



SUMMARY MINUTES

City Council
Special Meeting
August 23, 2021
5:00 PM

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: None

SPECIAL ORDERS OF THE DAY

1. Alta Housing Presentation.

Sheryl Klein, Executive Director from Alta Housing, shared a video about Alta Housing, reported Palo Alto Housing changed its name to Alta Housing to reflect its expansion, and described assistance provided to residents during the pandemic. Fair Oaks Commons in San Mateo County opened in November 2020. Luna Vista in Mountain View was scheduled to open in October 2021. Wilton Court in Palo Alto was under construction. Alta Housing recently relocated to Sobrato Center for Nonprofits.

NO ACTION TAKEN

CLOSED SESSION

2. CONFERENCE WITH CITY ATTORNEY-POTENTIAL LITIGATION
Subject: Houman Boussina (Personnel Dispute)
Authority: Potential Exposure to Litigation Under Government Code
Section 54956.9(d)(2) One Case, as Defendant.

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

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Council went into Closed Session at 5:16 P.M.

Council returned from Closed Session at 6:31 P.M.

Mayor DuBois announced there was no reportable action.

SUMMARY MINUTES

STUDY SESSION

- ~~3. 3150 El Camino Real [21PLN-00169]: Request for Prescreening of Applicant's Proposal to Re-zone the Subject Properties from CS (Service Commercial) to Planned Home Zoning (PHZ) and to Redevelop the Site with an Approximately 134,515 Square Foot Mixed-use Project. The Project Would Include 129 Residential Rental Units and Approximately 2,800 sort of Retail Space Which Would Replace Existing Restaurant and Office Space. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project.~~

This item was removed from consideration prior to the meeting at the request of the applicant.

AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

None.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Kimberley Wong recalled racist comments made to her and others and inquired about Council actions that prevented racially motivated attacks.

Nelson Ng commented that the decision not to charge an individual for racially harassing comments conveyed a message of no consequences to racist actions. He inquired about the Council's plans to act on its Resolution denouncing anti-Asian hate matters.

Mary Sylvester concurred with Ms. Wong's and Mr. Ng's comments. The community needed a stronger proclamation against hate crimes, hate crime training for Police Officers, and a meeting between City officials and the District Attorney regarding criminal charges for verbal assault.

Chris Robell referred to a recent newspaper article suggesting a Business Tax not apply to mom-and-pop businesses. He supported a Business Tax on companies occupying at least 20,000 square feet and a revenue target of approximately \$30 million.

Annette Ross recounted recent racially motivated attacks and concurred with Ms. Sylvester's comments.

SUMMARY MINUTES

MINUTES APPROVAL

4. Approval of Action Minutes from August 9, 2021.

MOTION: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Mayor DuBois to approve the Action Minutes for the August 9, 2021 City Council Meeting.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

CONSENT CALENDAR

5. Approval of a Lease Amendment Between Palo Alto Players and the City of Palo Alto for the Premises at the Lucie Stern Community Center Located at 1305 Middlefield Road for an Approximate 36-month Term, at a starting Base Rent of \$1,410.00 per Month and Increasing 3 Percent Annually.

MOTION: Council Member Cormack moved, seconded by Mayor DuBois to approve Agenda Item Number 5.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

CITY MANAGER COMMENTS

City Manager Ed Shikada summarized the latest public health order from the California Department of Public Health. The County of Santa Clara (County) announced a COVID-19 booster vaccination for people with compromised immune systems was going to be available beginning August 14, 2021. COVID-19 testing continued at Mitchell Park Library on Tuesdays, City Hall on Wednesdays, and Cubberley Pavilion on September 27, 2021. A series of events, Together Again Palo Alto, was planned for September 10-18, 2021 to celebrate being together again. A second community meeting regarding the Ground-Based Augmentation System (GBAS) at San Francisco International Airport (SFO) was scheduled for August 23, 2021. The Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) was hosting a community meeting regarding countywide fire services on August 25, 2021. The City began a blog to inform the community about Sustainability and Climate Action Plan (S/CAP) activities. Registration for fall art classes at the Palo Alto Art Center opened August 26, 2021 for residents and September 2, 2021 for everyone. The Know Your Neighbor Grant Program provided funding on a first-come first-serve basis for community events. *The Art of Disability Culture* was going to be on display at the Palo Alto Art Center from September 11 to December 11, 2021. Public Art murals were on display at the Public Safety Building (PSB) construction site. Upcoming Council Agenda items included Foothills fire mitigation strategies, safe storage of firearms, homelessness,

SUMMARY MINUTES

the Independent Police Auditor (IPA), economic development and street closures, parking management, the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP), and grade separation for Churchill.

ACTION ITEMS

6. Detailed Review of Alternatives Being Considered for Meadow Drive and Charleston Road Train Crossings, and Direction to City Staff for Conducting Additional Studies for Consideration of Final/Preferred Alternative(s).

Millette Litzinger, Consultant AECOM, reviewed the viaduct, trench, hybrid, and underpass alternatives under consideration for Meadow Drive and Charleston Road. The viaduct was 20 feet above the roadway while the trench was 30 feet below the roadway. A trench required diversion of Adobe and Barron Creeks. In the hybrid option, rail tracks were raised approximately 15 feet above the roadway, and Meadow and Charleston were lowered approximately 6 feet.

Peter DeStefano, Consultant AECOM, advised that in the underpass alternative, rail tracks and Alma Street remained at grade, and Meadow was lowered beneath rail tracks and Alma. A couple of key intersections on either side of Alma accommodated turning movements. Turning movements to and from eastbound and westbound Meadow to southbound Alma were not accommodated due to the elevated bicycle/pedestrian path on the south side of Meadow. Also, a turning movement from westbound Meadow to southbound Park Boulevard was not accommodated. Charleston was lowered beneath rail tracks and Alma from west of Park Boulevard to west of Wright Place. A bicycle/pedestrian path was located on the north side of Charleston and passed beneath rail tracks and Alma Street. To make some turning movements, vehicles needed to travel to a two-lane roundabout near Mumford Place. Turning movements from westbound Charleston to Park Boulevard and from northbound Park to Charleston were not accommodated. Only right turns were allowed from Ely Place onto northbound Alma. Some partial and three full property acquisitions were needed for the underpass alternative.

Paul Burge, Consultant AECOM, related that train horns, train engines, interaction between train wheels and rails, and roadways were significant noise sources associated with the existing rail line. Table 5-1 indicated that the viaduct and hybrid alternatives helped reduce wheel/rail and engine noise, and some people questioned the finding. Both alternatives included a short, parapet noise barrier, which helped reduce wheel/rail and engine noise in most circumstances. Electric multiple-unit (EMU) trains also helped

SUMMARY MINUTES

reduce noise. It was possible to install parapet noise barriers at grade in other alternatives. EMU trains without parapet barriers did not reduce wheel/rail noise.

Ms. Litzinger indicated that additional study of Caltrain's long-term plans was needed to design alternatives that accommodated four tracks, if required. Because the City did not identify growth beyond 2030, extending the traffic study to 2040 was not going to produce significantly different results. Design refinements of underpass alternatives, additional study of urban designs, and evaluation of sustainability provided additional details but did not alter the basic design of alternatives or differentiate one alternative from another. Geotechnical investigations were typically conducted in the next phase of this type of project, but conducting them now could confirm assumptions contained in cost estimates and the planning study. In addition, information from geotechnical investigations could be used to explore the feasibility and merits of a box jacking system. A shadow analysis was usually performed in the next phase, but it would help determine the extent of shadows cast by the elevated railroad structure onto adjacent homes. Additional noise studies that included Caltrain's long-term growth forecasts may result in revision of noise recommendations. Additional evaluation of storm drainage infrastructure for alternatives that lowered rail tracks could further define impacts to creek crossings and drainage costs. Additional outreach may provide additional feedback and an indication of a preferred alternative. Conceptual designs for bicycle/pedestrian undercrossings at Seale and Loma Verde were part of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan (Bike Plan) Update.

Chief Transportation Official Phillip Kamhi shared Staff's professional recommendations for prioritization of additional studies based on the likelihood of study results helping narrow the slate of alternatives. The cost estimate for all of the studies ranged between \$1.25 million and \$1.73 million.

Elizabeth Alexis felt additional geotechnical, storm drain, and groundwater studies were necessary to determine real options and costs. Perhaps Caltrain and other cities were willing to participate in the studies. A bicycle consultant could make recommendations for connecting bicycle facilities at crossings to facilities across the City.

Jean Bozman expressed concern regarding the total cost of \$950 million, especially in light of the pandemic and economic constraints. The City needed to think differently about its priorities and collaborate with neighboring cities.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ellen Hartog remarked that the solutions were trouble for residents in the area. She questioned the need for two separations located within a block of each other.

Melinda McGee suggested the City needed a transportation plan extending to 2050.

Michael Wessel opposed the Meadow underpass alternative including the roundabout because it required the acquisition of several homes and an apartment complex. The roundabout was going to decrease pedestrian safety and increase noise and pollution.

Robert Neff preferred the hybrid alternative and encouraged the Council to move toward a preferred alternative and to consider the missed opportunities of dedicating too much money to only one project.

Steven Rosenblum urged the Council to consider the system rather than individual crossings. The viaduct alternative provided a connection between east and west Palo Alto.

Keith Reckdahl believed conducting additional studies of traffic, shadows, and sustainability was pointless at the current time. The Charleston Meadows neighborhood almost unanimously opposed elevated rail alternatives because they significantly affected quality of life. The shortcomings of alternatives had to be identified and fixed. Bicycle connections needed to be addressed before construction commenced.

Nadia Naik reviewed Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP) recommendations that were not mentioned in the Staff Report.

Sandeep Bahl preferred the trench alternative, which could be covered to increase connectivity.

Larry Klein, speaking as an individual, recommended no additional studies related to four tracks and urban design. Neighbors' main issue with noise was the impacts on third and fourth-row residences.

Council Member Filseth requested reasons for the viaduct alternative costing more than two hybrid alternatives.

Ety Mercurio, AECOM Consultant, explained that the cost of a structure was higher than an embankment due to the costs of structural steel and structural concrete.

Council Member Filseth inquired regarding a route from westbound Charleston to southbound Alma in the Charleston underpass alternative.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. DeStefano indicated that the intersection of Charleston and Alma was going to be signalized and provide a turning movement from Charleston to Alma.

Council Member Filseth asked about the advantages and disadvantages of the underpass versus the hybrid.

Mr. DeStefano related that one advantage to the underpass alternative was the bicycle/pedestrian path extending beneath rail tracks and Alma. In the hybrid alternative, the bicycle/pedestrian path extended beneath rail tracks only. One advantage of the hybrid alternative was more direct traffic movements due to the signalized intersection.

Mr. Kamhi added that additional advantages of the hybrid alternative were potential property impacts and cost. Box jacking was a construction technique that may benefit alternatives.

Ms. Mercurio explained that box jacking may be a way to eliminate shoefly tracks and provide a cost savings.

Council Member Filseth agreed with Staff's recommendation for additional studies.

Council Member Stone inquired whether Staff recommended all additional studies or only those with a high priority.

Mr. Kamhi sought Council direction on which studies to pursue based on which were likely to help narrow the list of alternatives. Staff prioritized additional studies based on information that they believed would be helpful.

Council Member Stone asked if geotechnical studies were needed only if Council selected the underpass alternative.

Mr. Kamhi clarified that Staff sought Council direction on additional studies rather than a narrowing of alternatives.

Council Member Stone requested the reasons for the geotechnical study being more expensive than other studies.

Ms. Litzinger advised that it provided geotechnical information, feasibility of the box jacking system, and updated renderings and animations. The cost escalated when the box jacking system was included.

Council Member Stone inquired regarding efforts to obtain feedback from Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD).

SUMMARY MINUTES

Mr. Kamhi reported the first step was working with PAUSD Staff to develop a process for obtaining PAUSD's feedback.

Council Member Kou requested renderings that depicted a street view of the viaduct with and without a train and the length of the viaduct between North Loma Verde and Fern.

Transportation Engineer Ripon Bhatia responded with a length of 6,500 to 7,000 feet. At the highest elevation, the tracks were 20 feet above ground. Electrification structures added 20 to 30 feet to the height.

Council Member Kou noted that the bike path ran along the south side of Meadow in the underpass alternative and asked if vehicles were allowed to turn right onto Park Boulevard.

Mr. Bhatia answered no.

Council Member Kou asked about the ability of vehicles to turn right from Park onto Meadow.

Mr. Bhatia indicated there was no turning movement from northbound Park to eastbound Meadow. Vehicles were allowed to turn from southbound Park onto Meadow.

Council Member Kou asked about a right turn from Meadow onto Alma.

Mr. Bhatia indicated there was no turning movement from eastbound Meadow onto southbound Alma.

Mr. Kamhi clarified that vehicles were allowed to turn from eastbound Meadow onto northbound Alma and make a U-turn for southbound travel.

Council Member Kou asked if a traffic study was conducted to determine the impacts of these movements.

Mr. DeStefano responded yes. Some traffic would divert to other streets such as El Camino.

Mr. Bhatia advised that the traffic study found the existing F Level of Service (LOS) for the intersections improved.

Council Member Kou inquired about a right turn movement from northbound Alma onto eastbound Meadow.

Mr. DeStefano indicated a U-turn at Alma Village was necessary.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Kou inquired about a right turn movement from westbound Meadow onto northbound Alma.

Mr. Bhatia related that that was allowed.

Council Member Kou requested the turn movements not accommodated in the underpass alternative for Charleston.

Mr. Bhatia replied eastbound Charleston onto northbound Alma, northbound Alma onto westbound Charleston, and southbound Alma onto westbound Charleston. The traffic circle accommodated vehicles wishing to make these movements. Turn movements accommodated eastbound Charleston onto southbound Park and southbound Park onto westbound Charleston.

Council Member Cormack noted that traffic delays and safety concerns were the reasons for constructing grade separations. She inquired about a timeframe for narrowing the alternatives to a preferred alternative.

Mr. Kamhi remarked that ideally the Council determined a preferred alternative soon in order to begin the next phase of the project and leverage Measure B grade separation funding. A realistic timeframe was two years to conclude the current phase.

Council Member Cormack requested the anticipated amount of Measure B funding and the possibility of receiving federal funding.

Mr. Kamhi advised that Measure B funding was estimated at approximately \$350 million in 2016 dollars. The City was not selected for federal funding. The City was not able to advocate for additional funding until the project was better defined. The City had missed some opportunities to apply for funding because the project was not sufficiently developed.

Council Member Cormack recalled the criteria a prior Council developed for alternatives.

Vice Mayor Burt wished to ensure that alternatives increased connectivity within Palo Alto. The latest update regarding Measure B funding indicated Palo Alto was likely to receive \$400 million in 2020 dollars. The City needed a preferred alternative to expend Measure B funding and to apply for other funding. Caltrain recognized the need to close or grade separate all crossings and to work with cities to obtain funding for grade separations. He asked about the impacts of shoefly tracks on Alma in the hybrid and underpass alternatives for Charleston and Meadow.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ms. Mercurio related that shoefly tracks in the hybrid alternative impacted the turn lanes on Alma.

Vice Mayor Burt noted the likelihood of closing the Meadow and Charleston intersections to vehicular traffic for several years during construction and inquired about the number of bicyclists and pedestrians who utilized the intersections. Grade separations accelerated the necessity to construct a dedicated South Palo Alto bicycle and pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of Loma Verde.

Mr. Kamhi did not have data for students passing through the Meadow and Charleston intersections. Bicycle counts were conducted at schools.

Council Member Tanaka understood that the City was not selected for federal funding because the project was not ready.

Mr. Kamhi clarified that he was not aware of the reason for the City not being selected for funding provided in the transportation funding authorization bill.

City Manager Ed Shikada reported the transportation funding authorization bill was an appropriations bill passed in the past few months. The bill earmarked funding for development of projects identified by members of Congress. The process for the pending infrastructure bill had not been defined.

Council Member Tanaka suggested the City's federal advocates review the infrastructure bill.

Mr. Shikada advised that advocates were tracking the bill on behalf of the City.

Council Member Tanaka inquired regarding a table listing the alternatives and the number of property acquisitions required for each alternative.

Ms. Litzinger referred Council Member Tanaka to the fact sheet and matrix.

Mayor DuBois did not wish to expend funds without attempting to narrow the list of alternatives. Based on the work of the XCAP, narrowing the list of alternatives was possible during the meeting. The Council needed Caltrain to identify an alternative location for four tracks in light of the proximity of homes to the tracks. The underpass alternative improved traffic flow and did not raise a structure into the sky. Some geotechnical work could help the Council determine the viability of the trench alternative. Staff needed to continue community outreach as the process continued. The hybrid and

SUMMARY MINUTES

viaduct alternatives were likely to increase noise. He wanted to flesh out details and options for the underpass alternative and eliminate the viaduct and possibly the hybrid alternatives.

Council Member Filseth concurred with Mayor DuBois' comments regarding the four-track system. The Bike Plan needed to be updated soon but certainly before existing bicycle infrastructure was closed for construction of grade separations. The hybrid alternative was preferable to the viaduct alternative. Questions about the underpass alternative needed to be answered. There were many advantages to the trench alternative, but the cost was prohibitive and issues had to be resolved.

Council Member Cormack requested Staff comment regarding work on the four-track system or continuation of the process as outlined.

Mr. Kamhi believed that all of the alternatives accommodated a four-track system, but a four-track system created additional challenges in some alternatives. Staff did not know if Caltrain was going to require a four-track system in Palo Alto. The question was whether the alternatives could accommodate four tracks and, if so, whether the cost of four tracks prohibited further consideration of alternatives.

Council Member Cormack supported the suggestion for a Study Session with Caltrain. The construction process was going to be extraordinarily disruptive. The Bike Plan Update needed to be holistic and proceed parallel to grade separations. She inquired whether the viaduct alternative retained trees or allowed them to be installed.

Ms. Litzinger advised that there were no restrictions on installing trees for a viaduct.

Ms. Mercurio clarified that Caltrain determined the fate of trees located in the right-of-way.

Council Member Cormack concurred with Council Member Filseth's comments regarding the hybrid alternative. The potential for the underpass alternative to confuse motorists was significant. The trench alternative presented significant engineering challenges. If the Council wished to narrow alternatives, it needed to discuss the matrix.

Vice Mayor Burt concurred with comments to consider additional studies to the extent they provided critical information for narrowing alternatives or selecting a preferred alternative. Caltrain Staff was receptive to his suggestion for a Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG) subcommittee to explore design issues common to all cities. Caltrain Staff previously clarified that

SUMMARY MINUTES

they wanted to locate a four-track system at a station and where the tracks had the least impact on grade separations. The City needed to demonstrate to Caltrain that Palo Alto was not a better location for four tracks. The main reason Palo Alto was not a better location was Caltrain's narrow rights-of-way in Palo Alto. The hybrid alternative sounded appealing, but its height was far greater than its depression. The height was achieved by constructing a tall earthen wall, which would be a massive division of the City.

Council Member Stone requested details of fencing along walls in the trench alternative.

Ms. Mercurio explained that a fence was intended to prevent access to high voltage wires providing power to electric trains and to prevent people from throwing objects onto tracks. The fence's height would vary.

Mr. Kamhi added that documents indicated a 10-foot height. Concealing the fence with vegetation was possible, and details were part of a later phase.

Ms. Mercurio reported the use of tie backs to support trench walls limited the type of vegetation that was installed above tie backs. Vegetation that grew deep roots was prohibited. Almost all alternatives required removal of existing vegetation and installation of new vegetation.

Council Member Stone concurred with Mayor DuBois' comments regarding the viaduct alternative and Vice Mayor Burt's comments regarding the appearance of the hybrid alternative. The environmental impacts and construction time of the trench alternative were concerning. The underpass alternative was attractive.

Mayor DuBois inquired about a shelf life for findings from a geotechnical study.

Mr. Kamhi indicated the anticipated shelf life coincided with the lifespan of the project. However, climate change and other changes affected the longevity of results. He noted that estimates for Measure B funding was in 2025 dollars.

Ms. Mercurio advised that geotechnical findings did not expire, assuming the correct data was utilized. Additional geotechnical studies were going to incorporate existing data and augment it with precise data.

Mayor DuBois asked Ms. Naik and Mr. Klein to recommend additional studies.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Ms. Naik indicated her personal recommendation was a geotechnical study, design refinement of the underpass alternative, and conceptual designs for Seale and Loma Verde. Working through the LPMG, the City needed to seek support from Sunnyvale and Mountain View to conduct studies of box jacking, percent grade, and speed. She did not recommend the City pay for anything related to designing for four tracks.

Mr. Klein urged the Council to proceed with two tracks and leave four tracks to Caltrain to figure out. Additional outreach was not a study but an ongoing effort. He recommended proceeding with design refinement of the underpass alternative and geotechnical and noise studies. Studies of traffic and box jacking could wait.

MOTION: Mayor DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Tanaka to direct Staff to:

- A. Eliminate the Viaduct option;
- B. Eliminate the Hybrid option;
- C. Establish a policy to engage with Caltrain on 4-tracks by City Council, Staff, and LPMG representatives;
- D. Refine Underpass alternatives to address current shortcomings, including the size of the roundabout, the bike/ped connections, and right-of-way impacts;
- E. Conduct a preliminary geotechnical study; and
- F. Continue work on the bike plan in parallel with consideration of construction time and interaction with grade crossing plans.

Mayor DuBois was amenable to retaining the hybrid alternative if Council Members did not support eliminating it. The Bike Plan Update and grade separations needed to proceed in parallel, but the Bike Plan needed to be complete prior to construction of grade separations. He inquired about the possibility of removing updates to renderings and cost estimates from refinement of underpass alternatives and adding designs that addressed shortcomings.

Mr. Kamhi reported studies could be limited based on the end product that the Council wished to obtain.

Mayor DuBois clarified that he wished to minimize land acquisitions and review the bicycle/pedestrian crossing in more detail.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Council Member Tanaka liked the fact that the trench alternative minimized surface land acquisitions. There may be ways around subsurface land acquisitions. The underpass alternative was intriguing, but it required land acquisitions, possibly significant land acquisitions. The City needed to pursue rail funding contained in the pending federal infrastructure bill.

AMENDMENT: Council Member Kou moved, seconded by Council Member Tanaka to add onto the Motion as Part G:

G. Direct Staff to obtain the cost for a second cost opinion of the Trench option, in particular to a company with experience of trenches, underground or subterranean methods in parallel to the geotechnical studies.

Vice Mayor Burt expressed interest in value engineering a trench alternative, but obtaining a second opinion may not be the best method. He inquired whether Staff had any sense of the cost of a second opinion.

Mr. Kamhi answered no. Results of an additional geotechnical study were going to inform the potential cost of a trench alternative. As more data was obtained, cost estimates were going to change.

Vice Mayor Burt noted that the preliminary geotechnical study was an important factor in further consideration of a trench alternative.

AMENDMENT PASSED: 6-1, Cormack no

Mr. Kamhi advised that eliminating one lane from the roundabout caused the underpass alternative to fail.

Council Member Filseth felt eliminating the hybrid option was premature, and there was no compelling need to eliminate it.

AMENDMENT TWO: Council Member Filseth moved, seconded by Council Member Cormack to eliminate Part B of the Motion.

Council Member Cormack emphasized the importance of grade separation decisions. The community did not expect the Council to make decisions during the meeting.

Vice Mayor Burt did not believe a 16-foot-tall berm could be disguised and inquired regarding the possibility of constructing a viaduct-type passage in place of a berm.

Ms. Mercurio reported an alternative with a mix of embankment and structure was feasible.

SUMMARY MINUTES

Vice Mayor Burt questioned whether the Council had sufficient information to narrow the alternatives.

Council Member Stone indicated that eliminating both elevated options was premature.

Council Member Tanaka noted that the sense of urgency resulted from the need to obtain funding.

AMENDMENT PASSED: 6-1, Tanaka no

Council Member Cormack did not support the Motion because the possibility of eliminating alternatives was included in the final page of the Staff Report. After reviewing the matrix, she was not able to reconcile some colleagues' statements with information in the matrix. She supported Parts B, D, and E.

Council Member Filseth remarked that east-west connectivity implied connections through a viaduct that separated the east and west sides of the City. However, Alma Street was basically an expressway that limited connectivity. Absent new streets crossing Alma, significant improvements to east-west connectivity were unlikely.

FINAL MOTION AS AMENDED: Mayor DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Tanaka to direct Staff to:

- A. Eliminate the Viaduct option;
- B. Establish a policy to engage with Caltrain on 4-tracks by City Council, Staff, and LPMG representatives;
- C. Refine Underpass alternatives to address current shortcomings, including the size of the roundabout, the bike/ped connections, and right-of-way impacts;
- D. Conduct a preliminary geotechnical study;
- E. Continue work on the bike plan in parallel with consideration of construction time and interaction with grade crossing plans; and
- F. Obtain the cost for a second cost opinion of the Trench option, in particular to a company with experience of trenches, underground or subterranean methods in parallel to the geotechnical studies.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 6-1, Cormack no

SUMMARY MINUTES

COUNCIL MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council Member Filseth found the Governor's new mandate for COVID-19 vaccinations by September 30, 2021 interesting when 80 percent of eligible Canadians were vaccinated.

Mayor DuBois announced he was scheduled to visit Heidelberg, Palo Alto's Sister City, to discuss sustainability initiatives and experiential learning for high school students. Recent racist attacks were extremely troubling, and everyone needed to speak against them.

Closed Session

7. CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATORS
Authority: Government Code Section 54956.8
Property: 300 Homer Avenue, Assessor's Parcel Number 120-17-093
Negotiating Party: Palo Alto History Museum
City Negotiators: Ed Shikada, Kiely Nose, Clare Gibson, Phil Crosby
Subject of Negotiations: Lease Price and Terms of Payment.

MOTION: Council Member Filseth moved, seconded by Council Member Kou to go into Closed Session.

MOTION PASSED: 7-0

Council went into Closed Session at 9:48 P.M.

Council returned from Closed Session at 11:36 P.M.

Mayor DuBois announced no reportable action.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:36 P.M. in honor of the birthdays of former Council Member Emily Renzel, former Council Member Enid Pearson, and Annette Hanko for their leadership in environmental preservation.