



City Council Committee of the Whole

FINAL MINUTES

Special Meeting
March 18, 2019

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in the Council Chambers at 8:47 P.M.

Present: Cormack, DuBois, Fine, Kou, Tanaka

Absent: Filseth, Kniss

Action Items

1. Connecting Palo Alto Grade Separations Recommendations: Adjust Schedule, Update Selection Criteria, and Review Terms for Upcoming Contract Amendment With AECOM to Increase Funds and Timeline for Additional Engineering and Outreach Services.

Mayor Filseth advised he would not participate in this Agenda Item because his residence was located within 500 feet of the Caltrain right-of-way.

Council Member Kniss advised she would not participate in this Agenda Item because she had an interest in real property located within 500 feet of the Caltrain right-of-way.

Vice Mayor Fine explained the process of the Committee of the Whole and the number of votes needed to approve various actions. The Council needed to select a preferred option for each crossing, identify the information needed to make the selections, identify necessary mitigations and impacts of the selections, begin environmental review, prepare a funding plan and continue public outreach.

Ed Shikada, City Manager reported the Council last discussed grade separations in January 2019 and directed Staff to return with a timeline for additional work. The final scheduled meeting of the Community Advisory Panel (CAP) was held on March 13, 2019. A community meeting was scheduled for March 27, 2019. Over the past year, the Council had narrowed the alternatives to six and directed Staff to prepare a scope and budget to study tunnel variations. The current schedule showed the selection of preferred alternatives occurring in April 2019. If the Council chose to revise the schedule, a contract amendment with Architecture, Engineering, Consulting, Operations and Maintenance (AECOM) would be

FINAL MINUTES

necessary. Over the next few years, Staff would conduct an environmental review, approve agency agreements for managing construction, acquire any necessary property, obtain agency permits and/or approvals, and seek approval of a construction contract. Completion of construction was anticipated in December 2031. If the Council selected preferred alternatives in June, the CAP could meet in April and May, and Staff could conduct additional technical analyses, community engagement, and community polling. Alternatively, the Council could select preferred alternatives in October. The Council had the potential to consider the value of additional evaluation and communications, the urgency to engage other agencies regarding funding, the cost of additional evaluation, and the long-range timeline in deciding to revise the timeline.

Chantal Cotton Gaines, Assistant to the City Manager, reviewed the adopted list of criteria for alternatives. The criteria had not been prioritized. A contract amendment for AECOM would include services required by moving the selection of a preferred alternative from December 2018 to April 2019; required to prepare the scope and budget for a South Palo Alto tunnel alternative; and required to fulfill additional changes, if any, to the schedule. A contract amendment could be presented to the Council as early as April 8, 2019.

Mr. Shikada noted the essential item was information the Council needed to select preferred alternatives. The Council may adjust the timeline, community engagement, and evaluation criteria and direct Staff regarding the AECOM contract.

Council Member DuBois asked if the AECOM contract cost of \$120,000 per month would vary based on the work they performed.

Mr. Shikada answered yes. The \$120,000 monthly cost reflected the full allocation of AECOM's and its subconsultants' resources.

Council Member Kou requested clarification of the relationship between the \$500,000 AECOM contract amendment and the \$1.278 million for the capital project.

Ms. Gaines explained that a portion of the AECOM contract amendment could be funded from the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) project for grade separation and the remainder from the FY 2020 CIP project for grade separation.

Council Member Kou confirmed the funds remaining in the FY 2019 project for grade separation totaled \$1,710,098 from which \$500,000 would be paid

FINAL MINUTES

to AECOM for the contract amendment. The FY 2020 project was projected to have \$1 million in funding.

Ms. Gaines promised to respond after calculating the balance.

Council Member Tanaka requested the number of hours AECOM billed monthly and if it totaled \$120,000.

Mr. Shikada said he would obtain the information and respond.

Judy Kleinberg asked the Council to delay any discussion of funding grade separations until it had discussed funding sources with the business community. No business representatives were members of the CAP. The revenue funding proposals to date targeted only the business community, but the interests of the business community had not been addressed or considered at CAP meetings.

Keith Bennett, Save Palo Alto's Groundwater indicated the trench and tunnel options would affect groundwater levels and flows and result in significant unintended consequences.

Arthur Keller supported a Council discussion of funding for alternatives. A tunnel or trench in South Palo Alto should travel beneath Barron Creek and Adobe Creek. The entrance for a South Palo Alto tunnel was located south of Matadero Creek. A Head Count Tax needed to apply to large nonprofits in addition to for-profit businesses. A citizen's initiative needed to be considered for funding of incremental costs because it could be approved with a majority vote.

Neva Yarkin suggested the use of eminent domain should be eliminated or reduced to almost nothing. The AECOM contract needed to be extended, CAP meetings had to continue and the tunnel option needed to be eliminated. It was thought that traffic on Embarcadero should be studied for a partial or full closure of Churchill.

Kaitlyn Nguyen urged the Council to find options that did not cause residents to lose their homes.

Tanya Tran expressed concern about the possibility of losing her home.

Mindy Anderson did not support Caltrain upgrades at the expense of residents' homes. The threat of eminent domain needed to be eliminated.

Carolyn Schmarzo for herself and her neighbor opposed tunnel options and the use of eminent domain.

FINAL MINUTES

Joanne Fu opposed tunnel options and the use of eminent domain.

Manish Baldua opposed the use of eminent domain and wanted to understand the framework for the design criteria.

Stephen Rosenblum supported a Citywide tunnel or a Citywide viaduct. Equity and connectivity needed to be the criteria for selection of a preferred option.

Barbara Hazlett remarked that the traffic study for the closure of Churchill was fatally flawed. Residents of Professorville opposed any plan that resulted in a substantial increase in traffic to Professorville and the consultant's plan to install a traffic signal at the intersection of Emerson and Embarcadero.

Nadia Naik noted an option for four Caltrain tracks in South Palo Alto remained viable. The Council should schedule a study session regarding the Caltrain business plan in order to comment on the business plan and to understand Caltrain's options. The potential revenue from proposed funding sources had not been disclosed and was needed to weigh the alternatives.

Tony Carrasco suggested the Council separate the alignment issue from land use issues.

Tiffany Griego, Stanford Research Park Managing Director asked the Council to initiate a dialog with the business community and local employers before acting on proposed taxes to fund grade separations. The proposed taxes were thought to have unintended consequences for the City and Stanford Research Park.

Dan Kostenbauder, Silicon Valley Leadership Group recommended the Council include the business community in conversations prior to considering taxes to fund grade separations.

Rachel Kellerman expressed concern that decisions about rail crossings were being made without the benefit of advice from a transportation and traffic expert. A potential rail crossing plan provided more traffic to the Professorville neighborhood and less safety for everyone.

Tom Kellerman suggested the CAP continue to meet. In reviewing the Traffic Report, the CAP should focus on alternate routes and mitigations for westbound traffic diverted from the Churchill crossing. The intersection of Emerson and Embarcadero needed to be included in the list of intersections to be mitigated.

FINAL MINUTES

Sean Hee asked the Council to direct AECOM to provide an alternative that addressed residents' concerns about eminent domain. The community needed to be aware of all alternatives that the Council was considering.

Rob Levitsky questioned the decision to close the Churchill crossing when there was no reason to close it.

Mr. Shikada reported the community meeting scheduled for the end of the month would provide more clarity regarding the various issues. The traffic analysis, communication of the analysis, and the evaluation of options for mitigations needed additional work. A study session with Caltrain regarding its business plan was in order; however, information about the business plan was being presented incrementally.

Council Member Cormack wanted to understand funding mechanisms for grade crossings and to obtain a risk analysis. She supported selecting a preferred alternative in October, continuing CAP meetings, conducting polling in September, and the ability to change the priority of criteria to understand the tradeoffs of alternatives. Grade separations created permanent changes in the community's mobility. Perhaps the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) could provide a risk analysis of the various alternatives.

Council Member Tanaka reiterated his question regarding the number of hours AECOM billed monthly.

Mr. Shikada responded approximately 500 hours. AECOM and its sub-consultants were involved in the engineering analyses of alternatives, preparing modeling and animations, community meetings, technical meetings, responding to questions, and preparing communication materials. The \$120,000 per month cost did not include Staff costs.

Council Member Tanaka did not support the preparation of separate Environmental Impact Reports (EIR). He wanted to review the overall impact across the City. Polling was needed to understand the community's viewpoint. A discussion of taxes as funding mechanisms needed to be continued until the business community could provide input. A funding strategy should include value capture. He requested clarification of the public comment regarding four Caltrain tracks in Palo Alto.

Mr. Shikada explained that the Caltrain business plan evaluated service and organizational restructuring of commuter rail service. One concept included a significantly higher frequency of trains along various segments of the rail line. To increase frequency, Caltrain had suggested the use of passing tracks and passing stations. He had requested Caltrain provide any

FINAL MINUTES

information regarding the right-of-way needed to support passing tracks and stations, but Caltrain had not fulfilled the request.

Council Member Tanaka questioned the Council's ability to select a preferred alternative if Caltrain was considering changes in rail service.

Mr. Shikada agreed that changes in rail service could significantly affect the design of grade separations, which supported the case for regional funding of grade separations.

Council Member Tanaka asked if Caltrain's decision could be influenced.

Mr. Shikada stated the Council could hold a policy discussion around influencing Caltrain's decisions.

Council Member Tanaka inquired regarding the deadline for Caltrain to make its decision.

Mr. Shikada did not recall the anticipated date for Caltrain adoption of a business plan. Caltrain was conducting a study of operations, organization, governance structure, and funding.

Council Member Tanaka felt the Council needed to know the date of Council's adoption of the business plan.

Mr. Shikada suggested Caltrain's participation in grade separation issues could require years to resolve. The Council was able to elect to delay the planning of grade separations, but there was an opportunity cost to the delay.

Council Member Tanaka believed any Council decision should not include the use of eminent domain for above-ground infrastructure. The political and legal costs of eminent domain were tremendous. Polling was important to understanding the community's potential acceptance of funding strategies.

Council Member Tanaka left the meeting at 10:00 P.M.

Council Member DuBois did not believe the Council had received good scenarios for the Charleston and Meadow crossing. The Council had not had an opportunity to discuss the updated Traffic Report. He wanted to consider new ideas rather than simply narrow the existing list of ideas. Answers to key technical questions were needed. The use of the criteria was qualitative rather than quantitative. He prioritized criteria for aesthetics and noise over construction impacts. A process to obtain voter support needed to be included in the schedule. A funding strategy was to move in parallel to the study of options. Coordination of construction along the Peninsula was

FINAL MINUTES

under discussion. The City needed to reserve Measure B funding. The Council was reviewing categories of funding, not specific mechanisms. The analysis of a Business Tax funding mechanism was fairly high level and not quite accurate. One EIR was expected to be completed for the entire City. He suggested the EIR contain at least two system-wide scenarios and, if possible, allow the mix and match of options. He expressed concern about the Council being asked to approve an expenditure of funds after the expenditure had been made. He suggested the schedule include the funding plan, community outreach, and milestones. The Committee of the Whole should meet more frequently. He wanted to review scenarios in detail to ensure options were not eliminated based on worst-case assumptions. He proposed the Council create a community Working Group and appoint residents, businesses, and multiple Stanford University organizations to it. The community Working Group planned on providing two sets of recommended scenarios to the Council.

Council Member Kou asked if the AECOM financial person received the lobbyist's letter regarding advocacy and funding sources.

Mr. Shikada advised that Staff had shared the letter with AECOM and said AECOM was familiar with the funding programs and had factored them into the work.

Council Member Kou requested the tri-party agreement among the City, Stanford University, and the County of Santa Clara (County) be added to potential funding sources.

Mr. Shikada reported an independent consultant would have difficulty factoring a policy document into funding sources. The Council was able to discuss guidelines for assumptions used in that work.

Council Member Kou suggested Staff discuss use of the tri-party agreement with County Supervisors. She inquired regarding value capture approaches contained in the CAP presentation.

Mr. Shikada explained that value capture was the increase in value of surrounding property and was used as an assessment district mechanism to fund capital projects. Generally, value capture applied to areas where significant development was proposed.

Council Member Kou asked if value capture could be applied to grade separations.

Mr. Shikada replied not likely because the potential for development, particularly nonresidential development, was not good.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou asked if a passing track was required for High Speed Rail (HSR) rather than for Caltrain.

Mr. Shikada recalled that the scenario for passing tracks was based on HSR operations. He thought a wider right-of-way along the Caltrain corridor would have significant impacts.

Council Member Kou requested the proposed locations for passing tracks.

Mr. Shikada was not sure where they would be located.

Council Member Kou noted Caltrain's high-growth scenario would require an additional 11 miles of passing tracks. The City needed information from Caltrain so that it could avoid revising plans after spending millions of dollars to develop the plans.

Mr. Shikada stated Caltrain's decisions would impact the City.

Council Member Kou requested clarification of the traffic analysis for the intersection of Emerson and Embarcadero.

Mr. Shikada indicated more analysis was needed.

Council Member Kou inquired about the Council's review of a partial closure for Churchill.

Mr. Shikada clarified that Staff's interactions with Caltrain and others had suggested a partial closure was not operationally feasible. As the frequency of trains increased, keeping the Churchill crossing open would be problematic. A full closure was the ultimate solution for Churchill.

Council Member Kou asked if the Caltrain electrification project had been delayed.

Mr. Shikada was not aware of any specific delay, but Staff could verify the information with Caltrain.

Council Member Kou suggested Mr. Tanda explain his role in grade separations.

Wayne Tanda, Consultant reported he was reviewing the impacts of closing Churchill on the community in general and emergency services specifically.

Council Member Kou wanted to ensure the traffic analysis included physical observations, experience, and data.

FINAL MINUTES

Vice Mayor Fine inquired about the number of EIRs that would need to be prepared for grade separations and the Downtown Coordinated Area Plan.

Mr. Shikada explained that the number of EIRs depended on the preferred alternative for each crossing. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines contained an exemption for pure grade separation projects. Noise, traffic, aesthetics, public service, and other environmental issues had to be studied for any option under consideration. Staff wanted to ensure a project was complete rather than a fragment of a larger project so that the analyses of impacts was thorough and accurate.

Vice Mayor Fine reported he had been thinking about grade separations by segmenting them into south, middle, and north Palo Alto. He concurred with comments requesting a Study Session with Caltrain and requested clarification of potential polling.

Mr. Shikada indicated questions could cover topics on which the Council wished to obtain general feedback. Staff had discussed polling as an aid to narrowing the alternatives and in anticipation of a ballot measure for funding. At the current time, polling may not provide good information because the community needed more education about the alternatives.

Vice Mayor Fine remarked that the polling questions should be crafted carefully. He asked if the TAC would continue to meet.

Mr. Shikada clarified that the TAC was created to interact with multiple agencies simultaneously and they would not opine on issues absent a compelling need for agencies to respond. TAC meetings tended to facilitate information sharing rather than agreement or disagreement with issues.

Vice Mayor Fine concurred with the need for better traffic analyses. The preferred alternative for Churchill was closure, and it could be the last grade separation alternative to be constructed.

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

- A. Accept updates to the timeline for the Connecting Palo Alto Rail Grade Separation planning effort, with the timeline being extended to October 2019;
- B. Direct Staff to review and consider recommendations to the City Council-adopted criteria for Rail Grade Separation without the tiering structure;

FINAL MINUTES

- C. Continue the CAP meetings;
- D. Direct Staff to return to Council with polling options;
- E. Hold specific meetings on the financial risk and strategy on the Caltrain business plan, passing tracks, and Embarcadero/Churchill crossings;
- F. Direct Staff to develop a list of ongoing questions and answers; and
- G. Recommend the City Council approve the parameters for an upcoming contract amendment to contract C18171057 with AECOM funded in the Grade Separation capital project (PL-17001) to continue work to assist the City with the selection of a preferred solution for environmental review.

Council Member Cormack wanted to provide an opportunity for individuals to work with the ordering of the criteria and to include focus groups in Part D. The Council needed to discuss Council Member DuBois' proposal for a Working Group and inquired whether additional members could be appointed to the CAP.

Mr. Shikada indicated the number of members was limited by Staff's ability to support the CAP. The CAP had functioned as a conduit for communications with the community. The City Manager had appointed the CAP members.

Council Member Cormack suggested the Council discuss changes to the CAP to include people with other perspectives and more technical expertise. She thought the Council should have a rough estimate of revenue generated by the various funding mechanisms. With respect to risk, she wanted to know whether a simple majority or a super majority was needed to approve ballot measures for funding. She supported the Committee of the Whole meeting monthly and receiving updates regarding technical issues and financial strategies.

Vice Mayor Fine agreed that Part E may refer to traffic issues Citywide. He mentioned the Emerson/Embarcadero intersection because it was the most salient intersection.

Mr. Shikada recommended the Council discuss a venue for discussion of the financial strategy. A business-related tax was one component of the financial strategy.

Council Member DuBois concurred with Part A, but Part E was overly specific. He thought a detailed schedule of meetings could include the stated topics

FINAL MINUTES

as well as others and he wanted the timeline (Part A) to show Rail Committee meetings, Working Group meetings and topics. He thought the criteria tiers should not be removed and he preferred an interactive model that scored options against the criteria in a spreadsheet that individuals could manipulate. The Working Group was able to handle the polling and focus groups and provide the results to the Council. His concept for a Working Group included members of the business community, Stanford University, and members of the CAP. A proposal to extend the AECOM contract needed to be presented to the Council for approval.

Vice Mayor Fine clarified that Part G would approve the parameters of the contract rather than the contract. The schedule of meetings did not have to include topics.

Council Member DuBois proposed combining Parts A and E.

Vice Mayor Fine agreed to delete the list of topics for meetings.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to amend Motion, Part A to state "Direct Staff to propose a detailed timeline ..." and delete Motion Part C "Continue the CAP meetings."

Council Member DuBois suggested Part B state "create a model that quantitatively scores scenarios."

Vice Mayor Fine asked if Council Member DuBois or Staff had examples of such a model. If the Council was able to utilize a dynamic scoring model, removing the tiers was logical.

Council Member Cormack remarked that the model could be an Excel spreadsheet that allowed individuals to order alternatives based on the criteria.

Mr. Shikada felt the model was becoming complex and added that consultants would provide input.

Council Member Cormack wanted the model to be simple enough for anyone to utilize.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to amend Motion, Part B to state "Direct Staff to create a dynamic model that orders the alternatives based on the criteria."

Mr. Shikada reported a new Working Group was the primary variable in Staff's ability to achieve any timeline. The effort required to support a

FINAL MINUTES

Working Group was significant. If the Council delegated broad topic areas to the Working Group, Staff's ability to achieve a timeline was even more difficult. He thought Staff would probably facilitate the Working Group because the use of consultants would be extremely expensive.

Council Member DuBois believed the Working Group was the key issue. A ballot measure sought approval of funding for a specific scenario rather than approval of a scenario. He expressed concern that the community would not support a ballot measure without input from a Working Group.

Vice Mayor Fine understood Council Member DuBois wanted the Working Group to be a sounding board for ideas and provide feedback to the Council. It would continue to facilitate communications to the community and prepare the community for the finance component.

Council Member DuBois reiterated his composition of Working Group members. The Working Group's goal was to recommend preferred alternatives to the Council by October.

Vice Mayor Fine noted the City Manager's concern regarding Staff resources and proposed the use of Council Contingency Funds for a consultant to facilitate the Working Group.

Council Member Cormack clarified that the Working Group's work to recommend a preferred alternative would not occur at the same time as its work to facilitate community support for a ballot measure.

Council Member DuBois advised that the Working Group would be ready for environmental review by October, develop a rough funding plan, conduct polling, and recommend a ballot strategy.

Mr. Shikada suggested the Council provide the Working Group with a set of parameters for their discussions. Asking a group of differing interests to develop a Funding Plan created an inability for the Working Group to reach consensus, unless the Council also provided some type of voting structure.

Council Member DuBois suggested Staff consider the issues and recommend an approach.

Mr. Shikada proposed the Committee of the Whole direct Staff to provide a recommendation to the Council for the structure of a Working Group.

Vice Mayor Fine was not comfortable with the Working Group handling polling and ballot strategy. The Working Group was capable of providing recommendations for polling and a ballot strategy.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Cormack clarified that the Working Group was to review alternatives and funding.

Vice Mayor Fine offered the following language: "return to Council with a plan for a community Working Group, which would focus on evaluation of alternatives, funding, technical issues, and communications to the community." The Working Group needed to include CAP members, businesses and Stanford University.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to amend Motion, Part C to state "Direct Staff to return to Council with a plan for a Community Working Group which would focus on project alternatives, funding and technical issues, and communications. The Working Group should include members of the CAP, businesses, and Stanford.

Council Member DuBois remarked that the time could be used to prepare for an EIR for all grade crossings and the Downtown Coordinated Area Plan.

Vice Mayor Fine inquired into the Working Group's role in the environmental review process.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to delete Motion, Part E "Hold specific meetings on the financial risk and strategy on the Caltrain business plan, passing tracks, and Embarcadero/Churchill crossing."

Council Member DuBois wanted Staff to craft a plan for the Working Group so that it could work toward consensus.

Council Member Cormack offered the following language for a community Working Group: "[would] focus on recommending project alternatives based on funding and technical issues."

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to amend Motion, Part C to state "... focus on recommending project alternatives ..."

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to remove from the Motion, Part C "The working group should include members of the CAP, businesses, and Stanford."

Vice Mayor Fine proposed the Working Group Report to the Council.

Council Member Kou asked if the Working Group would report to the Committee of the Whole or the Council.

FINAL MINUTES

Vice Mayor Fine replied the Council.

Mr. Shikada advised that the Working Group would be a Brown Act Committee.

Sandra Lee, Assistant City Attorney added that the Working Group would comply with requirements to post an agenda and receive public comment.

Vice Mayor Fine noted the elimination of certain alternatives could allow Mayor Filseth to participate in grade separation discussions.

Council Member Kou asked if a segmented EIR would be prepared.

Ms. Lee reported CEQA required projects to be considered as a whole. To the extent that grade separations for the various intersections were related, they had to be considered in one environmental document.

Council Member DuBois preferred to develop a set of alternatives and perhaps two scenarios of those.

Council Member Cormack commented that the Downtown Coordinated Area Plan project would not begin until the end of 2019.

Council Member DuBois hoped the EIRs for the grade separations and the Downtown Coordinated Area Plan could be conducted concurrently.

Council Member Cormack felt two environmental documents could be prepared. She was willing to delete Part B because a dynamic model could be incorporated into the community Working Group's process.

Council Member DuBois disagreed with removing Part B.

Council Member Cormack requested the timeframe for returning to the Council with polling options and focus groups in relation to the community Working Group.

Vice Mayor Fine explained that the Working Group would work in parallel with the Council over the next several months. The Council wanted options for polling, but it did not know which questions to ask. The Working Group was not supposed to be driving polling.

Council Member Cormack indicated Part C was a component of Part A. Polling and focus groups should be included in the timeline.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, Part C "Direct Staff to return

FINAL MINUTES

to Council with a plan for a community Working group which reports to Council and ..."

Council Member DuBois suggested Part A state "timeline extended to October 2019, including feedback from focus groups and polling."

Vice Mayor Fine asked if Council Member DuBois and Council Member Cormack were attempting to set the timeframe for polling.

Council Member Cormack was not going to make a final decision for a preferred alternative until she understood the community's willingness to support a financing program for a preferred alternative.

Vice Mayor Fine felt polling should be delayed.

Council Member Cormack disagreed in that the Working Group was able to determine community support for funding some alternatives based on cost alone.

Council Member DuBois asked if the October 2019 deadline pertained to beginning environmental review.

Mr. Shikada advised that the selection of a preferred alternative would occur in October under the proposed schedule. The community could willingly support an alternative with a cost of \$1 billion if the City did not have to pay for it. Secondarily, if a ballot measure was needed to fund a portion of that alternative, community support could change and polling with assumptions for cost sharing was difficult.

Council Member Cormack felt it needed to be done.

Mr. Shikada reiterated his suggestion for the Council to provide some assumptions for cost-sharing so that the Working Group could work on polling. Revising the composition of the Working Group severely inhibited Staff's ability to meet the timeline.

Council Member DuBois suggested polling should be included in Part A.

Vice Mayor Fine clarified that the Council did not want polling results but touchpoints for community feedback.

Council Member Cormack wanted community engagement included in the timeline.

Council Member Kou inquired if community engagement included the business sector.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Cormack indicated the business sector would be included in Part D.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to delete Motion, Part D "Direct Staff to return to Council with polling options" and amend Motion Part A to state "... and which includes community engagement."

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, Part D "... and answers ..."

Council Member DuBois wanted the ability to consider new concepts in addition to narrowing the existing alternatives. Iteration needed to occur in the process.

Mr. Shikada reported new concepts required time for evaluation and Staff planned on presenting any issues to the Council.

Council Member DuBois wanted to consider any creative ideas for Churchill given the traffic impacts. The Council's decision to close Churchill was premature.

Council Member Kou asked if a bicycle and pedestrian crossing at Seale Avenue for east-west connectivity remained under consideration.

Mr. Shikada indicated Staff had not focused on a crossing at Seale Avenue. Staff had developed options for the crossing to remain at Churchill. A crossing at Loma Verde was on a separate track.

Council Member Kou inquired about discussions with Menlo Park.

Mr. Shikada advised that discussions had not progressed substantively. Perhaps the Council could provide Staff with guidance.

Vice Mayor Fine requested Staff to challenge the Council in order to ensure the Working Group was a valuable exercise.

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

- A. Direct Staff to propose a detailed timeline for the Connecting Palo Alto Rail Grade Separation planning effort, with the timeline being extended to October 2019, and which includes community engagement;

FINAL MINUTES

- B. Direct Staff to create a dynamic model that orders the alternatives based on the criteria;
- C. Direct Staff to return to Council with a plan for a community working group which reports to Council and would focus on recommending consensus-based project alternatives based on funding and technical issues, and ideas for communication;
- D. Direct Staff to develop a list of ongoing questions and answers from the Rail Committee of the Whole; and
- E. Recommend the City Council approve the parameters for an upcoming contract amendment to contract C18171057 with AECOM funded in the Grade Separation capital project (PL-17001) to continue work to assist the City with the selection of a preferred solution for environmental review.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 4-0 Tanaka absent; Filseth, Kniss recused

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:25 P.M.