transit that will come down El
Camino Real and there are potential station locations that have been preliminarily identified. So
that will provide another transportation opportunity and we can start to think of those as transit
districts as well. And so when you think of that then the notion of transit oriented development
and the notion of what you do in service as transportation serves those neighborhoods and vice
versa as those neighborhoods support transit it starts to expand the opportunities within this
overall corridor and how we think about planning it.

Now what is transit oriented development since you are of course a commission that deals with
planning in the city I’m sure you’ve heard this many times but I’d like to just touch on it because
really there is a lot of discussion about what is transit oriented development, what are the
components and so on. We like to think of it as four key components. First of all and most
fundamentally you need an accessible urban framework and that is the pattern of streets and
blocks that allow all modes of travel to actually get to transit and if you don’t have that then both
the neighborhoods and so on can’t use transit effectively and the transit system itself is not well
supported. Second you need supportive land uses and there are a few land uses that definitely
support transit and there are other land uses that do not. Generally speaking, and I’ll use a local
example, and not that I’m trying to push them out, but generally speaking, a store like Fry’s does
not support transit. You don’t ride transit to pick up the kinds of things that they sell there or a
Costco or big box retail or those kinds of things. Also, industrial does not support transit
because the population densities within those kinds of uses are very low. The types of uses that
do support transit are residential and of course the higher the density the better. We don’t want
to be Manhattan but you can look to a place like New York and you can see with those kinds of
densities why they have no cars on the street except taxis of course and this very busy transit
system. So residential densities uses and office uses as well generate a significant amount of
transit ridership. So those are two particular uses that depending upon the types of densities that
are acceptable to the community then we want to fit them in and we can actually support our
transit system and that of course is going to help keep Cal Tran alive during time. That gets us to
the third point of supportive densities. And finally we need an attractive public environment.
The thing that I like to talk about the most is actually the transit vehicles themselves are quite
nice. The transit agencies spent a lot of time and a lot of effort and a lot of money getting good
buses, good trains, nice seats, and once you’re in the vehicle it is a nice ride. The problem with
transit is the trip from home to the vehicle and that’s where we urban designers come in and
planners and those we commission. If you think about this is if I feel unsafe getting there, if its
an uncomfortable environment while I’m waiting, its rainy, I don’t know when the bus or train is
coming, I don’t have real time information, then I might be inclined to say I’m driving because it
is too much of a hassle to get to that train even though it may not be that far away. That’s why
we need to be thinking about the public environment that becomes an integral part of transit
oriented development and of that transit system. I think that’s very important in this corridor
area because there are a lot of places in this corridor that have supporting uses, supporting
densities, but it is not easy to get to the train station. Ultimately to get to the BART station and
the other stations that are along El Camino Real.

Elements of the plan, another way of thinking about what we want to do here, is ultimately we
need a plan that spells out some of the key components and that of course involves having a
vision of what we want in the first place and that is sort of the stage we are trying to get through
now and once we do that developing this framework with streets and blocks, establishing a
circulation system with land use and density patterns, open space, and then city design, all the
various pieces that infill back into the plan and infill back into the vision and the framework.
I’d like to just mention about that framework and take us now to Palo Alto. One of the things we
all know is of course one of the biggest problems with cross town circulation is the current rail
tracks and to a certain extent, high speed rail maybe can make it better but it may not change it
depending on the alternative that they select. One of the things that we can see is that when you
look at this pattern, the existing urban pattern, the residential areas on the North East side, North
is not north and west is not West in Palo Alto I know, but let’s use the drawing as North. So
north is up on the drawing. The neighborhoods north of the tracks and into downtown have this
very walkable and accessible urban framework. That framework falls apart along El Camino
Real and sort of the south side around the campus area and some of the large institution uses and
so on that we have. That framework of course we have this long wide band where this entire
framework ends. Of course Alma is part of the problem and the tracks are the other part of the
problem, so a lot of what we need to think about as we go forward in this project and in this
process is how we can improve on this urban framework that exists through here. And even
within the corridor area we are looking at, what can we do to make that work and function better
so it provides, a) better circulation and so on and, b) functions better for this amazingly diverse neighborhood that already exists.

One of the things we’ve done is we’ve looked at the types and places where there might be circulation framework opportunities for just crossing that one corridor and this diagram is a little hard to read but essentially what you’ll see from these dots here is we’ve mapped where the existing vehicular crossings are, the yellow ones, and we’ve marked where the existing pedestrian and bike crossings are, non-vehicular, and so those are down through Homer at California Avenue and then we said, well, where are the potential vehicular crossings? This is today. Forget about high speed train. This is today. Where else could we cross when we wanted to? The interesting thing about it is there aren’t many places that we can cross that don’t have anything to do with the train because for instance, right along this area, along Charleston, all these residential areas back up against the existing tracks. So unless we want to remove somebody’s house, we can’t cross anywhere. That removes this entire area as potential crossing locations for pedestrian or bicycle. Same is true down here. So by deductive means we are able to find that there are actually land use patterns and a variety of other reasons why we can’t make the crossings anyway. High speed train will have nothing to do with that and to a certain extent Caltrain will have nothing to do with that unless of course we can get everything down below grade and then maybe we can have more crossings. Then of course we have cost considerations but it doesn’t mean it is an impossible thing to do. Now the places we can do that are the white circles. You can see right near downtown there are several places where we could make that crossing, into the hospital area, crossings into where the park is, into the high school. We wouldn’t want vehicular crossings into the high school but we could have a bike connection there. That’s the kind of land use on the other side of the tracks that could accept a crossing but single family residential can’t. So its pretty interesting because you find regardless of what is going on with the trains themselves, we have land use constraints that limit what we can do and how we cross that corridor.

Finally I do think we need to talk about the train itself. I don’t want to just completely not mention that. I think that one of the things our approach has been on this, the first start has been, what do we know about the train. We know a lot of details about what they’re thinking but what we know for sure is they are looking at three alternatives. One of those is a sort of below grade, or at least a cut, and the other two are combinations of surface, below grade, and aerial viaduct. So we know they are looking at three alternatives and at this point we know what those alternatives are and presumably you have seen those as well. We don’t know if the high speed train is even coming for sure. We don’t know whether it will even look like any of those three alternatives so our sense has been, and this is partly what I’m trying to get at in this whole conversation and as Barbara started, is that we feel that what’s most important, and we believe this is what the council directive is all about, is we need to plan this area anyway. And we need to plan it of which the high speed train, in any configuration it may take, yes, as a consideration we need to think about it but we aren’t even sure it is going to arrive. So let’s plan and get a vision for this area to start to address a lot of the things I was already talking about, how we can make a better and greater neighborhood in this area. That includes identifying the visions which we are trying to do now and preparing alternatives and preparing this corridor plan. Then, as we are going through this we can circle back around and say this is what we want. What among the various high speed rail alternatives, or among what high speed train is doing, how can we use
that to help us implement our goal? If it never comes, we can still continue to implement our
goal for this area because we have one. We have a goal and it is embodied in your
comprehensive plan. With that I am going to turn it back over to Barbara and she can talk a little
bit about it further.

Barbara Maloney: To wrap up our presentation part of the study session here I just want to
briefly talk to you about what we have heard from the task force and the community relating to
many of these things we have been talking about. We have a number of ways we have been
reaching out. There is a project website and we have had task force meetings. As I mentioned
there have been seven of those, the eighth is coming up next week. They are doing a good job
representing neighborhoods, businesses and other stakeholders in the area who have an interest
in this and we are encouraging them to reach out to their constituents to not only get to the
community meetings but talk to them about what is going on and reflect their concerns in our
meetings. We have been actually getting pretty good attendance from the public at those task
force meetings as well. As far as the community meetings, the City has done a good job of
noticing those meetings. There is the web page and we are having two community meetings in
each phase of the project. This is the website which is up and running. It has been up and
running for a few weeks now so we are providing information as we go along and posting
material to that. Two of the task force meetings that we had that were the most interesting for us
and for the task force in terms of beginning to start getting our teeth into what the various issues
are and starting to get our teeth into the project. The first one we had which was the third
meeting that we had with the task force, we called a connectivity discussion and it sprang from
the drawing that Michael just showed you which showed the whole corridor, showed where the
crossings of the tracks and the rail area is for vehicular crossings, pedestrian crossings and so on
and we basically provided that drawing to the task force members, broke everybody up into
small groups and asked them to consider these questions. How can we make better connections?
Where should they be? Can we do pedestrian connections, bike connections, and if the trench
were covered if the train were in a trench configuration, it is our understanding from the
engineers that there is probably going to be an opportunity in that scenario for there to be
coverings for that trench as much as 800 feet long as long as there is 1400 feet left between
coverings because they need that for emergency purposes to get access to the trains themselves
should there be a problem. There are these opportunities for 800 feet covers. I’m not clear who
pays for those or how those would be implemented but if there were those, where might
locations for those be and how might those be used. So that was the topic of our first working
session for the task force and they enthusiastically jumped into this dialogue. We’ve got on the
left side there the long drawings on the middle of the wall there on the left and they represent
two of the tables that were working on that, about 6 or 8 people per table. They came up with a
lot of interesting things. You can see it either on the wall or the slide, the blue strips represent
locations where people were suggesting there might be cover over the trench and if they were
covered that would be a good location because they could envision uses that might work there
like park space or a crossing of some kind or another that might be both vehicular and ped and
bike and so on. Places where there could just be plazas, places where there could be an enhanced
train station whether that’s for Caltrain or not. The red dots were also very important they found
in that they defined destinations and those are places people want to get to from one side or
another so those were places we move forward I think will be very helpful to us as we go
along. So we’ve got some really very helpful information out of that and these are two of the
other drawings. Some folks got really excited about the coverings down around University Avenue and others were focused on some other areas in the project. Some of the yellow lines you see on there were suggestions about where some bike facilities should be improved for bike access along the corridor. We did find a lot of enthusiasm and support for bicycle access through the corridor and for Palo Alto as a whole. So some of the things we heard, just to summarize some of them, a lot about connectivity, reinforcement as Michael was saying, protecting those residential neighborhoods, particularly the single family neighborhoods and a lot of thought about the different kinds of crossing improvements. We also were asking them to identify particular intersections, vehicular intersections where there are pedestrian problems, conflicts, safety concerns, that kind of thing and those will be useful for us also as we move forward.

The second working meeting we had with the task force was relating to some land use and transportation questions. I won’t go through this whole list of questions but we had some that had to do about what the future of the corridor might be, this corridor area. Is it an area that might have higher intensity and be more downtown like perhaps in some ways, more TOD oriented? Was it a place where more moderate intensity changes are more appropriate or is it an area where there shouldn’t be any change? Little or no change? Also, if intensification is feasible, where would that be? We also asked accompanying transportation question. What should El Camino do? What should the land along El Camino, how can that be supportive? If there are traffic problems where are they and how can the street network be improved? We used as a basis for this, Michael showed this earlier, this is essentially a drawing that we’ve done from your zoning that indicates sites that are currently zoned for housing or mixed use in proximity to transit and services. And so, using that as a base to suggest areas where there might be opportunities, you can see the groups were beginning to look at things like the red blocks that people were putting on the maps indicate areas where there could be an intensification of retail uses, service uses. They were certainly clustered in most cases down at the southern end of El Camino in the study area, particularly south of Cal Ave. Some of the bike and pedestrian improvements were the yellow ones, it’s kind of hard to read the scale. You can see also there were ideas about new public spaces that are shown. The retail is shown in the red, the yellow, I don’t know what all the colors are going forward but you can see again on this one there was a lot of interest in the University Avenue area and how development could be reinforced. There were opportunities both with the cover ideas as well as on sites that adjoin University Avenue for intensification of uses which might be commercial uses or residential uses, any number of things. The yellow squares are higher density residential uses. And then we had our first community meeting and I just wanted to summarize a few of the findings on this, you’ll see on the easels on the left the selection, it’s not all of the questions we asked and the answers we receiving from the community. But we did a voting exercise that we could kind of begin to get a sense of people’s preferences on some different questions. We thought it was pretty interesting in the first question, what do you think the most important role of the study area is? There was a lot of support for residential uses in the corridor. There was support also of course for services, work, and cultural events but there was also almost equally strong support for residential and for all of the above so there seemed to be good confirmation of the idea, as Michael was saying, that this is a mixed use corridor and it should continue to remain and be reinforced as a mixed use corridor. The biggest problems? Poor connections to the rest of the city is clearly an issue but lack of services was seen as an important one as well. How important is increasing the use of alternate travel modes in the city and in the study area? Very, very important. Are there areas where land uses should be changed or intensified to improve the area? Clearly the three top vote getters in
that regard are probably pretty obvious. University Avenue, Park Blvd., El Camino, Fry’s, California Avenue area but there were questions and concerns about how that would work in the southern part of El Camino down in the vicinity of Charleston and questions have come up about that in the task force meeting and in the community meeting. Then finally, what new uses would be desirable in each of those areas? University Avenue, mixed use and retail and office. California Avenue, mixed use and retail. Park Blvd., El Camino, Fry’s, mixed use, residential and the other uses and El Camino near Charleston, retail certainly, mixed use and to some degree residential. So we feel as though we’ve gotten quite good direction from both the task force and the community from this and based on that overview we’d love to answer your questions and have any kind of a dialogue that you would like to have.

Chair Lippert: Director Williams.

Curtis Williams, Planning Director: Thank you Commissioners. I just wanted to apologize that the presentation was late this afternoon. We got it up for your viewing but we didn’t have time to make copies before the meeting so Elena has just delivered those to you. We will have that up on the website tomorrow as well so you or others can take a look at that. Thank you.

Chair Lippert: Thank you and thank you very much for your presentation. Thank you very much for members of the Rail Corridor Task Force members showing up this evening, I really appreciate it. I’m going to make an opportunity for members of the Rail Task Force if they wish to speak individually simply fill out a speaker card and I’ll just take them in the order that we receive them then I’ll have members of the public speak so with that we’ll begin with Tom Vlasik. Tom you have three minutes and you can add any additional comments and information you have and that will be followed by Irvin Dawid.

Mr. Tom Vlasik: Thank you Commissioners. I am the Southgate representative to the task force and I appreciate very much being able to represent my neighborhood but also the greater community and the appointment to the task force by the Council. The task force efforts started out somewhat slow but I think they’ve dramatically improved as we focused on the opportunities and constraints under the guidance of the consultants and I very much appreciate the framework that they put forth tonight and the opportunity they’ve had to share that with the task force and starting at the community meetings. It is a rough process to start and to take the diversity we have on the task force and put it into a form where the people are up to speed on the simple planning tools let alone the diverse issues we are coming to grips with. We are still in this early vision process but I very much appreciate the efforts that have been made over the last several meetings to guide us in a way so we could come together and put this vision into some form. I also appreciate that we are not stressing high speed rail, that it is not the driving force and I think that fundamentally, at least from my perspective, we appreciate the need to address the housing element requirements that may be able to be solved with some of the growth focused on this area but also there is a great deal of feeling on the part of the task force members that whatever we come up with, recognizing that we have to come to grips with a lot of factors. We do not want to come up with a plan that dramatically changes the character of the community. I see it as a community plan, not an urban design plan. In our community, Palo Alto is a significant place for us to live and do all of the things we find important so I think the committee is frustrated a bit because of the daunting task of putting these elements together but you do have a good group of
people who really are seriously bringing diverse opinions together and I really appreciate the
work of the consultants and look forward to your input too.

Chair Lippert: Thank you very much. Next we'll have Irvin Dawid followed by Phil Burton.

Mr. Irvin Dawid: Yes thank you Mr. Lippert and members of the Planning and Transportation
Commission. My name is Irvin Dawid. I’m one of two appointees from the Sierra Club. We are
the so-called environmental contingent. Just for the record the Sierra Club had, there were
several of us that applied, there is no “Sierra Club” position here, just coming from the
environmental community. My colleague Tom Jordan, sometimes I think he was appointed to
counteract my own more smart growth type of attitudes. Unfortunately the biggest thing I have
to say is some of the negative and that is that I was not there for our first community workshop.
I was in San Luis Obispo for a Sierra Club California meeting. I very much regretted that but I
never regret the opportunity to go to San Luis Obispo. I would urge everybody to do that. It is
the most bike friendly community that I know of that I go to. As Tom indicated, the role of the
consultants were really helpful and we were slow in getting started. Once the consultants came
on, and they really changed everything. It was like putting a car or bicycle into a more fast
moving gear and we started breaking out into work groups and as a whole we started becoming
more productive. The biggest hurdle that, and Tom also mentioned this, was to overcome you
could call it the high speed rail perspective. We had members of the public come and they
would use the public common just to talk about high speed rail. It is very clear the name of this
task force is rail corridor, not high speed rail corridor. In fact, even rail corridor is a bit of a
misnomer. As the consultants indicated, there are actually three corridors we are actually
discussing although one of them gets very little attention and that is the tracks themselves and
Alma Street. Speaking of that last corridor I would just say we’ve also had liaisons come
regularly and they have played a crucial role. Lee is one of them, Judith Wasserman from ARB
is another one, Paul Goldstein from the Bicycle Advisory Committee is another one and he made
a comment that I should have made. He pointed out that on Alma Street right by the Homer
Tunnel that he constantly sees people walking on the dirt path that is as narrow as a podium
because they are walking to get to the train station so the liaisons have played a crucial role and I
think we’re coming together now. Thank you.

Chair Lippert: Phil Burton, and if we have any other members from the rail corridor task force
that wish to speak, this is the time for them to do so.

Phil Burton: Good evening. My name is Phil Burton and I represent the midtown south. I am
going to try to be very brief. First item to report on is that yesterday evening I had a meeting
with the steering committee of the midtown resident’s association. They were very interested to
learn more about the process, the results so far in terms of what the process is doing. I think the
most immediate outcome is that they want to become more aware of events like community
outreach and I will do my part to make sure they have that information so there can be greater
community participation. The second thing I want to mention is that I was not at the first
community meeting because of a family medical emergency. I was actually back in New York
City. I had a chance to ride the New York City subway system and yes, it is amazing how many
people they move in a very limited amount of space but it is a very different urban environment,
nothing we can ever achieve her or would necessarily want to. Thank you.
Chair Lippert: Thank you very much. With that we’ll have Beth Bunnenberg followed by Bill Cutler. Beth, like myself, is a liaison or representative to the task force.

Beth Bunnenberg: Thank you, Beth Bunnenberg, 2351 Ramona Street. As has been stated, I am a liaison to the task force. I would like to at this point request some notice be given to the historic structures along the rail corridor. Thus far the study has not seemed to address the very special structures. Some of the samples are the Palo Alto tree with its roots that wrap around the old railroad bridge there at San Francisquito Creek, the 1941 Streamline Motor and University Avenue train station. Numerous business buildings along Alma Street that are on our city’s historic inventory, the Southgate possible national register district, and the green meadow national register district so I hope that as time progresses we will get some chance to put those in. Thank you.

Chair Lippert: Thank you very much. With that we’ll have the first member of the public speaking, that’s Bill Cutler, and if there are any other members of the public that wish to speak to this item, now is the time to hand in a card.

Mr. Bill Cutler: My name is Bill Cutler. I live at 4114 Park Blvd. First I have a comment and a question on process. What the consultants have shown us looks to me like a very effective and responsive process but I have one concern and that is the degree to which it can demonstrate that the entire community of stakeholders are really being engaged and the stakeholders important interests are being folded in. There is a tool called stakeholder audit which enumerates who the stakeholders are either by individual, group or by type and then identifies what the interests are for each of these stakeholder groups and the idea would be to demonstrate by some measure that the process is really reaching all of the stakeholders. Personally, I think it is not effective to just put up notices, bang a notice up on the telephone pole saying you all come, people like me who like to shoot off their mouths will show up. The other people who are a lot more quiet will not show up until late into the study when they get irate at the fact that their interests have been ignored and I would like to see some kind of process that would get these people out and into the process. The other comment I wanted to make was I realize in watching the presentation tonight that there is an opportunity for study and development in the El Camino Way area. There are a number of restaurants and there have been a couple of restaurants that were my favorites that have left and I think there is an opportunity for the neighborhood village along the El Camino Way alignment that would have restaurants the are interesting and shops that would be interesting to the people who lived in the neighborhood. With the density of residential that is adjacent to that both within the corridor study area and across El Camino on the west side, I’m wondering if that area might have the potential of being developed and have enough clientele to support something there that would be really interesting. So I wanted to call that to your attention and perhaps have that given some focus in the study.

Chair Lippert: Thank you very much. Are there any other members of the public that wish to speak to this item? Ok with that I’m going to close the public hearing and we will return to the commission. Commissioners, if you turn to the last page of the presentation there is PTC discussion items. This is actually an excerpt or it’s actually an abbreviated version of some questions that were asked at your community meeting number one. So with that what I’d like to do is return to the Commission. I’ll give each Commissioner five minutes, we’ll go down and
look for lights here. And if you could focus your comments or questions on the discussion items
I think it would be very helpful in terms of giving the consultants some feedback as well as any
other items that are appropriate. Do I have lights? I guess we’re done, no, I guess what we’ll do
is I’ll just begin down the line. Do you mind leading off Commissioner Martinez?

Commissioner Martinez: Ok. First to the planning director, my sources in Sacramento tell me
that there is a bill in the Senate to transfer the responsibility for high speed rail to Cal Trans. I
know it’s kind of speculative but how does that affect the process that we are going through right
now, if any?

Curtis Williams, Planning Director: Well, it does not affect the process we are going through
now but it may have implications for high speed rail and providing a different sort of oversight
for the high speed rail function in that its currently the authority as is an independent group that
has come under a lot of criticism for the way they’ve handled things so establishing them within
Cal Trans… I can probably make some untowards comments about the length of time it takes
anything to get through Cal Trans, it might be further delayed, but we don’t really know how that
would in and of itself would probably just be some initial delay at a minimum just to change the
bureaucracy kind of and move it in Cal Trans but how the substance of the alternatives they are
looking at and how those kinds of things would change or if they would, we don’t really know.

Commissioner Martinez: Only that our liaison in high speed rail would change to perhaps
different state representatives. I wanted to thank Beth about her comment about the historic
structures. I wanted to add one more and that’s Caltrain itself. Putting it underground or putting
it above, its kind of part of Palo Alto’s history so I want to make sure we preserve that. Question
to our consultants, I wanted to thank you. I’ve really enjoyed listening to you and it’s the second
time I’ve gotten to do that. Can you provide a little bit more substance in why the corridor study
includes El Camino Real? Why has it been expanded that way?

Barbara Maloney: We were presented as part of our scope of work that the study area extended
the full length of the study and then from Alma to El Camino and I think that’s because as one of
the task force members said, there are three corridors in this area and its clear that El Camino
plays a critically important role in transportation and circulation and land use throughout this
area. The study was slightly ill defined when we got there and what we’ve said is we should
actually look at properties outward of both El Camino and Alma so we get the envelope around
each of those rights of way as well as for the study area. Curtis do you want to expand on that?

Curtis Williams, Planning Director: No I think that is generally well put and if you look at the
train stations and particularly University and California Avenue train stations certainly the
walkable area to those train stations extends to El Camino and both of those locations we do
anticipate bus rapid transit on El Camino at some point in the future and so all these connections
in terms of the transit and walkability issues I don’t think we can look at the corridor without
being inclusive in that way and also we do show on the east side the line actually going east of
Alma for several blocks just to acknowledge that there are impacts certainly on the residents,
whatever the alternatives are for this corridor, the Cal Tran corridor. There are some impacts
there that will accrue to those residents on that side of Alma that we need to also be aware of as
we go through the study.
Commissioner Martinez: Thank you. One last question though. I understand that the sphere of influence does extend both across Alma and to El Camino but is it the intention or the direction of the study to propose developments in areas towards El Camino other than the transit where we are proposing infrastructural changes or looking at that kind of work that impacts the corridor study itself?

Curtis Williams, Planning Director: My guess is, and it is still to be defined by the task force and by the consultants and their joint work but my guess is that we’re not going to real specifically define land uses out to El Camino. Probably the closer you are to Caltrain the more specific we’ll be. There may be some opportunity sites or a few locations in this corridor though where it makes sense to focus and say this is an area that probably has potential for some redevelopment that might range from A to C but we are not going to get down to the point of saying that it should be a park or it should be a commercial retail space and FAR should be increased to such and such a point. We are not getting to the level of specificity even in the California Avenue area plan for instance. So again, I think that needs to be determined to some extent but just in terms of general land use patterns in these areas of opportunity that may exist within the corridor, I think that’s what we hope can be defined in this process and consistent in conjunction with the other plans that are going on.

Chair Lippert: Commissioner Garber.

Commissioner Garber: For the consultant, when you speak of mixed as a land use what do you mean?

Barbara Maloney: We typically mean either one of two things – that can be mixed in a building, retail under residential or retail under office or under office or residential so it could be mixed use within building configuration but it could also be side by side mixed use where we would have areas that would have retail projects and housing projects and even office projects in close proximity. Thank you.

Michael Smiley: There was an interesting comment that came from the task force that I thought was very good actually. I can’t remember which meeting it was but one of the task force members spoke to me and asked me that same question and the answer, typically as professionals we’ll say, well yes its mixing uses, in a building or next to each other but actually it goes back to what I said in the beginning and that is mixed use also in the context of this kind of planning includes parks, open space, cultural facilities and a broad array of things that are about the mix of this district and so mixed use, if we’re talking about a specific site, might be a building that has retail on the ground floor and then residential but if we’re talking about a district and I thought Mr. Cutler got a kind of interesting idea. That there is El Camino Real is a place that might have a more interesting array of things going on as a district. I’m not necessarily endorsing it but I’m saying we can also think of this as a place that has everything from churches to retail. It’s a real community mix of things going on.

Commissioner Garber: Understand, thank you. For staff, how does this particular study fold into the Fry’s area study? How will they relate to each other?
Curtis Williams, Planning Director: Well we are trying to inform both processes of what is happening in the other so we did have a meeting in the task force where we presented a number of different ongoing planning activities including Cal Avenue Fry’s area, plan to show what’s happening in that effort, also the bicycle master plan and other comprehensive planned activities so that they got a bigger picture of the activities going on so as we move forward we’ll do that and the same thing on the Cal Avenue side we’ll consider what that means and we’ll have to bring those two things closer together and I think right now we’ve delayed the Cal Avenue plan coming back to you in some respects because we want to see how this effort proceeds and if there is a closer alignment or an alignment of the two studies.

Commissioner Garber: Thank you. A couple of general comments and if we have a chance to go through maybe I’ll add some more at another time. It seems to me for the consultants it might be interesting/helpful to understand how this particular corridor operates as a feeder for the city. We know the statistics about how many people come in and off of the train itself but I’m interested in seeing that in context against for instance how 101 and 280 support the city and I think understanding how those numbers inform the use of the city will help us put into perspective some of the uses that are going to have to occur and occur today along that corridor.

I am reassured by the thoughtfulness that your study is undertaking here. In particular I like some of the thought experiments you are going through to look at what would happen if you were simply in particular to remove the train. And to recognize in fact that there is still the residual issues that are separating the city. I know from a variety of other communities, in order to stitch communities back together you have to put roadways back through areas where that fabric is not allowed or has been taken away. This is a topic that we’ve spoken about specifically in regards to the Fry’s area plan and the Cal Ventura area plan. What’s important there, at least in one commissioner’s view, is adding streets back in to take that area and stitch it back into our community. Looking at opportunities to cross that rail corridor as it existed I think there is a long way to trying to find ways to stitch the community back and forth but that raises a significant other issue and that is there are benefits to the existing condition. Someone can get from north to south in Palo Alto very quickly by diverting their path and going down Alma and then diverting back to wherever it is that they are going. If you were to fundamentally change a lot of those intersections along there you are fundamentally changing the likelihood of Alma operating that way. I’m not saying that’s good or bad, I’m just saying that the actual experiential differences can have impacts and beginning to try to find a way to quantify to understand what those things are will help us to make a decision as to what sort of vision we should be embracing or at least if we do embrace one we know what the consequences are.

Chair Lippert: Commissioner Fineberg

Commissioner Fineberg: I’d like to start with the back page of the PTC discussion items, the second bullet point that we were to consider was, and this is per your working groups I guess, was can it be a location for higher density, greater height and where. I’m a bit perplexed that this is a question that either the PTC or the task force or members of the public are being asked to answer because I have not heard a discussion publicly in this community about whether we are looking for sites that have higher density, greater height and where they should be. There are
some people that think there should be and some that think they shouldn’t be and we have not
made any policy decisions so to start the conversation with can it be a location before there is an
articulation of whether there should be locations, I find a little bit of the assumptions driving the
outcomes, rather than there being a full and fair conversation of what’s the vision of where we
want to end up and then how you get there. Consistent with that, I am concerned that I’m seeing
a little bit of discrepancy between the consultants have described there being meetings of
community members that were well attended yet at our staff report on page 5 it says the first
community workshop had about 25 members or people attending, most of which are members of
the task force, 17. To me, there were less than 10 members of the public that have been at the
one workshop and unless I am mistaken and I was not able to attend that I don’t consider less
than 10 people a good show, a good amount of input from the members of the public. We’ve
had one today, Mr. Cutler, and I have to acknowledge his comment. If there is a tool,
stakeholder audit, that he mentioned that we can use to track the feedback we are getting and
who the feedback is coming from, I think that would go to greatly inform us about where the
inputs are coming from and how we are reaching our conclusions. The process we have right
now is maybe not encompassing full public input with many representations of different ideas
and different approaches. Also, Mr. Williams, you said that we are delaying the work on Cal Ave. so that the process can happen simultaneously with this. In a perfect world, I think it’s
fantastic that we not plan one piece and ignore another piece. So there is a side of you that says
good but there is another side of me that says our old comp plan reached the end of its life in
2010. We were supposed to update it. Right now the work program was 2010 and any delays
we have along the way, any expansion of scope, leave us with more time where we are not
getting guidance from a comprehensive plan that isn’t based on traffic data from the mid 1980s,
that isn’t based on things that are so old, that isn’t based on conversations happened one or two
decades ago. We need to do whatever it is to get a new comprehensive plan before the next one
is due in 2020. We keep not operating with a vision of what we want to be that we’ve defined. I
applaud the work of the rail corridor task force, thank you to everyone who is on it. Spending of
your time and giving of yourselves, please keep doing that. We have to make sure that it moves
along with but doesn’t delay getting a new comp plan update and then staff obviously is going to
have to figure out how to stage that. I want to acknowledge Commissioner Keller’s comments,
make sure they get entered into the record with whatever public format they’re supposed to and
just to characterize them. He’s just breaking down the scenarios of the five different things that
could possibly happen, focusing on the train, whether there are no changes to Caltrain, under
grounding, above grounding, and that’s kind of not too much of the focus of today’s
conversations. I want to echo Beth Bunnenberg’s comments from the HRB about this process
must recognize historic resources. My guess is that might come along when there is more detail
review, things like identifying sensitive receptors along the corridor and many other things but
that is a big one that needs to be considered early on in a significant manner and if I could have
one more please, or second round.

Chair Lippert: We’ll do a second round if you have those and if not you can do it now and that
will be it. Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: I wanted to thank the task force as well as the staff and consultants. It
looks like a lot of work has happened and a lot of discussion has happened. I definitely want to
commend the various task force members that have gone out to the community, midtown and
other resident associations to reach out and I actually view although maybe the attendance of the
general public wasn’t as high, I think by having a large task force, 17 members, and having each
task force member reaching out to their own channels and own neighborhoods, we do get a good
voice of Palo Alto so thank you for reaching out and doing that. I think you guys are bringing up
the right questions and right issues. This is a good discussion for us to have. In regards to the
three questions that were posed to us, I think in terms of the role of the corridor for the city, I
think the survey was right. It’s pretty much all of the above. To say its only one or a couple
would be very hard to argue and so I think that to me is maybe obvious to most but the one thing
I do have to say about this, and its probably how the task force got to this level, but while it is
probably going to be a mixed use of a bunch of these different uses, some uses there are better to
be adjacent to high traffic areas than others so for instance, having a retail shop or a restaurant
near a busy street is far better than having a single family house for instance. While I understand
the consultants point of view in terms of having residential next to retail on street level, perhaps
what works a lot better is having residential above versus side by side, especially on busy streets
so those are some things that could be considered although I don’t know if that’s within the
scope of the task force. In general, I think it is smart planning of these various uses and their
compatibility to the various locations they are in. In regard to the second question, can it be a
location for a higher density?

I agree with my colleague, that we need to have more discussion and I think this is part of that
discussion we are having and if we want to have higher density where should it be and if we
want to have higher density. That’s also a very good question as well. Some of this, ABAGS is
trying to push upon Palo Alto and it is of course for our city to have the discussion ourselves to
figure out if that makes sense but in terms of this question itself, University Avenue I think is
pretty well developed. It is doing quite well as far as I can tell. Its pretty well developed, it has
had a lot of planning already. The California Avenue, Fry’s area we actually have a plan
underway as we have this discussion here. I think there’s actually quite a bit of opportunity for
improvement and to actually optimize the area better than it is perhaps done today so thinking
about that in context to how the rail corridor is going to be changing over the next few decades
or so is important. In terms of the El Camino South area we all know there has been a lot of new
housing in South Palo Alto and this can facilitate growth in services for those new residential
units. Now realize new residential units aren’t necessarily near El Camino South but certainly
having some services closer would make sense so I’m not sure it needs more housing along El
Camino South or even along El Camino but certainly having more services would make a lot of
sense to me. Finally, on the last question, what does the corridor need to create a better urban
place and I think the first thing the task force seems to be doing extremely right is we are kind of
moving from a very reactive model where things are coming down and we need to react to them
to be more proactive and that’s the formation of the task force and the thinking of the task force
today to kind of get ahead of things versus reacting to when projects are proposed or when things
are handed down from various agencies whether it be Caltrain or high speed rail or whoever. It’s
actually really good that this kind of thinking is happening and I really think the task force is
doing something that probably should have been done a while back but its essential that it is
being done and I think as the task force continues to meet and tries to tackle these hard problems,
one thing to think about is there are a lot of problems posed, a lot of goals trying to be achieved
but perhaps one thing to think about is while it is 17 people, all these programs are very large,
just getting the connectivity, the crossings, fixing those existing issues, whether we have high
speed rail or the electrification of Caltrain, just think about a few big problems rather than 10 big
problems, just a few and thinking about how those problems can be solved in various scenarios
be it high speed rail or Caltrain electrified or whatever the scenario might be but practically
thinking about how we solve these problems. One big part of this besides just finding the right
location and right configuration is also thinking about how do you fund it? How does it get
funded? There has been some discussion about having some covers, if the train is going to be
put underground in a trench. There is going to be some opportunity to perhaps monetize some of
that land that is created above and perhaps that can be a funding source but I think that is
something that has to be part of the thinking of the task forces, thinking about a few big
problems and then possible solutions according to what scenario might actually happen as well
as how you fund it and if the task force does that I think it is going to be greatly indebted so
thank you for all your work.

Chair Lippert: First of all, Commissioner Keller could not be with us this evening but he
submitted some comments and I’ve asked Director Williams and Elena Lee to share those with
the task force along with our comments this evening so you’ll be receiving those.
With regard to my comments, first of all I want to commend the working group. I think I’ve
done that a couple of times but not in this forum here. You’ve done a trem endous job, the
amount of work you’ve done in a very brief period of time has really been great and I know that
it took a while to get off of the high speed rail and get focused on the land use and it really shows
in the work that you’ve done so far and I think the conclusions that you come to in Phase 1 will
be very gratifying not only for yourself but for this community. With regard to some feedback
on the specific material that you’ve brought forward this evening, first of all, I think Al ma Street
is a very important street in Palo Alto. It is really a spine to the city and what I mean by that is it
is a place where everybody in the city goes but it is not a destination by itself. I think
Commissioner Garber outlined it pretty well which is that is really the way people get around
the city. It is our own private expressway.

I live over in downtown north over toward Middlefield Road but I would never go down
Middlefield road to get to midtown. I scoot over to Alma Street and I go down Alma Street and
cut through on Colorado to midtown and that’s how I get there. I use it several times a day and
so with the plan that you have with regard to looking at land use along there, right now I would
never look at that as being a mixed use corridor. I would never look at that as being by itself
along Alma Street, being destinations that people are looking to get to for community services
but I think perhaps with what Commissioner Garber alluded to which is with some of these
crossings and some of the reinforcement of the connections from East to West is going to begin
to make that street slow down and maybe operate a lot like Middlefield Road or maybe El
Camino Real. And then, as a natural progression, maybe there could be some mixed use uses on
there. Maybe there could be some sort of retail or office space with residential above it. One
thing that I’m very reluctant to do is to sort of jump forward and say, oh, this is the way I see
Alma Street and what I see this group doing is actually going through the process of beginning to
think about these parts and pieces and how they operate and a lot of the ideas I had many many
years ago are beginning to take form, but as I look at other elements the group is being asked to
look at, for instance the crossings how we knit together the fabric of the streets in this
community, Alma takes on a whole different complexion and so I can see higher density
development along there but with it being a corridor or being a spine, I don’t see that yet. Maybe
in 25 years from now, if we get some of those connections across Alma Street, we could go for higher density development and I do see an opportunity for higher density development actually while we think of height as being a barrier or wall could actually be a buffer to the single family residences and what I’m thinking of is again, it depends on the configuration of the high speed rail or what form electrification of Caltrain takes. If it is a trench there then naturally we can sort of knit together that city as almost a seamless piece of fabric. If we end up having an elevated railway along there and grade separation, how do you buffer the R1 communities on both sides? How do you begin to make it so that they’re not having to be subject to the sound of the train coming by every 8 minutes? And so buildings can actually begin to work and heights can begin to work as those kinds of buffers along the street. One last thing I wanted to say is that there are very few cities in the street where I drive down and I really observe the quality and the surroundings and Alma Street is one of them, another is Middlefield Road. El Camino Real I don’t look at it in terms of a visual asset to this community but there are certain aspects to Alma Street which visually have a very appealing visual quality to it and then I realize that I’m just looking at weeds running along the railroad tracks so I think there is an opportunity here to actually enhance and improve the visual quality of Alma Street. So with that, we’ll go to one more round of comments, begin with Commissioner Martinez and we’ll do three minutes apiece.

Commissioner Martinez: Ok. I want to take a bit of a contrary position here. I was at a community meeting in a little rural community last night in which we had a site for a town center and the community said, no, we need to look at a larger area. We need to look at the areas on both sides. And I said no, no, no lets just focus on what we have. And I want to say that to our group tonight as well. The real issue is the Caltrain corridor. We can be in a state of denial and say no, the corridor is really much larger but what is looming is the high speed rail, whether it is coming or not. If it comes we need to sort of be ready to address it. If it doesn’t come, maybe our project just goes away and nothing happens. The rest of it might be speculative about what could happen on El Camino or what happens on California Avenue but what we can do on the Cal Trans corridor itself can be a great benefit for what happens in our future regardless of the rail situation. I’d like to ask our consultants and our task force, when you get to Phase 2 where you’re looking at the alternatives to look at two very distinct alternatives. Grant those that want to see higher density development around this corridor but also take care and look at a civic low density open space intensive alternative because the corridor itself is one of our historic resources, the open space, you build five story buildings on it and it becomes something else. I would like us to have the option to look at this as being a civic connector to support what Commissioner Garber has said. One last point to support what Commissioner Fineberg said about community outreach, I totally agree that whether it is twelve or ten community members present, if it is less than 100 or more it is not a significant sampling regardless of how hard we try to outreach. Those percentages, 35%, believe this is 20% thought this was a better option, don’t mean very much when you have ten people that you are sampling so I would like to ask staff to really look at how we can do outreach in a more effective manner. Hold it here at the council chambers, do more communications to our neighborhood associations, put a big article in the paper, whatever we have to do to get that significant number up.

Chair Lippert: What about ten or twelve people with 25 opinions each? Commissioner Garber.
Commissioner Garber: So struggling a little bit with the concept of the corridor. Perhaps this shares something with some of the words Commissioner Martinez has just spoken about. The pattern of development in the city in terms of how we remember the experiences of the city is an east west direction. It is University Ave., it is California Ave., it is San Antonio. It could be some of these other connections that you’re beginning to explore. But it’s in lines that are perpendicular to the corridor itself. So it is very difficult for me to say well, the corridor should have this character or the corridor that we’ve defined here should all be high or should be a place where we work or it should be whatever because I don’t think of it that way. I think of that line as simply a line that constrains my ability to stitch the city together east west and that is why I come back to the exercise which is, if that line were not there and the city were to have been allowed to grow without that, what would have changed? And I am using that as a thought exercise to understand the gap between what we have now and where we would like to be. For example, if you did not have the rail, and let’s put aside the reality that if we didn’t have the rail we wouldn’t have Palo Alto as we know it today because we wouldn’t have people coming here but just pretend it wasn’t there on University Avenue. Where would Stanford be relative to University Avenue? There is a gulf right at the moment where the city ends at Alma Street and then there is this no man’s land of railroad track on El Camino, Bridge and Gateway and then you go through the forest and then you’re at Stanford. But if those things were not there, Stanford would be a much different experience than the city. It would be more like presumably some of the other great urban campuses throughout the country that are much more interrelated with their communities. So, is that something that, if we were to look at using the rail corridor, that area in a different way, would be beneficial for us? Is that something we want to be able to change in order for that sort of an experience to occur? Is the city better not having this divide in some of the places? I’m just trying to get my hands around the benefits, one way or the other, what the values are and using some of these exercises as ways to expose the values that we think are precious. I think I’m going to have to leave it like that for the moment with my three minutes.

Chair Lippert: Commissioner Fineberg followed by Tanaka.

Commissioner Fineberg: I want to talk about the first question, what is the role of the corridor in the city. I think corridor might be the best word in there. As our consultants talked about, the corridor, they intersperse the wording also mixed use district and I kind of struggle thinking of Alma as a district because as a resident, to me, its many many neighborhoods with a really fast road running down the middle of it and everything is relative. When I used to live further east near the bay it took me a long time to get to Alma so I almost never used Alma. Now I live in Green Meadow. It is really easy to get to Alma and compared to going up Lewis or Greer because I avoid Middlefield, Alma is really fast but it is still not a true highway. And we have an issue in the city, especially in the southern part of the city that many residents talk about getting in their cars because it is a suburban model of the street layouts and there isn’t walkable neighborhood serving retail. There aren’t little villages except for at Charleston Center and our residents south get in their cars and drive to Mountain View to do all their shopping and all their sales tax dollars leave Palo Alto. If we break the function of a thoroughfare that works as a thoroughfare, we’ll simply have more of that. It might sound like a regressive way of planning but the reality is, if we just increase density along a corridor and leave the suburban neighborhoods without any urban core, it is just going to break things. So, if the balance
somehow provides things that are daily needs, grocery stores, retail, I can see that it might enhance things rather than just break things, but if there can be some attention to that, focusing on Alma as a mixed use district though I think is a bit of a misnomer because it is really made up of many districts. If you start in the south and look on the east, it is the first little bit of it, which most people don’t even think of is Palo Alto. Mayfield Mall which is an abandoned shopping center, soon to be converted to medium density housing, continue north for quite a while, at least maybe a mile, it’s R1.

Then there is a little bit of Alma Plaza retail and will eventually be medium density housing and a little bit of retail. Keep going north and it is mixed multifamily and single family until you get to downtown and that to me is a pretty consistent face of you driving north and the right side of the road is all houses. Left side is industrial but you can’t see it through the bushes. If I could finish up on just the last thing then, I think also in the start of your presentation, you talked about some assumptions that were made in how we go forward with planning and you said that we have three stations. We don’t. San Antonio has a very high probability of being closed. How one plans for these unknowns is the million dollar question. We need to be careful how we measure the likelihood of having the bus rapid transit stations. I would encourage you to take a look at how VTA defines the probability of that when they evaluate specific projects and they define it as there being funding sources identified and/or approved and/or how near term funds will be received. The idea that there is a vision and a concept that maybe in twenty years there might be something, I don’t think we should change our comprehensive plan on a vision when the reality is VTA is cutting funding and eliminating bus routes now? So, I think before we recommend changing comp plan and then following up with ZOU's there needs to be a degree of certainty or the correct conditional language to have those assumptions be accepted as having any likelihood of happening and the last thing is, given the uncertainty with what’s happening with Caltrains and the high speed rail, I think there has to be conditional wording in many of the things that if this happens, then this happens. If this doesn’t happen, then this shouldn’t because if, for instance, we end up with no high speed rail, then why build houses where there is no station. If we do get high speed rail, then something else makes sense. That will be it. Thank you.

Chair Lippert: Commissioner Tanaka.

Commissioner Tanaka: I pretty much said all I needed to say last time but I’ll just wrap it up with one last thought and that is, as I’ve said before, I think this is a chance to help decide our fate. I think it is great we are being proactive. We should use the change that is going to happen as well as some of the potential big changes that are going to happen with potentially high speed rail and other things to fix problems that the city has had for a long time, all the connectivity problems, the grade separation problems. Try to proactively get ahead of the problems and see if there is a way to try and alleviate these problems given the change that is bound to happen. Thank you for all your work and we look forward to seeing more of it. Thank you.

Chair Lippert: I’m just going to follow up on a couple of comments that I made previously about being the spine to Palo Alto. If you are a pedestrian, the likelihood of you walking down Alma Street is practically nil. I see very few people walking on Alma Street. If you are a bicyclist you are never going to take Alma Street. It is the most dangerous street in the city we have now. If
you are a bus rider, you’re not going to take Alma Street. There aren’t any buses that go down Alma Street. You’re going to take El Camino Real down from the transit center down to California Avenue and beyond. My greatest concern is that if we don’t get some sort of cross connectivity and to sort of slow down the way Alma Street functions right now, there is just no way that any of those other aspects of how we get down Alma Street are going to come about and then perhaps by being able to have the cross connectivity, re-knitting the city fabric back together again and then being able to have actual places worth going to along Alma Street, you will begin to see pedestrians, you will begin to see bicyclists and maybe we’ll even get some bus service along there. With that, I’ve got a minute and thirty seconds left and I’ve promised Commissioner Garber that he can have the remainder of my time.

Commissioner Garber: Most of my comments have really been about analysis. Let me talk real briefly. At the intersection of University Ave. and the rail line, the opportunity there is for civic identity. It’s really the only place in Palo Alto that has this lotus of university, of city, this large transit center, etc., etc. and really there is no place that celebrates that. The underlying infrastructure works against that sort of a read and if there is anyplace that needs to be able to bridge all those different competing ideas, that’s the place that that needs to happen and its one of the only places where Palo Alto really has that opportunity there. Cal Ave. is in tremendous need of revisioning. And that’s not just the responsibility of the rail corridor study. But the greatest opportunity to have an impact with simple changes and simple re-imagining are greatest there. In both, one could easily imagine a cultural center or civic center, sort of expression occurring on University Avenue, having that occur on California Avenue would be transformative for that part of the city. It would also create all sorts of other issues but there is tremendous opportunity at Cal Ave. We have talked about the area study that is going on just to the south and the opportunity to put office along Park and how that can feed what California Avenue is doing, having mixed use along that street as well as feeding into how you use the Fry’s site relative to both residential, be it high density, be it no density, however it happens. Tremendous opportunity there and how the rail corridor operates to support that, I think can be key. Once you get further south, gosh as you’ve acknowledged and recognized in your framework diagram, extraordinarily difficult to create the stitching of the two pieces together. It would be great if you could find a way to bring Loma Verde through and create another sort of midway corridor that’s halfway between Oregon Expressway, California and San Antonio, but I think I will live at least a lifetime or so before I can actually imagine that actually happening. Are there opportunities for pedestrian crossways to occur or bicycle crossways? Probably more readily. But the constraints become significantly more difficult. Great opportunities to be able to find ways if the corridor is to continue and the rail is to continue to exist, for it to be not on the surface between University and California Ave., maybe what you do is at least one of the studies, what you’re really doing there is sort of emphasizing what you can do, what the positives are, and you exploit that as best you can. That’s it for me.

Chair Lippert: Well again, thank you very much for your presentation and I hope you get some constructive feedback.
SCOPE OF SERVICES

1. SCOPE OF SERVICES

PHASE 1: CONTEXT AND VISION (4 months)

Task 1.1 Project Initiation
The BMS Design Group team will meet with staff to finalize the work program, schedule and project budget. The work program will be used throughout the process to monitor progress; work products will be clearly defined. At this time the team will submit requests for data of varying types.

At this time schedules and procedures for project communications will be identified. A preliminary schedule of High Speed Rail Committee, Planning and Transportation Commission and City Council meetings will be set.

Task 1.2 Review Background Materials
City Staff will provide GIS and Autocad data and mapping, reports, analyses and other data for relevant studies, city documents, and other materials including in progress plans.

The BMS team will utilize the city’s data to prepare base maps suitable for analysis and plan preparation. The team will undertake a thorough review of site conditions, relevant documents and plans including documents relevant to corridor transportation and, in particular, documents produced by the HSR Authority related to alignment options and station information. Utilizing materials provided by the city, including policy and regulatory plans and ordinances, planned or proposed project information, site and aerial photos, and work by other consultants, the BMS team will assemble and review materials in preparation for subsequent tasks. The team will create a preliminary list of issues to be discussed with the Task Force and community.

The BMS team and city staff will conduct a site tour of the project area.

Task 1.3 Task Force Meeting 1
The preliminary Task Force meeting will serve to introduce the project work program and schedule. BMS Design Group will facilitate a discussion of goals for the project and issues that the Task Force considers essential to the outcome of the project.

Task 1.4 Stakeholder Interviews
The BMS team will conduct a limited number of individual or small group stakeholder interviews. These will provide key stakeholders with an opportunity to discuss issues of particular concern directly with the team. These meetings, if needed, will be conducted on the same days as other standing meetings such as Task Force.

Task 1.5 Community Meeting 1 | Issues Charrette
The BMS team will conduct the first project community meeting. The agenda for the meeting will include a review of the work program and schedule, as well as an update by city staff on any related HSR or city planning information. The BMS team will facilitate a discussion and prioritization of issues of concern to the community. These will become elements in the ultimate evaluation of project concepts and alternatives.
Task 1.6  Urban Design and Land Use Analysis – Issues and Opportunities

Prepare Urban Design and Land Use Analysis

The BMS team will collect a range of information regarding the existing nature of the study area and its short and long term opportunities. Information to be compiled and considered will include:

- Existing land use patterns
- Existing facilities, including public and community uses such as schools, parks, community facilities, etc.
- Neighborhood/district context – neighboring uses and districts, areas of influence
- Community scale and character
- Architectural and landscape character
- Distinguishing features such as landmarks, entries and edges
- Relationship of facilities and uses to major and minor rights of way and circulation framework
- Opportunity sites
- Parcel configurations
- Parcel ownership
- Proximity to transit facilities

Provide Market-Based Inputs to Issues and Concepts

Making use of existing data and studies as much as possible, EPS will conduct a high-level market review to assess potential development opportunities in the study area. Utilizing area demographic and employment trends, development patterns, competitive supply, and project performance, EPS will characterize the market support for various types of development along the Corridor. The results of EPS’s market review will be incorporated as the land use alternatives are developed. EPS will work with the rest of the consultant team to shape the land use alternatives by attending the task force meeting described in Task 1.7 to provide perspective on the implications of each alternative in terms of its capitalization on market opportunities, its projected buildout timeframe, and the comparative value being created for property owners.

Preliminary Identification of Implementation Constraints

The BMS Team will work with City staff, rail agency representatives, and other important stakeholders to understand the potential parameters of each party’s participation in the implementation of the Corridor plan. Issues to discuss will include the entities’ legal and administrative obligations and constraints, the amount of and competition for financial resources, etc. For example, do changes to existing regulations or programs require popular elections? What funding sources are available and how much have been pledged to other projects or programs? Do the by-laws of various entities’ formation prevent or require certain actions? This review will help to ensure that the parties involved and the community-at-large understand the “ground rules” for evaluating the viability of alternative planning concepts.

Task 1.7  Task Force Meeting 2

The second Task Force meeting will focus on reviewing and discussing the urban design and land use analysis. The meeting will be facilitated by BMS to ensure that the Task Force can review and comment on all the various element of analysis that are presented. The focus will be on confirming the team’s analysis and identifying key issues and opportunities.

Task 1.8  Transportation and Circulation Framework Analysis – Issues and Opportunities

BMS and subconsultants will summarize and describe key transportation parameters associated with the HSR alignment options and station location including potential impacts, obstructions to connectivity, multi-modal access,
infrastructure requirements, and costs. BMS and subconsultants will also summarize transportation-related issues as identified in the analysis, and as discussed by staff, city leaders, the Task Force and community. Working with the BMS team, the transportation subconsultants will discuss land use, urban design and transportation opportunities associated with the study area and future infrastructure improvements.

BMS and the subconsultants will provide a comparative assessment of existing and future constraints to the integration of HSR into the Rail Corridor and the constraints created by implementation of the HSR. They will also summarize the transportation-related opportunities for expediting the integration of HSR as well as the potential for transit-oriented development.

**Task 1.9 Task Force Meeting 3**
The third Task Force meeting will focus on reviewing and discussing the transportation and circulation analysis. The meeting will be facilitated by BMS to ensure that the Task Force can review and comment on all the various element of analysis that are presented. The focus will be on confirming the team’s analysis and identifying key issues and opportunities.

**Task 1.10 Community Meeting 2 | Vision Charrette**
The second community meeting will be a longer meeting to allow a full discussion of the issues and opportunities associated with urban design, land use, transportation and circulation elements. As part of the meeting, the BMS team will facilitate a small group brainstorming of initial visions for the project area, incorporating the opportunities identified by the analysis as well as others that community members will bring to the discussion.

**Task 1.11 Task Force Meeting 4**
This Task Force meeting will review the work to date, including the results of the community meeting. Discussion will focus on confirming issues, opportunities and visions for the area.

**Task 1.12 Summary of Context and Preliminary Vision for Corridor**
The BMS team will prepare a brief summary of the work to date compiling materials prepared for and developed at the various meetings. The materials in this summary will be presented so as to lead directly into and form the basis for the analysis and tasks of Phase 2, especially the definition of alternatives.

**Meetings (maximum):**

Task Force: 4

- Goals and Issues
- Urban Design and Land Use
- Transportation and Circulation Analysis
- Summary of Context and Vision

High Speed Rail Committee - 1

Planning and Transportation Commission Progress Reports and Hearings – 2

City Council Progress Reports and Hearings – 1

Community: 2

- Issues Charrette
- Vision Charrette

**Deliverables:**

*Summary of Context and Vision*
• Goals, Policies and Vision Statements
• Issues and Opportunities

PHASE TWO: ALTERNATIVES AND ANALYSIS (5 months)

Task 2.1 Urban Design, Land Use, and Transportation Concepts
The BMS team will prepare urban design, land use and transportation concepts for the study corridor. These concepts will be integrated and coordinated with the transportation concepts, building upon one or several alternative urban design framework of streets and pathways, and parcels. The concepts will identify the creation of neighborhoods or districts within the corridor as well as the manner in which areas of the corridor may be better integrated into and connected with adjoining neighborhoods and districts. The concepts will explore the most relevant and feasible land uses and densities and opportunities for transit-oriented development. The concepts will be configured to illustrate a range of options that will lead to configuring alternatives combining urban design, land use and circulation elements.

Task 2.2 Task Force Meetings 5 and 6
This Task Force meeting will be organized to allow a thorough review of the urban design, land use and transportation and circulation concepts. From the range of concepts presented, the Task Force and consultant team will identify preferred concepts that will be integrated into the plan alternatives.

Task 2.3 Community Meeting 3 | Concept Review Workshop
The community meeting will be conducted as small group work sessions, with facilitated discussion of the urban design, land use, circulation and transportation concepts. The discussions will be summarized with priorities among the range of concepts identified by the community. Voting for preferences and priorities may be one technique used to discern public preferences.

Task 2.4 Preliminary Urban Design, Land Use and Transportation Alternatives
Based on the feedback from the Task Force meeting and the community meeting, the team will prepare up to three plan alternatives. These will be configured to reflect three realistic alternatives that resolve issues and match community priorities and concerns. A variety of graphic materials and media will be used to depict the alternatives including plans, sketches, sections, photosimulations, and 3D models.

Task 2.5 Task Force Meeting 7
The Task Force meeting will be the opportunity for members to review and propose modifications to the preliminary alternatives. Issues, further analysis, and additional concepts will also be discussed.

Task 2.6 Refine Alternatives and Preliminary Evaluation
Based on the Task Force meeting, the BMS team will refine the alternatives. At this time, working with city staff and select stakeholders, the BMS team will identify potential environmental impacts associated with the alternatives. These will focus on impacts to historic resources, visual and noise impacts. An overview of possible traffic impacts will be discussed but detailed analysis will not be conducted at this time.

Task 2.7 Task Force Meeting 8
At this Task Force meeting, the BMS team will present the refined alternatives and provide information relevant to evaluating the alternatives, such as cost, phasing, feasibility of development options, and regulatory or policy hurdles. The team will facilitate a discussion with the Task Force to gain their insights into further evaluation of the plans.
Task 2.8 Community Meeting 4 | Alternatives Review Workshop
The final community meeting of this phase will include a review of the alternatives, as modified by input from the Task Force as well as by the High Speed Rail Committee, Planning and Transportation Commission, and City Council. The facilitated discussions will focus on evaluation of the alternatives and any proposed modifications.

Task 2.9 Summary of Alternatives and Evaluation
A brief summary of the work of Phase 2, focusing on the alternatives, will be prepared. It will include discussion of the alternatives as well as their evaluation, including comments and input from the Task Force, community, and city policy-makers.

Meetings (maximum):
Task Force: 4
• Review Concepts
• Review Preliminary Alternatives
• Review Alternatives and Evaluations
High Speed Rail Committee - 1
Planning and Transportation Commission Progress Reports and Hearings – 2
City Council Progress Reports and Hearings – 1
Community: 2
• Concept Review Workshop
• Alternatives Review Workshop

Deliverables:
Summary of Concepts, Alternatives and Evaluations

PHASE THREE: PLAN PREPARATION (3 months)
Task 3.1 Task Force Meeting 9 - Charrette: Identify Preliminary Preferred Plan(s)
Based on input from Phase 2, the BMS team will conduct a charrette with city staff and the Task Force. The purpose of the charrette will be to work intensively through the various alternatives identified and to determine those elements that most align with the issues and concerns of the community and that will provide the most beneficial framework for the future of this area of Palo Alto. If needed, options may remain on some components to provide flexibility or to illustrate certain policy decisions that will need to be made.

Task 3.2 Refine Preferred Plan(s)
The BMS team will refine the plans identified in the Task Force charrette, clarifying and outstanding issues and providing a range of illustrations such as 3D modeling, photosimulations and other hand- and computer-generated drawings that will illustrate the plan concepts.

Task 3.3 Community Meeting 5 | Preferred Plan(s) Workshop
The BMS team will facilitate a community meeting with the intent of reviewing, clarifying if needed, and confirming the preferred plans for the corridor as well as any remaining options for elements or particular issues. The meeting will be conducted with a combination of presentation, small group discussions and attendee input via voting, comments or other means.
Task 3.4 Identify Preliminary Implementation Issues and Strategies
The BMS Team will identify the variety of regulatory changes, physical improvements, and programmatic approaches required to implement the preferred plan. Where investments in new public infrastructure are required, the BMS Team will work with city staff to estimate the costs of those improvements. Then, EPS will help to frame a financing strategy for those improvements by exploring the availability of existing funding sources as well as the potential capacity for new development to contribute to infrastructure costs through various means. In addition to state, federal, and rail agency funding, EPS will consider locally implemented funding sources such as Community Facilities Districts, development impact fees, tax increment, the City’s CIP, public private partnerships, transferable development rights, etc. While not resulting in specific cost burdens and financing mechanisms assigned to specific properties, this analysis will indicate whether the study area appears capable of carrying the burden for the new infrastructure, or if alternative funding sources are likely to be required. Also, it will be important to create a conceptual implementation schedule that aligns the phasing of improvements with the availability of funding from various sources. The implementation strategy will also account for the responsibilities allocated to various parties and stakeholders, including the City of Palo Alto and local property owners and developers in addition to the rail agencies and other levels of government.

The team will also identify potential environmental issues associated with plan implementation.

Task 3.5 Task Force Meeting 10
The Task Force will meet to review implementation issues and strategies identified by the BMS Design Group team.

Task 3.6 Draft Rail Corridor Plan
Based on input from all preceding tasks and from the summaries prepared at the conclusions of phases 1 and 2, the BMS team will prepare a draft corridor plan. It is expected that this plan will be a compilation of materials already prepared with additional commentary and illustrations as needed. The plan will be configured to correlate with other city policy documents to allow ready inclusion by staff. The draft plan will be provided to city staff for a preliminary review. Following receipt of any major comments, the team will provide a revised plan for distribution to the Task Force.

Task 3.7 Task Force Meeting 11
The team will meet with the Task Force to receive comments on the draft plan. Following review by the Task Force and staff, the team will finalize the plan for presentation and distribution to city decision-makers.

Task 3.8 Community Meeting 6 | Open House
A community meeting will be held to review the Rail Corridor Plan. This community meeting will be held in an open house format, allowing the community to review and comment all elements of the plan.

Task 3.9 Final Rail Corridor Plan
Following presentations to the High Speed Rail Committee, the Planning and Transportation Commission, and City Council, the BMS Design Group team will finalize the Rail Corridor Plan.

Meetings (maximum):
Task Force: 3
  • Preferred Plan Charrette
  • Implementation Issues and Strategies
  • Draft Plan Review
High Speed Rail Committee - 1
Planning and Transportation Commission Progress Reports and Hearings – 2
City Council Progress Reports and Hearings – 1
Community: 2
  • Preferred Plan Workshop
  • Draft Plan Open House

Deliverables:
Draft and Final Rail Corridor Plan
EXHIBIT B
SCHEDULE OF PERFORMANCE

The CONSULTANT shall complete all project tasks and services within the timeframes and schedule agreed upon between CITY and CONSULTANT. The BMS Design Group team will meet with staff to finalize the work program, schedule and project budget. The work program will be used throughout the process to monitor progress; work products will be clearly defined. At this time the team will submit requests for data of varying types.

At this time schedules and procedures for project communications will be identified. A preliminary schedule of High Speed Rail Committee, Planning and Transportation Commission and City Council meetings will be set.

Estimated Time Periods:

Phase 1 - 4 months
Phase II- 5 months
Phase III- 3 months
EXHIBIT “C”
COMPENSATION

The CITY agrees to compensate the CONSULTANT for professional services performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Agreement, and completed to the reasonable satisfaction of the CITY, as described in Exhibit A, Scope of Services, a *not-to-exceed* price for professional services of Two Hundred Thousand Dollars ($200,000.00). Compensation will be paid for services provided as outlined below and as detailed in Exhibit C-2, Project Budget and Schedule Summary, based on the Hourly Rates provided in Exhibit C-1, Schedule of Rates.

### PHASE ONE - CONTEXT AND VISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Project Initiation</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Review Background Materials</td>
<td>$7,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting 1</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Stakeholder Interviews</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Community Meeting 1</td>
<td>Issues Charrette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Urban Design and Land Use Analysis</td>
<td>Issues and Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting 2</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Transportation and Circulation Framework Analysis</td>
<td>Issues and Opps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Community Meeting 2</td>
<td>Vision Charrette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Summary of Context and Preliminary Vision for Corridor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>$53,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE TWO - ALTERNATIVES AND ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Urban Design, Land Use and Transportation Concepts</td>
<td>$24,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Task Force Meetings 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Community Meeting 3</td>
<td>Concept Review Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Preliminary Urban Design, Land Use and Transportation Alternatives</td>
<td>$14,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Refine Alternatives and Preliminary Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Task Force Meeting 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Community Meeting 4</td>
<td>Alternatives Review Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Summary of Alternatives and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>$75,764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PHASE THREE – PLAN PREPARATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Task Force Charrette</td>
<td>Identify Preliminary Preferred Plan(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Refine Preferred Plan(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Services
Rev June 2, 2010
CONSULTANT agrees to complete all Basic Services, including reimbursable expenses, within this amount. Any work performed or expenses incurred for which payment would result in a total exceeding the maximum amount of compensation set forth herein shall be at no cost to the CITY.

REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES

Reimbursables shall include, but are not limited to, the cost of copying plans, outreach materials, postage, signage or other items not included herein. Travel, computer and phone charges shall be considered as included in the CONSULTANT overhead costs. Any needed office spaces or related supplies shall be provided by CONSULTANT and shall be considered to be included in the Scope of Services above.

ADDITIONAL SERVICES

The CONSULTANT shall provide additional services only by advanced, written authorization from the CITY. The CONSULTANT, at the CITY’s project manager’s request, shall submit a detailed written proposal including a description of the scope of services, schedule, level of effort, and CONSULTANT’s proposed maximum compensation, including reimbursable expense, for such services based on the rates set forth in Exhibit C-1. The additional services scope, schedule and maximum compensation shall be negotiated and agreed to in writing by the CITY’s and CONSULTANT prior to commencement of the services. Payment for additional services is subject to all requirements and restrictions in this Agreement.
## EXHIBIT “C-1”
### SCHEDULE OF RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRM</th>
<th>POSITION TITLE</th>
<th>HOURLY RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMS</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS</td>
<td>Sr. Planner</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMLEY-HORN</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>$250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMLEY-HORN</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>$166.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMLEY-HORN</td>
<td>Analyst</td>
<td>$114.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIMLEY-HORN</td>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>$245.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>Sr. Associate</td>
<td>$165.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPS</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Exhibit C-2
Project Budget and Schedule Summary

*(Excel Spreadsheet Inserted Here)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>s by Firm:</th>
<th>$134,980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

$2,020
EXHIBIT “D”
INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS

CONTRACTORS TO THE CITY OF PALO ALTO (CITY), AT THEIR SOLE EXPENSE, SHALL FOR THE TERM OF THE CONTRACT OBTAIN AND MAINTAIN INSURANCE IN THE AMOUNTS FOR THE COVERAGE SPECIFIED BELOW, AFFORDED BY COMPANIES WITH AM BEST’S KEY RATING OF A::VII, OR HIGHER, LICENSED OR AUTHORIZED TO TRANSACT INSURANCE BUSINESS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

AWARD IS CONTINGENT ON COMPLIANCE WITH CITY’S INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS, AS SPECIFIED, BELOW:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED</th>
<th>TYPE OF COVERAGE</th>
<th>REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>MINIMUM LIMITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EACH OCCURRENCE</td>
<td>AGGREGATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>WORKER’S COMPENSATION</td>
<td>STATUTORY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>EMPLOYER’S LIABILITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>GENERAL LIABILITY, INCLUDING PERSONAL INJURY, BROAD FORM PROPERTY DAMAGE BLANKET CONTRACTUAL, AND FIRE LEGAL LIABILITY</td>
<td>BODILY INJURY $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPERTY DAMAGE $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
<td>BODILY INJURY &amp; PROPERTY DAMAGE COMBINED $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY, INCLUDING ALL OWNED, HIRED, NON-OWNED</td>
<td>BODILY INJURY $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- EACH PERSON $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- EACH OCCURRENCE $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PROPERTY DAMAGE $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BODILY INJURY AND PROPERTY DAMAGE, COMBINED $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PROFESSIONAL LIABILITY, INCLUDING, ERRORS AND OMISSIONS, MALPRACTICE (WHEN APPLICABLE), AND NEGLIGENT PERFORMANCE</td>
<td>ALL DAMAGES $1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>THE CITY OF PALO ALTO IS TO BE NAMED AS AN ADDITIONAL INSURED: CONTRACTOR, AT ITS SOLE COST AND EXPENSE, SHALL OBTAIN AND MAINTAIN, IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE TERM OF ANY RESULTANT AGREEMENT, THE INSURANCE COVERAGE HEREIN DESCRIBED, INSURING NOT ONLY CONTRACTOR AND ITS SUBCONSULTANTS, IF ANY, BUT ALSO, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF WORKERS’ COMPENSATION, EMPLOYER’S LIABILITY AND PROFESSIONAL INSURANCE, NAMING AS ADDITIONAL INSUREDS CITY, ITS COUNCIL MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AGENTS, AND EMPLOYEES.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. INSURANCE COVERAGE MUST INCLUDE:
   A. A PROVISION FOR A WRITTEN THIRTY DAY ADVANCE NOTICE TO CITY OF CHANGE IN COVERAGE OR OF COVERAGE CANCELLATION; AND
   B. A CONTRACTUAL LIABILITY ENDORSEMENT PROVIDING INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CONTRACTOR’S AGREEMENT TO INDEMNIFY CITY.
   C. DEDUCTIBLE AMOUNTS IN EXCESS OF $5,000 REQUIRE CITY’S PRIOR APPROVAL.

II. CONTRACTOR MUST SUBMIT CERTIFICATES(S) OF INSURANCE EVIDENCING REQUIRED COVERAGE.

III. ENDORSEMENT PROVISIONS, WITH RESPECT TO THE INSURANCE AFFORDED TO “ADDITIONAL INSURED”
   A. PRIMARY COVERAGE
WITH RESPECT TO CLAIMS ARISING OUT OF THE OPERATIONS OF THE NAMED INSURED, INSURANCE AS AFFORDED BY THIS POLICY IS PRIMARY AND IS NOT ADDITIONAL TO OR CONTRIBUTING WITH ANY OTHER INSURANCE CARRIED BY OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE ADDITIONAL INSURED.

B. CROSS LIABILITY

THE NAMING OF MORE THAN ONE PERSON, FIRM, OR CORPORATION AS INSUREDS UNDER THE POLICY SHALL NOT, FOR THAT REASON ALONE, EXTINGUISH ANY RIGHTS OF THE INSURED AGAINST ANOTHER, BUT THIS ENDORSEMENT, AND THE NAMING OF MULTIPLE INSUREDS, SHALL NOT INCREASE THE TOTAL LIABILITY OF THE COMPANY UNDER THIS POLICY.

C. NOTICE OF CANCELLATION

1. IF THE POLICY IS CANCELED BEFORE ITS EXPIRATION DATE FOR ANY REASON OTHER THAN THE NON-PAYMENT OF PREMIUM, THE ISSUING COMPANY SHALL PROVIDE CITY AT LEAST A THIRTY (30) DAY WRITTEN NOTICE BEFORE THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF CANCELLATION.

2. IF THE POLICY IS CANCELED BEFORE ITS EXPIRATION DATE FOR THE NON-PAYMENT OF PREMIUM, THE ISSUING COMPANY SHALL PROVIDE CITY AT LEAST A TEN (10) DAY WRITTEN NOTICE BEFORE THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF CANCELLATION.

NOTICES SHALL BE MAILED TO:

PURCHASING AND CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION
CITY OF PALO ALTO
P.O. BOX 10250
PALO ALTO, CA 94303
## Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study

**SCHEDULE**

Updated 05.23.2011

### Meeting Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Dates</th>
<th>TASK ONE - CONTEXT AND VISION</th>
<th>TASK TWO - ALTERNATIVES AND ANALYSIS</th>
<th>TASK THREE - PLAN PREPARATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEBRUARY</strong></td>
<td><strong>02.17.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>02.17.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>02.12.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARCH</strong></td>
<td><strong>03.17.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>03.17.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>03.01.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APRIL</strong></td>
<td><strong>04.07.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>04.07.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>04.05.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAY</strong></td>
<td><strong>05.05.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>05.05.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>05.03.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JUNE</strong></td>
<td><strong>05.19.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>05.19.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>05.17.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JULY</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.08.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.08.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.06.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AUGUST</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.16.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.16.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.14.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.27.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.27.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>06.25.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCTOBER</strong></td>
<td><strong>07.07.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>07.07.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>07.05.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NOVEMBER</strong></td>
<td><strong>08.07.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>08.07.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>08.05.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DECEMBER</strong></td>
<td><strong>09.17.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>09.17.2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>09.15.2011</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Meetings to Include in Phase One Schedule

1. Planning and Transportation Commission
2. High Speed Rail Committee
3. City Council
4. Community Meetings
5. Task Force Meetings

### Actual Meetings in Phase One

1. Planning and Transportation Commission
2. High Speed Rail Committee
3. City Council
4. Task Force Meetings

### Meetings to Include in Phase Two Schedule

1. Planning and Transportation Commission
2. High Speed Rail Committee
3. Community Meetings
4. Task Force Meetings

### Actual Meetings in Phase Two

1. Planning and Transportation Commission
2. High Speed Rail Committee
3. City Council
4. Community Meetings
5. Task Force Meetings

### Meetings to Include in Phase Three Schedule

1. Planning and Transportation Commission
2. High Speed Rail Committee
3. City Council
4. Community Meetings
5. Task Force Meetings

### Actual Meetings in Phase Three

1. Planning and Transportation Commission
2. High Speed Rail Committee
3. City Council
4. Community Meetings
5. Task Force Meetings

---

*EX: Additional task force meeting exchanged for High Speed Rail Committee meeting*
Palo Alto Rail Corridor Study
Community Meeting #1

Questions for Open House Segment

What do you think is the most important role of the study area?
   a. A place to live
   b. A place to work
   c. A place to obtain services
   d. A place for cultural events
   e. All of the above

How do you envision the future of the study area?
   a. High intensity/diverse urban core
      An area of high intensity with a mix of uses similar to downtown Palo Alto with some taller buildings (above 50 feet)
   b. Moderate intensity mix of uses
      An area of moderate intensity with heights under 50 feet
   c. Little to no change

Are there areas where land uses should be changed and/or intensified to improve the area?
   a. University Avenue / Caltrain Station Area
   b. California Avenue Area
   c. Park Street / El Camino / Fry’s Area (South of Oregon Expressway)
   d. El Camino near Charleston Road (South end of study area)

What new uses would be desirable in these areas?
   a. University Avenue / Caltrain Station Area
      i. Retail
      ii. Office
      iii. Residential (apartment)
      iv. Mixed use (retail under office or residential)
      v. Other (describe)
   b. California Avenue Area
      i. Retail
      ii. Office
      iii. Residential (apartment)
      iv. Mixed use (retail under office or residential)
      v. Other (describe)
c. Park Street / El Camino / Fry’s Area (South of Oregon Expressway)
   vi. Retail
   vii. Office
   viii. Residential (apartment)
   ix. Mixed use (retail under office or residential)
   x. Other (describe)

d. El Camino near Charleston Road (South end of study area)
   xi. Retail
   xii. Office
   xiii. Residential (apartment)
   xiv. Mixed use (retail under office or residential)
   xv. Other (describe)

What do you think is the biggest problem facing the neighborhoods that surround the study area?
   a. Traffic
   b. Lack of convenient services
   c. Poor connections to the rest of the city
   d. Other (describe)

How important is increasing the use of alternative travel modes (transit, bicycling, walking) in Palo Alto?
   a. Very important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Not important

Improvements to which types of travel are most important to Palo Alto quality of life?
   a. Auto
   b. Rail
   c. Bus and Bus Rapid Transit
   d. Bicycling
   e. Walking

Which of these connection improvements are of highest priority?
   a. Pedestrian connections across Alma and the rail tracks
   b. Bicycle connections across Alma and the rail tracks
   c. Vehicular connections across Alma and the rail tracks?

Neighborhood Issues: Traffic (Map Exercise)
Where are the vehicular issues in your neighborhood?
   a. Speeding
   b. Cut through traffic

Neighborhood Issues: Pedestrian (Map Exercise)
Where are the vehicular issues in your neighborhood?
   a. Inadequate or unsafe crosswalks
   b. Inadequate pedestrian amenities
Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions
- Project Overview
- Planning Approach and Community Input to Date
- Discussion
The BMS Design Group Team

CITY OF PALO ALTO

BMS Design Group
San Francisco, CA
Project Management, Urban Design, Land Planning, Community Outreach
- Barbara Maloney
  Partner-in-Charge & Project Director
- Michael Smiley, AICP, ASLA
  Partner & Project Designer

Fehr + Peers
San Francisco, CA
Transportation Planning

EPS
Berkeley, CA
Market Analysis & Implementation Feasibility

ADVISORS
- TASK FORCE
- COMMUNITY
- STAKEHOLDERS
City Council Direction

*July 10, 2010*

- Evaluate land use, transportation and urban design elements of the corridor
- Generate a Community Vision for land use, transportation and urban design opportunities along the Caltrain corridor, particularly in response to proposed improvements to fixed rail services
- High Speed Rail not intended to be the primary focus of this study
- Authorization of Task Force, a Brown Act Committee
Rail Corridor Work Program

Phase 1: Context and Vision  
- Analysis (urban design, market, transportation)  
- Issues  
- Preliminary Vision for the Corridor  

Phase 2: Alternatives and Evaluation  
- Plan Concepts  
- Evaluation  

Phase 3: Plan Preparation  
- Refined Plans  
- Implementation Strategies  
- Draft and Final Rail Corridor Plan  

February – July 2011  
July 2011 – January 2012  
January – March 2012
PLANNING APPROACH AND COMMUNITY INPUT

Defining Issues, Setting Goals
Preliminary Vision Statements and Concepts
Rail Corridor Planning Process

Task Force Meetings (8)
Nov 2010 – June 2011

Issues Studied
- Purpose, Procedures
- HSR Update
- Role of the Task Force
- Approach to the Project
- Relevant City Projects
- Connectivity Opportunities
- Land Use and Circulation Opportunities
- Preliminary Visions

Community Meeting
May 19, 2011
- Project Introduction, Issues and Priorities
Task Force Meetings

EXISTING CONDITIONS
- Understanding Role of the Corridor in the City
- Analyzing Existing Conditions: Land Use and Circulation
- Defining Conservation v. Development Opportunity Areas
- Defining Districts (residential, commercial, transit)
- Reviewing Regulatory Considerations (Comp Plan, Zoning)

RELEVANT PLANNING CONCEPTS
- Transit-Oriented Development
- Mixed Use Development
- Complete Streets
- Layered Circulation Networks

CURRENT PLANNING AND PROPOSED PROJECTS
- Caltrain and High Speed Train Options
- El Camino Plans and BRT
- California Avenue Concept Area Plan
Study Area with Station Areas

LEGEND

- STUDY AREA BOUNDARY
- EXISTING CALTRAIN STATIONS
- PROPOSED BUS RAPID TRANSIT STOP
Existing Land Use

**LEGEND**
- City of Palo Alto Limits
- Project Study Area
- Caltrain Station Location
- Bus Rapid Transit Stop
- General Commercial
- Mixed Use
- Light Industrial
- Research Park
- Civic/Institutional
- Single-family Residential
- Multi-family Residential
- Park
- Stanford University Academic Reserve & Open Space
- Vacant

* Existing land use designations to be verified.
Task Force Meetings

IDENTIFY PROTECTED RESOURCES
- Single family residential
- Open space
- Schools
- Historic resources

IDENTIFY ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES
- Connectivity Improvements
- Land use and circulation
- Correct existing problems

ARTICULATE PRELIMINARY VISION
Group Work Session Questions:

- How can there be better connections across the rail lines?
  - Pedestrian / bicycle crossings?
  - Vehicle crossings?
- Where are important destinations?
- Imagine the rail in an open-trench along the full corridor; where would you like the trench covered for open space or development? Cover can be a maximum of 800’ length with 1400’ minimum open trench between covered sections.
- Where are there troublesome intersections that should be improved for pedestrians and bicycles?
- Where can additional bicycle routes be provided?
Task Force Connectivity Exercise

CONNECTIVITY EXERCISE

GROUP 1

1. How can there be better connections across the city?
2. What can be improved?
3. Where can there be pedestrian crossings?
4. Where are important destinations?
5. Are there missing pedestrian nodes or intersections that should be improved for accessibility?
6. Where can bike routes be improved?
7. Imagine the city in an environment where the full concept plan would not be limited to what we've created. How would it be enhanced or improved?

SYMBOLS FOR CONNECTIONS EXERCISE

- Proposed pedestrian/bike rail crossings
- Proposed vehicular rail crossings
- No rail crossing
- Important destination
- Intersection improvement
- Bicycle connection
- Trench cover (bus lane/W4 x 1)

CONNECTIVITY PLAN - EXISTING AND PROPOSED CROSSINGS

GROUP NOTES AND COMMENTS
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Task Force Land Use and Circulation Exercise

1. How do you envision the future of this corridor?
   A. Highest Intensity/Diverse Urban Core.
   B. Moderate Intensity
   C. Little to No Change

2. Where are potential land use intensification areas located?

3. What kind of uses would be appropriate in those areas?
Task Force Land Use and Circulation Exercise

1. What are your goals and expectations for transportation and circulation in Palo Alto?
2. What is the role of El Camino Real within Palo Alto?
3. Where are the most problematic areas and intersections?
Community Meeting 1 | May 19, 2011

Agenda
- Project Review
- General Discussion
- Open House

Limited Community Participation
10 attendees + Task Force members

Open House Questions
What is the Role of the Study Area?
What Uses Would be Desirable in:
- University Avenue / Caltrain Station Area
- California Avenue Area
- Park Street / El Camino / Fry’s Area
- South El Camino Area

Biggest Problems? Needed Improvements?
Community Meeting Open House Sample Questions

How do you envision the future of the study area?

- High intensity / diverse urban core
  - An area of high intensity with a mix of uses similar to downtown Palo Alto with some taller buildings (above 50 feet)

- Moderate intensity / diverse mix of uses
  - An area of moderate intensity with heights up to 50 feet in certain zones

- Little to no change

What do you think is the biggest problem facing the neighborhoods that surround the study area?

- Traffic
- Lack of convenient services
- Poor connections to the rest of the city
- Other (describe)
Community Meeting Open House Sample Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements to which types of travel are most important to Palo Alto quality of life?</th>
<th>Are there areas where land uses should be changed and/or intensified to improve the area?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto</strong></td>
<td><strong>University Avenue / Caltrain Station Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rail</strong></td>
<td><strong>California Avenue Area</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bus and Bus Rapid Transit</strong></td>
<td><strong>Park Street / El Camino / Fry’s Area (South of Oregon Expwy)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycling</strong></td>
<td><strong>El Camino near Charleston Road (South end of study area)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task Force Vision Exercise
Task Force Vision Exercise

Group 2
Plan and Overarching Concepts
Summary

COMMON THEMES
- Protect existing single family neighborhoods
- Improve neighborhood services
- Consider new development in select areas
- Improve connections across rail corridor
- Improve problem intersections
- Improve pedestrian and bicycle circulation
- Add open space and recreation

MORE DISCUSSION NEEDED
- Implications of the rail alternatives
- Appropriate land use mix and location
- Specific circulation improvements

COMMUNITY CONCERNS
- Infrastructure must keep pace with development
- Will traffic congestion increase?
- Potential impacts on existing neighborhoods
Community Outreach Summary

- **Project websites**
  - www.paloaltorailcorridor.org
  - www.cityofpaloalto.org/knowzone/agendas/rail_corridor_task_force.asp

- **Task Force meetings**
  - Walking tour with Task Force

- **Community meetings**

- **Evaluate additional outreach methods**
  - Focus groups
  - Color mailings and posters
  - Newsletter
  - Press releases

- **Next Steps**
NEXT STEPS

- Study Preliminary Concepts       July - September
- Task Force meeting 9            August 4
- Second PTC meeting              August (TBD)
- City Council                    September (TBD)
- Community Meeting               September (TBD)
DISCUSSION