



CITY COUNCIL SUMMARY MINUTES

Special Meeting
April 26, 2021

The City Council of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in virtual teleconference at 5:00 P.M.

Participating Remotely: Burt, Cormack, DuBois, Filseth, Kou, Stone, Tanaka

Absent:

Closed Session

1. CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATORS

City Designated Representatives: City Manager and his designees Pursuant to Merit System Rules and Regulations (Ed Shikada, Rumi Portillo, Molly Stump, Kiely Nose, Nick Raisch, Bob Jonsen, Geo Blackshire, Dean Batchelor)

Employee Organizations: Service Employees International Union, (SEIU) Local 521; Service Employees International Union, (SEIU) Local 521, Hourly Unit; Palo Alto Police Officers Association (PAPOA); Palo Alto Fire Chiefs' Association (FCA) and Employee Organization: International Association of Fire Fighters (IAFF), Local 1319; Palo Alto Police Manager's Association (PAPMA); Utilities Management and Professional Association of Palo Alto (UMPAPA);

Authority: Government Code Section 54957.6(a).

MOTION: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Council Member Stone to go into Closed Session.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Council went into Closed Session at 5:01 P.M.

Council returned from Closed Session at 6:30 P.M.

Mayor DuBois announced no reportable action.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

None.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Oral Communications

Ken Horowitz announced the Palo Alto Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) was open and practicing social distancing. He encouraged everyone to return to the YMCA to improve their physical and mental health and to support YMCA employees. He wished City Clerk Minor well in her retirement.

Cedric de la Beaujardiere urged the Council to direct the Police Department to stop towing vehicles in which people were living and to address homelessness.

Susan Mitchell asked the Council to consider redesigning traffic circulation at the intersection of Alma and the Embarcadero slip road because the current design aggravated bike and pedestrian safety on the slip road and traffic queues on adjacent neighborhood streets.

David Liu preferred the rail viaduct option rather than the trench option.

Dexter Girton shared photos of traffic queues on Embarcadero Road. If the Council closed Churchill Avenue, the queues were going to get worse.

Rebecca Eisenberg commented that no shelter beds were located in Palo Alto, and a federal judge recently ruled that the City of Los Angeles was not able to enforce ordinances against homeless people until the city provided shelter for the entire homeless population in Los Angeles.. The Council needed to hold the Police Department accountable for its actions.

Paul from Fairmeadow recalled that the City provided guidelines for storage of boats, campers, and trailers in residential driveways and requested the City publish them again.

Consent Calendar

Kathy Jordan, addressing Agenda Item Number 2, emphasized that the not-to-exceed amount of \$2.9 million was in addition to staffing costs.

Rebecca Eisenberg, addressing Agenda Item Number 2, expressed displeasure with the services and information provided by AECOM and questioned the wisdom of amending the contract again.

Council Member Tanaka registered a no vote on Agenda Item Number 2.

MOTION: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Mayor DuBois to approve Agenda Item Numbers 2-3.

2. Approval of Amendment Number 3 to Contract Number C18171057 With AECOM for Continued Services for the Connecting Palo Alto Rail Grade

SUMMARY MINUTES

Separation (PL-17001) Effort and to Increase Compensation by \$80,000 for a Total Not-to-Exceed Amount of \$2,874,658.

3. Council Approval of Appointment of Terence Howzell as Chief Assistant Attorney.

MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 2: 6-1 Tanaka no

MOTION PASSED FOR AGENDA ITEM NUMBER 3: 7-0

Mayor DuBois welcomed Mr. Howzell back to the City.

Council Member Tanaka wanted to be cautious in light of the difficult economic times and Budget cuts.

Action Items

4. TEFRA HEARING: Regarding Conduit Financing for the Oshman Family Jewish Community Center Located at 3921 Fabian Way; Approving the Issuance of Revenue Obligations by the California Enterprise Development Authority for the Purpose of Financing and Refinancing the Cost of the Acquisition, Development, Construction, Installation, Equipping, and Furnishing of Various Educational Facilities and Other Matters Relating Thereto; and Adopting Resolution 9950 Entitled, "Resolution of the Council of the City of Palo Alto Approving the Deemed Reissuance of Certain Revenue Obligations of the California Enterprise Development Authority in an Aggregate Principal Amount Not-to-Exceed \$37,800,000 for the Purpose of Refinancing the Acquisition, Construction, Improvement, Furnishing and Equipping of a Community Center for Oshman Family Jewish Community Center, and Certain Other Matters Relating Thereto."

David Ramberg, Administrative Services Department Assistant Director, reported representatives of the Oshman Family Jewish Community Center (JCC) were present if the Council had questions. Council approval of the Resolution enabled the JCC to access financing, did not result in the City incurring a financial commitment, and did not impact the City in any way. An at-places memorandum corrected the square footage amount contained in the Resolution.

Public Hearing opened at 6:54 P.M.

Rebecca Eisenberg recalled the JCC recently opposing a housing development on Fabian Way and asked the JCC to consider future housing projects with the same spirit of generosity that the community extended to the JCC.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Public Hearing closed at 6:57 P.M.

MOTION: Mayor DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Stone to adopt a Resolution approving the deemed reissuance of obligations by the California Enterprise Development Authority (CEDA) for the benefit of Oshman Family Jewish Community Center (Borrower).

Council Member Tanaka asked if there were any financial, legal, ethical, branding, or liability impacts for the City.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, replied no. State law required the City to provide a forum for a public hearing, which the City was doing.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

5. Connecting Palo Alto Rail Grade Separation: Discuss Final Report and Recommendations From the Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP); Removal of two Rail Grade Separation Alternatives From Further Consideration; and Review of the Draft Work Plan (Continued From March 23, 2021).

Ed Shikada, City Manager, advised that Chief Transportation Official Philip Kamhi was not present due to paternity leave.

Ripon Bhatia, Senior Engineer, reported on March 23, 2021, the Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP) presented an overview of its findings for rail grade separations. Tonight's discussion included a brief review of issues and recommended next steps. Staff recommended the Council consider eliminating two alternatives from further consideration and review and approve the proposed Grade Separation Work Plan.

Millet Litzinger, AECOM, indicated fundamental principles promulgated by the National Society of Professional Engineers were used to develop the conceptual design of each grade separation alternative. In addition, the conceptual designs were based on many factors such as safety, functionality, and constraints of each location. Caltrain's 2040 Service Vision was based on a moderate-growth scenario, which included eight Caltrain trains and four California High Speed Rail Authority (HSR) trains per direction per hour. The high-growth scenario included 12 Caltrain trains and four HSR trains per direction per hour and a four-track infrastructure. The Caltrain Joint Powers Board (JPB) asked Caltrain Staff not to preclude the high-growth scenario by making implementation more difficult or more expensive.

Gary Black, Hexagon, related that traffic studies included two scenarios, one for existing or 2019 conditions and one for future conditions based on the

SUMMARY MINUTES

City's 2030 Comprehensive Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). A traffic study extending further into the future was possible if the City updated its model or used an adjusted Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) model.

Ms. Litzinger noted suggestions for additional geotechnical and drainage investigations to advance the evaluation of alternatives. Any proposed modification of Adobe, Barron, and Matadero Creeks had to provide the same conveyance capacity, provide equivalent maintenance requirements without increasing costs, be functional for all flow events, allow fish passage, and not increase flooding or adversely impact flooding. Permits from many regulatory agencies were needed to modify a creek. Hydraulic studies may eliminate an alternative prior to environmental analysis. A Town Hall was conducted on August 19, 2020, and two live question-and-answer sessions were held in August and September 2020. The designs of two underpass alternatives were revised between March and June 2020, and iterations were not shown on renderings due to budget constraints. Any missing feature was clearly noted on renderings. Additional outreach with Caltrain, Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD), Stanford University, and bicyclists and pedestrians was needed. The San Francisquito Bridge Replacement Project may impact the design of the Palo Alto Avenue grade separation, and the widening of the Embarcadero Bridge was going to be addressed during the environmental process. The thickness of the bridge deck was going to be refined during the next phase of design.

Mr. Shikada stated Staff proposed eliminating the South Palo Alto Tunnel for both passenger and freight trains and the South Palo Alto Tunnel for passenger trains only. With respect to the Work Plan, key questions were the timeframe and sequence of additional work and the role of the Rail Committee versus the Council. If additional studies were required, additional amendments to the consultant's contract were going to be needed.

Nadia Naik, XCAP Chair, reviewed features of the Meadow/Charleston hybrid, viaduct, and trench alternatives and XCAP deliberations for South Palo Alto, and the recommendation for additional study of the underpass alternative.

Greg Brail, XCAP Member, reported advantages of the viaduct alternative were reduced construction time, location of tracks further away from homes, use of the land beneath the viaduct, and equivalent bicycle and pedestrian experience, while disadvantages were the visual impact of a large concrete structure and impacts to residents' privacy. The advantages of the hybrid alternative were a lesser construction cost and no need for a grade exception, while disadvantages were visual impact, large berms, and difficult navigation for inexperienced bicyclists. Advantages of the trench were less visual impact,

SUMMARY MINUTES

potential use of land over the trench, and at-grade travel for bicycles and pedestrians, while disadvantages were potentially the most expensive alternative to construct, impacts to creeks and groundwater, regulatory agency approvals, and increased unknowns. Designs for the three alternatives were going to change if a four-track system was required. Advantages of the underpass were rails at-grade, reduced traffic congestion, bicycle and pedestrian path grade separated from Alma Street, bicycle and pedestrian turn movements, no design exception from Caltrain, and no changes needed if HSR passing tracks were required, while disadvantages were most severe property impacts, safety concerns for bicycles and pedestrians at Park Boulevard, and limited turn movements for vehicles.

Ms. Naik compared estimates of costs, construction duration and impacts, and property acquisition, visual changes, creek and drainage impacts, movements of transportation modes, traffic congestion and delay, bicycle and pedestrian separation from vehicles, access to neighborhoods and amenities, noise, vibration, utility relocation, vertical curve reductions, design exception, and accommodation of four-track design, for each alternative.

Keith Reckdahl, XCAP Member, noted that the trench alternative polarized the community. Design parameters for a trench were numerous, and each possibly resulted in different pros and cons. The City needed approvals and permits from several different regulatory agencies for a trench. Major engineering challenges were the creeks, trench supports, and groundwater. The current design contained questionable decisions that added serious and unnecessary flaws to the trench design. The decisions gave the impression that the trench was not being fairly evaluated. Neighbors supported the trench alternative. The creeks were possibly the fatal flaw for the trench alternative.

Larry Klein, XCAP Vice Chair, emphasized that Council Members needed to take active advocacy roles with final decision-makers and funding partners. The City needed to form partnerships with jurisdictions throughout the Caltrain Corridor to obtain changes that allowed grade separations to be constructed on a cost-effective basis.

Mr. Reckdahl related that the trench, viaduct, and hybrid alternatives changed elevation. As the grade increased, the viaduct or trench became shorter in length, which reduced construction costs and allowed greater design flexibility. Caltrain's preferred maximum grade was 1 percent, but a project was allowed to request a design exception for up to 2 percent. A design exception request was fairly routine. The City needed to advocate for larger grades. Caltrain was reevaluating its design standards, and the City needed to be involved in the discussion. Caltrain required a large and gentle curve that transitioned

SUMMARY MINUTES

from one slope to the next. The shorter the curve, the faster the track changed elevations. However, a shorter curve added more load on the train. Reducing the curve reduced costs. The curve was more important to the length of the viaduct than the grade. The allowable vertical curve was affected by the weight and speed of the train. Heavier trains and faster trains needed longer curves. Grade-separation vertical curves were required to support both freight and passenger trains. Currently, freight trains dictated the design of grade separations. Reducing the speed of freight trains from 50 miles per hour (mph) to 35 mph reduced the size and cost of grade separations.

Ms. Naik reported AECOM utilized vertical grade and curve information provided by Caltrain.

Phil Burton, XCAP Member, advised that the jacked box construction method was not well known in the United States, but construction companies outside the U.S. claimed significant use of the method. The jacked box was a precast reinforced concrete box that framed the underpass and carried the bridge on which the tracks rested. The use of a jacked box eliminated the need for shoefly tracks, which saved time and money. In addition, the use of a jacked box eliminated the impact on Alma Street during construction. The jacked box method was first used in the U.S. for the Long Island Railroad project. The railroad was closed for one weekend while the jacked box was installed. AECOM did not study the jacked box construction method.

Ms. Naik explained that utilizing cost-savings methods resulted in more similar costs for alternatives and less delineation among alternatives.

Mr. Reckdahl advised that a survey of groundwater and testing for the strength and viscosity of the soil were needed to inform designs, construction methods, and cost estimates.

Ms. Naik reviewed the XCAP's recommendations for reviewing guiding documents, formalizing a system for input from key stakeholders, and conducting additional community outreach. The XCAP recommended further iteration of the underpass alternative, consideration of additional bicycle/pedestrian crossings, geotechnical and groundwater analysis, traffic mitigations and an updated traffic study, a noise and vibration addendum, and use of an urban designer to improve the bicycle/pedestrian experience in all alternatives. She reviewed XCAP's recommendations for next steps and Churchill Avenue. Caltrain Staff advised her that they were focusing their efforts on understanding whether the San Francisquito Bridge was unsafe or in good condition.

Barbara Hazlett remarked that Professorville and Embarcadero residents were concerned that the proposed traffic mitigation plan was going to have the

SUMMARY MINUTES

impact of a significant, illegal taking if Churchill was closed. Constructing a bicycle and pedestrian underpass was more logical and provided the greatest equity for neighbors.

Keri Wagner suggested very few residents of Charleston Meadows supported the viaduct alternative because it was going to divide the City. Property takings needed to be avoided whenever possible.

Arnout Boelens, speaking as a resident, stated from a bicycle and pedestrian perspective, none of the current designs for Charleston and Meadow effectively protected the most vulnerable road users. He suggested the Council study options for Charleston and Meadow to ensure they were safe, cohesive, direct, comfortable and attractive for pedestrians and bicyclists and involve PAUSD, Safe Routes to School, and the Palo Alto Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (PABAC) in the process.

Carlin Otto requested the Council eliminate the viaduct and hybrid alternatives from consideration because they did not improve the City. Noise from the alternatives was going to affect more residents than reported to the Council.

Mohamed Hadidi supported the recommendation to close Churchill. The partial underpass alternative in its current form was unacceptable. The Council needed to make a decision that was based on more than two years of painstaking XCAP work and that preserved or enhanced the character of the City.

Kerry Yarkin stated the Council needed to refer to the closure of Churchill as the closure plus mitigations. The Council needed to review in-depth the traffic studies for the Churchill closure plus mitigations. More than 800 pedestrians and bicyclists traveled Churchill every day. The Council needed to prioritize safety improvements for Churchill Avenue.

Deborah Ju urged the Council to eliminate the raised alternative from consideration and to approve the trench option. An overwhelming majority of residents of Charleston Meadows opposed a raised alternative. Six hundred residents signed a petition in support of the trench or tunnel alternative. An adequate noise analysis was not performed.

Keith Bennett, Save Palo Alto's Groundwater, indicated a trench permanently blocked groundwater flows unless mitigated by design. He requested the Council add evaluation of mitigation of groundwater flow blockage to Work Plan Item C. He also requested an analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from concrete for each alternative.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Cedric de La Beaujardiere supported the elimination of tunnel alternatives because of their costs and retention of the viaduct alternative because it impacted traffic, bicyclists, pedestrians and adjacent homes the least. The viaduct alternative also had the least construction impacts and the shortest timeline.

Rebecca Eisenberg remarked that the community opposed the viaduct alternative because AECOM provided poor renderings of a viaduct. A viaduct allowed streets that currently dead-ended at Alma to extend beyond Alma, which reduced traffic congestion and allowed pedestrian-only streets. The viaduct alternative improved pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle safety.

Jenny Cornell believed closing Churchill was a bad idea.

Maya McDonald asked the Council to focus on keeping rail tracks at or below their current height.

Michael Wessel opposed the Charleston/Meadow underpass alternative in its current form. He supported the trench first and the hybrid second.

David Herzl supported elimination of the viaduct and hybrid alternatives. Many residents opposed raised alternatives because of their visual effects and noise. The trench alternative was best if it utilized struts rather than anchors.

Stephen Rosenblum wanted a grade-separation solution that was equitable for all residents. Closing all rail crossings incurred the least cost of all alternatives.

Karen Kalinsky stated the underpass alternative separated bike and pedestrian traffic from vehicular traffic at the Meadow and Charleston intersections. A Meadow Drive underpass without a roundabout was more logical and safer for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

Ellen Hartog related that the trench alternative was by far the best solution and provided the most benefits of any other alternative.

Sandeep Bahl favored the trench alternative.

James Silver felt raised alternatives were going to divide the community and create an unsightly blight on the City. The underpass alternative was desirable because it minimized environmental impacts, accommodated four tracks, improved traffic congestion, and separated bicycles and pedestrians from the train and Alma.

Khurshid Gandhi advised that the Charleston Meadows neighborhood continued to support underground alternatives. AECOM did not work hard

SUMMARY MINUTES

enough to present viable alternatives. She urged the Council to explore alternatives to the use of anchors.

Jeff Wolfeld recalled that catenary wires were going to extend 30 feet above raised alternatives. He supported underground alternatives as the better designs.

Steve Carlson referred to Appendix A in the August 13, 2020 Hexagon traffic study because it did not fully support the claim that Churchill closure with mitigations avoided the creation of traffic congestion for the community at large. The study did not utilize Caltrain's traffic projections through 2040.

Renee Hofer supported the trench alternative and opposed all above-grade alternatives. She concurred with Ms. Ju's and Ms. Gandhi's comments.

Lisa Nissim asked the Council to eliminate Churchill closure from consideration and to focus on connecting the west and east sides of Palo Alto. There was no discussion of the need to improve traffic flow on Embarcadero and Page Mill. Closing Churchill was a drastic solution to traffic congestion that occurred only a few hours per day.

Inder Monga related that the partial underpass alternative addressed concerns about pedestrians and bicyclists colliding with vehicles on Churchill in Old Palo Alto, bicycles bunching at traffic signals, and traffic flow to Palo Alto High School, Churchill, Alma, and El Camino Real.

Susan Newman urged the Council to delay action on the Churchill closure alternative. If an objective pro/con analysis of Churchill closure was presented, the partial underpass and viaduct alternatives were likely to surpass the Churchill closure alternative in addressing the major functional goals of grade separation.

Kathy Jordan concurred with comments regarding east-west connectivity. Traffic needed to flow across Churchill to Palo Alto High School.

Susan Mitchell opposed the closure of Churchill and asked the Council to consider redesigning the plan to reroute traffic to achieve through-put on Embarcadero.

Rene Ho opposed raised alternatives and supported the trench alternative.

L LaPier stated bike paths on Seale and Loma Verde added costs and disrupted traffic on more streets. The easiest solution was to keep Churchill open and accept the Planning and Transportation Commission's (PTC) recommendations for improvement of the Churchill intersection.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Kou requested Mr. Reckdahl provide additional information about costs for the Carlsbad trench project.

Mr. Reckdahl calculated the cost per linear foot for the Palo Alto trench at \$133,000 to \$158,000. Carlsbad developed short and long designs for a trench and chose the long design. The cost of the Carlsbad trench was approximately \$39,000 per linear foot. While the Carlsbad trench was longer and included seven overpasses, the Palo Alto trench was impacted by two creeks. Carlsbad's water table was similar to Palo Alto's, and Carlsbad worked to avoid groundwater pumping and maintain water flow. A comparison of soil conditions was not possible at the current time, and labor costs were slightly lower in San Diego.

Council Member Kou expressed concerns about not studying the underpass and trench alternatives in detail and not being able to look at the Caltrain Corridor within Palo Alto as a whole. Apparently, grade separations were designed in isolation.

Council Member Cormack asked Staff to respond to the concerns Mr. Reckdahl raised.

Mr. Bhatia reported Staff and AECOM highlighted key differences between Palo Alto alternatives and the Carlsbad and San Gabriel designs in response to the XCAP's inquiries. A major difference was construction costs in 2012 and 2025.

Council Member Cormack requested suggestions for structuring Council Members' advocacy.

Mr. Klein recommended advocacy not be the responsibility of one Council Member. Each Council Member needed to engage in advocacy regarding the technical issues. The four-track system was a political issue more than a technical issue, and advocacy regarding the four-track system was probably appropriate for the Rail Committee.

Vice Mayor Burt recommended members of the public view the berms in San Carlos and Belmont to understand its impacts. The City prepared extensive maps of the underground water table, but they were not used in AECOM's analysis. The maps probably answered some questions. It was important not to rely on a 2030 Comprehensive Plan traffic projection because grade separations likely were not going to be constructed until 2030. The City needed a traffic model that projected traffic volumes after construction of grade separations. Caltrain and the Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG) were focusing on long-term funding and recognized that the entire Caltrain Corridor needed grade separations to meet the future volume of trains and traffic. Measure B monies for road improvements funded the City's grade separation

SUMMARY MINUTES

work. He inquired whether Measure B monies for grade separations or monies from other sources were going to be available for continued work on grade separations.

Mr. Shikada reported cities were competing for the funds with Mountain View leading the way.

Vice Mayor Burt clarified that he was not referring to construction funding.

Mr. Shikada noted major funding was needed for initial planning. Securing initial funding was likely to be difficult while the City was analyzing alternatives. Most funding discussions presumed Measure B monies for grade separations were going to be disbursed once alternatives were selected for each crossing.

Council Member Stone requested Staff comment regarding the possibility of the trench alternative negatively impacting climate goals and sea level rise.

Mr. Bhatia related that Staff was not currently considering sustainability impacts. The impacts were going to be significant, especially the impacts of the trench alternative on groundwater.

Council Member Stone asked if the trench alternative was the only alternative that impacted the creeks, assuming tunnel alternatives were eliminated.

Mr. Bhatia answered yes.

Council Member Stone inquired whether the trench alternative accommodated four tracks.

Mr. Bhatia explained that incorporating the four-track option into the trench alternative was difficult from the perspectives of cost and impacts.

Council Member Stone commented that discussing costs after alternatives seemed strange because cost was going to be a factor in any decision.

Mr. Bhatia advised that discussions of alternatives may result in elimination of some alternatives so that Staff focused on refining fewer alternatives. Discussing either costs or alternatives first was within the Council's purview.

Council Member Stone clarified that selection of alternatives was going to occur after the discussions of alternatives and costs.

Mr. Bhatia replied yes.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Filseth asked if the estimated costs for the hybrid and underpass alternatives were applicable to each or both crossings.

Ms. Naik responded for both crossings.

Council Member Filseth inquired whether an underpass for one crossing and a hybrid for the other crossing was possible.

Ms. Naik answered yes.

Mr. Bhatia clarified that minor design revisions were needed for that scenario.

Council Member Filseth asked if the XCAP or Staff anticipated reducing the number of property takings when refining the underpass design.

Ms. Naik noted the underpass design in the original proposal differed from AECOM's design. Commenting on property takings at the current time was difficult because AECOM's design proved the underpass design was possible.

Council Member Tanaka requested the rationale for utilizing tie-backs.

Ms. Litzinger reported some trenches utilized a horizontal member across the top of the trench to support the retaining walls. Analysis of the soil was needed to determine the type of support needed in Palo Alto. Utilizing horizontal members as the train descended into the trench was not possible because they blocked the train's passage.

Council Member Tanaka assumed pressure on the retaining walls increased as the depth of the trench increased.

Ms. Litzinger concurred.

Council Member Tanaka inquired about reasons for the cost differences between the trench projects.

Ms. Litzinger advised that a comparison of the projects was difficult because of significant differences, such as number of shoefly tracks and rail tracks, electrification, signal controls, and geometry, between the projects.

Council Member Tanaka inquired about the status of the proposal for slower freight trains.

Ms. Litzinger related that discussions to reduce the speed of freight trains through the Corridor conflicted with the Operating Agreement between Caltrain and Union Pacific.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mayor DuBois noted San Mateo's construction of one hybrid crossing for \$205 million. Based on that project, the cost estimate for Palo Alto's two hybrid crossings seemed low. The Council needed to focus on the issue of the four-track system. A commitment from Caltrain regarding the location of the four-track system was going to be helpful. A raised train and the infrastructure extending above the train was not an attractive option for Eichler neighborhoods. Public comments about noise impacts were valid. He inquired whether the use of tie backs required removal of all trees or only the trees in the specific tie-back locations.

Ms. Litzinger indicated the design was not sufficiently advanced to respond to the question. Landscaping was going to be limited to vegetation that did not require deep roots in the locations of tie backs.

Mayor DuBois remarked that some vegetation was possible. The proposed work plan was reasonable. The City and Stanford University discussed Stanford University's engagement in the process the prior week. An updated traffic study was needed. Geotechnical and hydraulic analysis was going to be useful. The locations of bicycle crossings needed to be balanced with their impacts on alternatives. Recommendations needed to be prioritized, and the four-track system was the highest priority.

Vice Mayor Burt asked if the City was allowed to continue using Measure B monies for road improvements to fund next steps for grade separations.

Mr. Shikada replied yes, but the question was the amount of available monies and the City's competing needs for the monies.

Mr. Bhatia indicated use of Measure B funds for roads was somewhat flexible, but funding was limited. Staff requested and received VTA's authorization for use of the funds.

Mr. Shikada suggested VTA's authorization was pro forma.

Kiely Nose, Administrative Services Director/Interim Assistant City Manager, clarified that the City's Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score provided the City with flexibility in allocating the funds. The Council's capital discussion was going to include prioritizing transportation projects over the five-year period.

Mr. Shikada noted the City's PCI score was likely to drop if funding for streets decreased.

Vice Mayor Burt stated the PCI threshold was not going to be an issue.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Stone inquired whether discussions with Stanford University included financial assistance for grade separations.

Mr. Shikada reported discussions included financial considerations but not a specific request for funding. Stanford University was monitoring the City's activities and expressed interest in the University Avenue-Palo Alto Avenue transit area. However, Stanford University did not express interest in being involved in any of the activities.

Council Member Stone asked if the 2023 completion date for Caltrain electrification changed.

Mr. Bhatia indicated the anticipated date was the end of 2022.

Council Member Stone inquired about mitigation measures for increased traffic at crossings while the City worked on and constructed grade separations.

Mr. Bhatia explained that the number of trains was going to increase gradually after electrification was complete.

Mr. Shikada noted proposed improvements for Alma and Churchill were going to manage safety concerns at the existing crossing.

Council Member Stone wanted to study the underpass alternative. He asked for comment regarding traffic volume turning at Meadow and ways to prevent traffic from cutting through neighborhoods.

Mr. Black reported 80 to 100 cars turned at Meadow during peak hours. Engineering solutions were available to eliminate cut-through traffic.

Council Member Stone asked if that number of cars was average or high.

Mr. Black indicated a high number was 300 to 500 cars in an hour.

Council Member Cormack requested the top one or two XCAP recommendations that were not listed in Staff's recommendations.

Ms. Naik related that formalizing engagement with stakeholders, additional noise analysis, an urban designer, and additional bicycle crossings were important.

Council Member Cormack supported elimination of the tunnel alternatives from further consideration. She requested the rationale for considering Charleston-Meadow when the Council had a recommendation for Churchill.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. Bhatia reported Staff hoped to obtain Council direction on the three crossings so that work progressed.

Mr. Shikada added that Staff was going to return with an estimate of the cost and scope of work for a follow-up study.

Ms. Naik clarified that understanding the relationship of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Master Plan Update and improvements recommended for Churchill, Meadow, and Charleston was important.

Mayor DuBois supported eliminating the tunnel alternatives and refining the trench and underpass alternatives. Charleston and Meadow were higher priority because of traffic volumes. It was appropriate for the Rail Committee to focus on advocacy work and a financial plan.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Kou to:

1. Eliminate the South Palo Alto Tunnel (Passenger and Freight) and South Palo Alto Tunnel alternatives;
2. Direct Staff to return to Council with:
 - i. South Palo Alto Underpass:
 - a. Pursue design iterations of Underpass alternatives at Charleston and East Meadow, including engaging an urban designer;
 - b. Engage a City Manager appointed stakeholder group;
 - c. Additional evaluation of the trench alternative;
 - ii. Churchill Area Bike/Pedestrian:
 - a. Scoping plan for Alma/Seale and Alma/vicinity of Loma Verde bike/pedestrian crossing, including an update on Bike/Pedestrian Master Plan and how it relates to grade separation plans;
 - b. Research the long-term viability of the Embarcadero Bridge whether and when an eventual replacement may be needed;
 - iii. Caltrain Issues:

SUMMARY MINUTES

- a. In collaboration with other cities, engage with Caltrain on new Engineering and Construction Standards and the 4-track issue and open a dialogue with neighboring cities, such as Menlo Park;
 - iv. Traffic:
 - a. Update Traffic Study and Provide an additional scope of work to address issues raised by the Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP);
 - v. Geotechnical and Drainage:
 - a. Conduct preliminary geotechnical and drainage investigations to evaluate alternatives in preparation for the next phase;
 - vi. Outreach:
 - a. Work with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) and related stakeholders to collaborate on designs (modifications and return to Council with an update by August 2021);
 - b. Fully engage with Stanford;
 - vii. An updated Work Plan and the anticipated timing for Council review of alternatives;
 - viii. Plans for a Technical Advisory Committee;
3. Refer to the Rail Committee to:
- i. Meet with Caltrain on technical issues and support a Local Policy Maker Group Subcommittee;
 - ii. Review and recommend updates to the Grade Separation Criteria; and
 - iii. Review XCAP's suggestions for safety mitigations along the entire corridor and recommend further action.

Vice Mayor Burt remarked that grade separations were as important to Stanford University as they were to the City. Yet, Stanford University was not participating in the process. The costs of next steps were not going to be

SUMMARY MINUTES

insignificant. The Rail Committee needed to lead advocacy work and review of criteria.

Council Member Kou proposed additional evaluation of noise and monitoring of peak noise levels.

Ms. Naik explained that peak noise levels were contained in the noise study.

Council Member Kou wanted to measure noise from freight trains as well.

Molly Stump, City Attorney, reported the Motion appeared to exceed the permissible boundaries of the item under the Brown Act. She needed time to review the Motion in detail.

Mr. Shikada asked the Council to focus on items that were not contained in the XCAP's recommendations and to provide more general direction to Staff.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to Motion, Part B.i.a, "... and mitigating takings of private property to the greatest extent possible."

Council Member Stone asked if Staff needed direction to study further the partial underpass alternative for Churchill.

Mr. Bhatia indicated that was contained in the XCAP's recommendations.

Vice Mayor Burt added that the partial underpass alternative at Churchill depended on clarifications from Caltrain. Without the information, additional iteration was not appropriate.

Council Member Cormack inquired whether the Mayor appointed a Rail Committee.

Mayor DuBois advised that he appointed Council Members Cormack and Tanaka and Vice Mayor Burt to the Rail Committee.

Council Member Cormack requested clarification of the Technical Advisory Committee.

Vice Mayor Burt intended the City Manager appoint a general, ongoing Technical Advisory Committee.

MOTION AS AMENDED: Vice Mayor Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Kou to:

SUMMARY MINUTES

- A. Eliminate the South Palo Alto Tunnel (Passenger and Freight) and South Palo Alto Tunnel alternatives;
- B. Direct Staff to return to Council with:
 - i. South Palo Alto Underpass:
 - a. Pursue design iterations of Underpass alternatives at Charleston and East Meadow, including engaging an urban designer, and mitigating takings of private property to the greatest extent possible;
 - b. Engage a City Manager appointed stakeholder group;
 - c. Additional evaluation of the trench alternative;
 - ii. Churchill Area Bike/Pedestrian:
 - a. Scoping plan for Alma/Seale and Alma/vicinity of Loma Verde bike/pedestrian crossing, including an update on Bike/Pedestrian Master Plan and how it relates to grade separation plans;
 - b. Research the long-term viability of the Embarcadero Bridge whether and when an eventual replacement may be needed;
 - iii. Caltrain Issues:
 - a. In collaboration with other cities, engage with Caltrain on new Engineering and Construction Standards and the 4-track issue and open a dialogue with neighboring cities, such as Menlo Park;
 - iv. Traffic:
 - a. Update Traffic Study and Provide an additional scope of work to address issues raised by the Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP);
 - v. Geotechnical and Drainage:
 - a. Conduct preliminary geotechnical and drainage investigations to evaluate alternatives in preparation for the next phase;

SUMMARY MINUTES

- vi. Outreach:
 - a. Work with the Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) and related stakeholders to collaborate on designs (modifications and return to Council with an update by August 2021);
 - b. Fully engage with Stanford;
 - vii. An updated Work Plan and the anticipated timing for Council review of alternatives;
 - viii. Plans for a Technical Advisory Committee;
- C. Refer to the Rail Committee to:
- i. Meet with Caltrain on technical issues and support a Local Policy Maker Group Sub-Committee;
 - ii. Review and recommend updates to the Grade Separation Criteria; and
 - iii. Review XCAP's suggestions for safety mitigations along the entire corridor and recommend further action.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to direct Staff to:

- A. Eliminate the following alternatives from further consideration, including South Palo Alto Tunnel (passenger and freight) and South Palo Alto Tunnel (with at-grade freight);
- B. Accept the Staff's Proposed Grade Separation Work Plan and Anticipated Timing;
 - i. Summer: Complete a detailed review of the Charleston/Meadow alternatives still under consideration, then provide direction on additional studies/next phase of the project;
 - ii. Fall: Complete a detailed review of the Churchill alternatives still under consideration, then provide direction on additional studies/next phase of the project;
 - iii. Fall/Winter: Council to reconvene the Rail Committee and discuss financial considerations;

SUMMARY MINUTES

- C. Refer to the Rail Committee to:
 - i. Work with Caltrain on political and technical issues; and
 - ii. Review and recommend updates to the Grade Separation Criteria.

Council Member Cormack expressed concern regarding the quantity and detail of the Council's directions to Staff. Staff provided a plan that included details of the issues.

Council Member Filseth shared the concern. The Council's purview was policy, vision, and oversight. The Council was providing prescriptive operational guidance.

INCORPORATED INTO THE SUBSTITUTE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Substitute Motion, Part B, "... incorporating details from the Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP) report and feedback from Council tonight."

Mayor DuBois expressed continuing concerns regarding prioritization and funding for grade separations. Resolving the four-track issue was going to be critical.

Council Member Kou appreciated the effort to simplify the Motion. However, there appeared to be resistance to some of the items contained in the Motion.

Vice Mayor Burt noted Staff was going to return to Council with a work plan, and the Council was likely to amend the work plan if important items were missing.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION AS AMENDED: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to direct Staff to:

- A. Eliminate the following alternatives from further consideration, including South Palo Alto Tunnel (passenger and freight) and South Palo Alto Tunnel (with at-grade freight);
- B. Accept the Staff's Proposed Grade Separation Work Plan and Anticipated Timing incorporating details from the Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP) report and feedback from Council tonight;
 - i. Summer: Complete a detailed review of the Charleston/Meadow alternatives still under consideration, then provide direction on additional studies/next phase of the project;

SUMMARY MINUTES

- ii. Fall: Complete a detailed review of the Churchill alternatives still under consideration, then provide direction on additional studies/next phase of the project;
 - iii. Fall/Winter: Council to reconvene the Rail Committee and discuss financial considerations;
- C. Refer to the Rail Committee to:
- i. Work with Caltrain on political and technical issues; and
 - ii. Review and recommend updates to the Grade Separation Criteria.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 6-1, Kou no

Council Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Mayor DuBois attended the "Breathe With Me" event at Gunn High School and thanked the Kiwanis Club for repairs to the duck pond. The City Manager, Vice Mayor Burt, and he met with the President of Stanford University and his staff to discuss issues of mutual interest. The meeting was positive and disclosed many areas of alignment.

Council Member Kou advised that May was Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, and celebratory events were going to be announced on the City website.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:07 P.M. in recognition of Jasmina Bojic, the Founder and Executive Director of UNAFF (United Nations Association Film Festival), a longtime Stanford educator and film critic to join the International Council for Film, Television and Audiovisual Communication (ICFT) UNESCO based in Paris.