



## City Council Rail Committee

Special Meeting  
Thursday, June 7, 2012

Chair Klein called the meeting to order at 4:18 p.m. in the Council Chambers, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Burt (arrived at 4:18 p.m.), Klein (Chair), Shepherd

Absent: Scharff

### ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Herb Borock spoke concerning two Closed Session items on the upcoming City Council agenda regarding High Speed Rail (HSR). He discussed the San Jose to San Francisco segment Environmental Impact Report (EIR) being approved while there was a lawsuit in the Central Valley on the Program EIR. The Brady lawsuit was scheduled for a hearing on the 15<sup>th</sup> of June. In Brady's request for judicial notice there was a request to the public records staff of HSR for supporting data on the trip time information released in the April Business Plan. The response from the HSR staff was there was no evidentiary data.

#### 2. Discussion of Senator Simitian's Request for Input on HSR Appropriations

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist said a vote on High Speed Rail (HSR) appropriations was likely to occur before July 1<sup>st</sup> although it was not likely to occur by the June 15<sup>th</sup> budget bill. Senator Simitian had contacted the City for their input with two questions 1) operating under the assumption there was an appropriation of HSR in the upcoming month, what were the three most prominent and direct local concerns the City had with the current project and 2) define what an acceptable project on the Peninsula looked like, whether it was the blended system or the Simitian/Eshoo/Gordon proposal. He had spoken with one of Senator Simitian's staff members who provided an update that there had not been support for the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemptions; they were not off the table but, the Legislature was not happy about them. They were looking at defining what the project would look like in more detail as a part of the bond language. He noted the situation was fluid and the request for information was received as soon as possible. If language was drafted, Palo Alto would be given an opportunity to comment. Staff had requested a special City Council Rail Committee (Committee) meeting for the week of June 11<sup>th</sup>. He

listed a number of top concerns the Committee had mentioned in previous meetings; 1) all reference of a four-track system from the San Jose to San Francisco segment must be removed from environmental documents, 2) the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) needed to identify the Peninsula Corridor Joint Power Board (PCJPB) as the lead agency for the San Francisco to San Jose segment, 3) the CHSRA must agree that no CEQA exemption of any kind would be provided for the construction of the project, 4) the CHSRA must not determine the Pacheco Pass route was the preferred access point to the Bay Area until the new Ridership Study was complete, 5) the CHSRA and its Program Level Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must adequately address local traffic impacts resulting from the loss of one to two lanes on Alma Street, and 6) that the CHSRA must follow what was outlined in the AB3034 – the authorizing bill for Proposition 1A.

Council Member Burt felt the final point could be folded into a preamble which was along the lines that Palo Alto still expected Senator Simitian to oppose funding for the HSR as currently proposed because the Business Plan was fundamentally flawed and did not conform to Proposition 1A and AB3034. Out of the items listed, the three that appeared most important were 1) no CEQA exemptions, 2) the rescinding or removal from the four-track system, and 3) Caltrain as the lead agency. He suggested including a concluding statement such as how can Legislature provide any meaningful guarantees that whatever they put in the budget language would actually be what the CHSRA would be obligated to live up to. Given that, there was language in AB3034, Proposition 1A, and direction by the Legislature and it had been largely disregarded. Writing the letter with opening and conclusion statements essentially adds the two other elements that may not be the main concerns but were valid points to note.

Chair Klein said the debate was whether or not the Committee should respond to the request. He felt even if the preamble confirmed Palo Alto's position was to kill the entire project; the City would be complicit if the project moved forward. His concerns would be 1) the elimination of the four-track systems, 2) no elevated structures in Palo Alto, and 3) no CEQA exemptions.

Council Member Burt believed Chair Klein's concern one and two could be combined into the no four-track system.

Chair Klein did not feel telling CHSRA that they needed to follow the laws in Proposition 1A and AB3034 when they had not been doing so to date. He wanted the letter to remain focused on what could be changed to some degree.

Council Member Burt noted his suggested verbiage was more of what guarantees could be placed in the legislative language to ensure what was being asked for could be lived up to given that Senator Simitian had pointed out numerous ways the CHSRA had not been following AB3034. There were hooks that could be set in-place to ensure there was compliance.

Council Member Shepherd felt her three concerns were 1) no circumvention of CEQA, 2) the elimination of all reference to a four-track system, and 3) the local traffic impacts. Many involved in the project were seeking efficiencies to CEQA and she was concerned the language could be manipulated. She requested boiler plate language for CEQA as known currently. She stated the JPB owned the corridor so she questioned why they were not automatically the lead agency. She did not follow how there were two EIR's in process. She felt having two EIR's in process placed the City in jeopardy of binding them to some letter of the law that did not work for Palo Alto later on. She believed the failure of traffic impacts was of critical concern and the auditor's report reflected the matter had not received sufficient attention.

Chair Klein asked if the suggestion was to have them pay for underground grade separations.

Council Member Shepherd said yes but would that be considered an outrageous request.

Margaret Monroe, Management Specialist pointed out Senator Simitian requested three significant concerns for Palo Alto. If traffic impacts and underground grade separations were of significant concern then they fit into the requested category.

Council Member Burt said the language being requested was to be inserted into the budget language. Was asking for HSR to cover the cost of grade separations feasible; maybe. If the tracks stay at grade level and there were areas that went above or below grade there would be large land takings of homes. Asking for them to cover the cost of grade separations in the absence of coupling it with not any significant takings of single family homes was a good ask. He was not in favor of home takings for grade separations.

Council Member Shepherd agreed she was not in favor of takings either.

Council Member Burt said they needed to be cautious when asking for grade separations without conditioning it on other severe impacts on the community.

Chair Klein asked how grade separations would look.

Council Member Burt said the trains would be recessed. Not necessarily the length of the City but the length of the grade separations.

Steve Emslie, Deputy City Manager noted not every crossing needed to be grade separated.

Chair Klein pointed out there could not be too many ups and downs when traveling by train.

Council Member Burt understood the analysis was starting to get done while the Alternatives Analysis was being worked on. It was at the heart of Palo Alto's issues and technical problems for the City for a high volume rail line whether it was Caltrain or HSR. Utilizing a trench system should be based on the need not the asking. Where there would be 100's of homes taken was not politically feasible so the realization should be there would be a lack of capacity based on grade separations.

Chair Klein shared the concern that the grade separation issue was complicated. The deeper involved the City becomes the more difficult it becomes a request.

Mr. Emslie hated asking for more studies unless it was a concern. The grade separation was being studied and stopped when the Alternatives Analysis began.

Ms. Monroe asked what study was currently being completed for release in September.

Mr. Emslie understood it was the Capacity Analysis and it would describe the impacts. He had not heard anyone was going to begin evaluating the likelihood of grade separations at different crossings.

Herb Borock shared the sentiment with Chair Klein as to whether or not to respond to Senator Simitian's request. But if there was going to be a letter sent to Palo Alto's legislative representatives what should be included was how the City wanted them to vote on the matter.

Chair Klein indicated if what was being requested was a wish list he suggested the items be of higher value than a study. He supported any necessary grade crossings approved by the City Council would be paid for by the CHSRA. He continued no elevated structures, no four-track system, and no CEQA circumvention should be on the list.

Council Member Shepherd asked to add control over grade crossing decisions.

Chair Klein said that was in the list of recommendations.

Ms. Monroe mentioned she had listed any necessary grade crossings by Palo Alto City Council would be paid for by CHSRA was one of the listed items.

Chair Klein asked if there was consensus on the four items to be in the letter.

Council Member Burt said the other question was how important it was to Palo Alto that Caltrain be the lead agency.

Ms. Monroe confirmed the four items 1) rescind four-track system language, 2) Caltrain as lead agency, 3) no CEQA modifications, and 4) no grade crossing.

Council Member Burt stated under Chair Klein's no four-track item it should read no four-track system and no elevated structure. He continued his interest in adding closure language referencing what guarantees could the legislation provide that those and other provisos would be binding on the CHSRA.

Chair Klein conscripted language urging the Legislature to take in its drafting the language so the concerns were enforceable given the CHSRA's record on not following the dictates of AB3034.

Council Member Burt agreed the suggested language or something similar would be acceptable to him.

**MOTION:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Chair Klein that the City Council Rail Committee direct Staff to write a letter in response to Senator Simitian's request for Palo Alto issues of concern consisting of 1) rescinding all reference to a four-track system or elevated structures, 2) Caltrain placed as the lead agency, 3) no California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) modifications, and 4) no grade crossing without City of Palo Alto City Council approval and any approved grade crossing would be funded for by the High Speed Rail (HSR).

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0 Scharff absent

### 3. Consideration of Support for the Initiative to Terminate HSR

Chair Klein said the verbiage to consider was different from the initial request.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist confirmed the language on the Staff documentation was retrieved directly from the High Speed Rail (HSR) website; Revote High Speed Rail.

Chair Klein received a call from former Congressman Radanovich and believed Council Member Burt did as well.

Council Member Burt confirmed he had received a call but had not spoken to him.

Chair Klein asked Council Member Shepherd if she had received a call.

Council Member Shepherd stated she had not. She asked if the consideration was for the legislation or the hand carried citizens' initiative to have it placed back on the ballot.

Chair Klein confirmed it was the citizens' initiative.

Council Member Shepherd asked if it was expected to be on the ballot in 2014.

Chair Klein said that was correct. The initiative was originally proposed by State Senator Lamalfa who had been joined by retired Congressman Radanovich; both authors were Republicans from the Central Valley area. They had a budget of approximately \$2 million to spend on people who frequent shopping centers with clip boards to acquire signatures and carry the campaign. They needed 550,000 signatures by December 2012 in order to be eligible for the next ballot in December of 2014. He mentioned if there was a statewide ballot in 2013 it would go on the ballot in 2013. If Governor Brown's tax initiative was to fail in November of 2012 it was a possibility he would place it on the 2013 ballot. John Garamendi Jr. of the Professional Evaluation Group, Inc. believed the Committee should back the proposed initiative. He felt Palo Alto had nothing to lose. He did not feel the item was time sensitive and recommended it be heard by the full Council as endorsed by the Committee.

Council Member Shepherd asked how the initiative worked if there were bonds that had already been issued and Palo Alto had already accepted

funds then in 2014 citizens' vote to abandon any construction that had been built to date.

Chair Klein said that would be the determinate, if the vote was to end HSR the structures that were built would remain and construction would stop.

Council Member Shepherd asked if they attempted to manage a 2012 election when they would have needed to achieve their required signatures.

Mr. Hackmann said by August.

Council Member Shepherd was concerned that Palo Alto would be paying on a capital improvement debt that did not exist.

Chair Klein understood and explained there were a number of provisions in the initiative in an attempt to counter the funds that had previously been authorized and spent.

Council Member Burt said there would not be construction on systems completed in 2014; they may be breaking ground at best. There may be a fraction of the Central Valley dollars stranded versus a lot more stranded if the initiative did not go through.

Omar Chatty spoke on a previous letter written by the Committee to Senator Simitian where there was a request for an escape hatch similar to what the Central Valley Legislature had included in HR71: To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to repeal the requirement that persons making disbursements for electioneering communications file reports on such disbursements with the Federal Election Commission and the prohibition against the making of disbursements for electioneering communications by corporations and labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Council Member Burt agreed the matter was not time sensitive and he confirmed there would be another Committee meeting soon.

Chair Klein said yes, June 13<sup>th</sup> was proposed.

Council Member Burt asked what the purpose of the meeting was.

Mr. Hackmann noted Staff was anticipating the Committee having the opportunity to comment on the proposed bond appropriation language and their comments would have a short turnaround time.

Council Member Burt preferred more time to digest the initiative prior to recommending something to the full Council.

**MOTION:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Chair Klein that the City Council Rail Committee continue Item Number 3: Consideration of Support for the Initiative to Terminate HSR to June 13, 2012 for further consideration.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0 Scharff absent

4. Consideration of Position on Governor's Proposal to Weaken CEQA for HSR

Council Member Burt thought the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) may want to couple the consideration of a position by way of a written communication.

Chair Klein stated if the communication would be sent to the Governor, the Legislature, and the regular distribution list.

Council Member Burt believed if the communication was going to be in a written form he recommended including two other political concerns within the letter. Recently there were two polls, one on the Governor's tax initiative, the other on High Speed Rail (HSR), and a ballot initiative on the tobacco tax. The reason the tobacco tax was unsuccessful was because the funds from the tax would be used for what the public felt were wrong purposes. The support for the tax initiative was weakened drastically when the follow-up question of using the fund for HSR rather than education was posed. Support for HSR had shown to be less than 50 percent in democratic and labor households. He was uncertain which points the Committee wanted to add to the letter but he felt the Legislatures may not realize the tax initiative was as crucial as it was and therefore it should be one of the statements included.

Council Member Shepherd believed there needed to be a nexus formed between the tax initiative and education and the educational initiatives that were expected to be on the ballot in November. She felt the City needed to include they were very committed to education and not just opposed to HSR.

Chair Klein agreed with both Colleagues but noted this type of letter needed to be focused and should not list too many points.

**MOTION:** Chair Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Shepherd that the City Council Rail Committee direct Staff to draft a letter of consideration



of position on the Governor's proposal to weaken California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for High Speed Rail (HSR).

Steve Emslie, Deputy City Manager committed to incorporating as much information as possible in the letter without losing focus.

Council Member Shepherd suggested Chair Klein finalize the letter.

Chair Klein agreed and requested the letter be sent to the regular distribution list with the inclusion of the media.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0 Scharff Absent

#### 5. Discussion of Potential Changes to the Caltrain Service Schedule

Jayme Ackemann, Caltrain Government Affairs Officer explained Caltrain was operating on an 86 day train schedule which was down from a peak of 98 train weekday train schedule. She noted many of the commute time trains were working at capacity and many at above capacity. There were two dedicated train cars for bicyclists but recently they have been bumped for pedestrian passengers because of over capacity issues. There was a modest increase to service which would restore some of the service from the initial reduction from 98 to 86. She would be taking comments from the meeting to Caltrain but if there were comments made outside of the meeting they would need to be submitted by the end of the week for consideration.

Chair Klein asked why the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) was given such a constrained response schedule.

Ms. Ackemann stated there was a notification for comments to the proposed schedule change at the beginning of May. Caltrain set the Public Hearing 30-days in advance which occurred last week and the budget was brought before the Board earlier this week.

Chair Klein asked Staff if the Committee was not informed of the comment period.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist stated he must have missed the notification because he had first heard of the comment period last week.

Ms. Ackemann confirmed last week Caltrain held the public meeting which was well attended but the notice for the meeting was noticed 30-days in advance.

Chair Klein asked when the Board was supposed to act.

Ms. Ackemann would need to confirm her information but believed they would be acting in July. The public comment needed to be closed in order to have time to collect the comments and make any necessary changes in response to the comments and be resubmitted to the Board for their consideration.

Chair Klein noted his discontentment with the short timeframe.

Ms. Ackemann stated the service increase brought the schedule from 86 weekday trains to 92. The difference restored what was referred to as the shoulder peak trains. Shoulder peak were trains that were at the latter end of the morning and the early end of the afternoon rush hour. There were two trains being added at the 4:00 p.m. and 6:20 p.m. time slots because of requests from the technology community where they worked a different schedule than what was considered normal commute time. Both of those trains would have limited stops comparable to the baby bullets. There were stops being added to several of the express trains to further accommodate some of the ridership changes seen. Palo Alto and Sunnyvale would receive an additional six stops per day. She noted if the Committee wanted to submit a comment next week she believed the Board would allow the late submission.

Elizabeth Alexis, advocate for Californians Advocating for Responsible Rail Design (CARRD) was pleased to hear Caltrain was increasing their service schedule to accommodate more ridership. She provided a map from the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) which showed color coded routes and she felt the information could be useful to make Caltrain scheduling comments. The main question to ask was where do people who work in Palo Alto live and where do people who live in Palo Alto work. In order to measure service levels Caltrain needed to figure frequency, travel time, regularity, and the importance of connecting transit. She pleaded for the Committee to request more service for California Avenue where there was a high level of people who worked and lived. She provided ACS data from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The data was from 2006-2008 but the majority was still valid. She noted a major issue for the train travelers was the connections to other services such as VTA.

Council Member Burt asked Ms. Ackemann if she was aware of the number of employees in the Stanford Research Park.

Ms. Ackemann was not personally familiar with the number but she was aware the Caltrain Operations Team had been in discussions with

transportation coordinators who work out of the Stanford Research Park. California Avenue had been a topic of conversation during those discussions. She was unable to explain why California Avenue did not have additional services as part of the proposal but she noted the reason the downtown stop was the main focus was because the ridership was overwhelmingly high.

Council Member Burt asked if the number of people boarding or un-boarding at University Avenue were actually doing so because there was no train service at or near their preferred destination of California Avenue. The information presented now or previously did not adequately clarify the analysis so in order to respond appropriately, a more sufficient explanation would be necessary. He asked if Ms. Ackemann brought the latest ridership information for the different stations.

Ms. Ackemann stated no but mentioned the information was available on the Caltrain website.

Council Member Burt was familiar with the website. He recalled the San Francisco station at 6<sup>th</sup> and the Palo Alto University Avenue station had the highest boarding's of any station. They also had the highest absolute increases and percentages year over year. The service to California Avenue was constrained by the baby bullet and yet growth continued without service. If Caltrain went from the baby bullet to the electrified express train service California Avenue ridership would qualify. He asked the number of stops a baby bullet made.

Ms. Ackemann clarified the number of stops depended on the train but she believed it was six.

Council Member Burt believed there was a crossover in the stations that served baby bullets and California Avenue was number 12 on the line even though it had been choked off. He said the presentation added p.m. peak trains but not a.m. peak. He asked why the demand was in the p.m. peak but not the a.m.

Ms. Ackemann noted there was an a.m. peak shoulder service being added and a number of additional stops to existing trains across the board. The p.m. peak trains did two things; 1) shortened the window where Caltrain only offered hourly service and 2) they responded to a really high level of demand for a much later peak service.

Council Member Burt asked for the times of p.m. peak hours.

Ms. Ackemann stated one p.m. train left at 4:30 p.m. and the other at 6:20 p.m.

Council Member Burt clarified the explanation was there were a large number of younger technology workers who lived in Palo Alto but worked in San Francisco who tended to arrive and leave work later than the historic work pattern. The shoulder peak may be addressing some of the late arrive issues although he believed it was the later a.m. peak that would be of a higher demand. He did not see the 4:30 p.m. services being as in demand as the 6:20 p.m. or even a later service. He noted the Committee was being shown the conclusion but not the methodology or the data used to achieve it. He asked Ms. Alexis if she could supply copies of her presentation to Ms. Ackemann.

Ms. Alexis agreed to e-mail it and had already provided a hard copy to her.

Council Member Burt said the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) seemed to have a great deal of active and committed users of Caltrain but there was a sprinkling in the communities of people who could really be part of a technical advisory committee. CARRD volunteers were extremely active with the HSR issues and could be used on a technical analysis basis. Ms. Alexis was able to understand the methodology used in sophisticated ridership analysis and projection patterns because of her economic studies expertise. He understood the modernization process for Caltrain was in the future but he had previously mentioned adding platform lengths at the higher ridership stations. He heard they were to be a part of the next phase of the Capacity Analysis but he did not understand why it needed to wait. Which of the Caltrain stations had platform lengths that would allow longer trains or what would it take to allow longer trains. He was not interested in more trains as much as higher capacity trains.

Council Member Shepherd mentioned how inept the transit systems were and noted the company Cisco had two shuttle buses to transport their employees from the Mountain View station to their facility. She was very interested in the connectivity throughout the valley. Stanford had the Marguerite shuttle system in place and a similar system strategy could work well for the City.

Chair Klein asked how much coordination was between Caltrain and the VTA.

Ms. Ackemann said there was a fair amount of coordination but with the understanding Caltrain coordinates with VTA, Samtrans, Capital Corridor, ACE, and Muni. Each time Caltrain connects with one service there was disconnect from another. Caltrain needed to prioritize those services and

more traditional public transit planning because there was a core service and the buses were timed to meet it rather than the reverse.

Chair Klein asked if there was a methodology to see the number of potential riders there were within a half mile of each station.

Ms. Ackemann said there was not a clear answer to that question because what that entailed was surveying a population or a work-place population and then extrapolating from those responses whether or not they would actually ride versus what they say they would do. Reengineering transit service around a possibility was difficult especially when there was existing demand with limited availability.

Chair Klein asked if the people on the platforms at University Avenue had ever been surveyed as to where they work or to get a sense of how far away they traveled. He asked if they would prefer a stop at California Avenue.

Ms. Ackemann was unaware if there had been a specific survey on that information but she was very aware of where their passengers were shuttling to. Caltrain worked closely with the shuttle providers.

Chair Klein asked if those numbers had been shared with the public.

Ms. Ackemann did not have them with her but she believed they were published in the annual ridership survey.

Chair Klein asked if Staff had numbers as to how many potential riders were in the California Avenue area.

Council Member Burt noted in the research park there were 22 thousand employees and the parts of California Avenue area that were not part of the research park increased those numbers.

Chair Klein mentioned the research park was such a large facility he was not certain of the split on the ridership between California Avenue and University Avenue.

Council Member Burt felt it would be dependent on the type of shuttle system provided.

Steve Emslie, Deputy City Manager spoke to Rafael Rius, the Transportation Project Engineer who indicated those numbers were not readily available.

Chair Klein asked for the number of Facebook employees were no longer part of the equation since the company moved.

Mr. Emslie believed Facebook housed between 1,600 and 2,000 employees.

Council Member Burt noted the Facebook employee ridership was for a comparatively short period of time.

Ms. Alexis believed there would be a similar sized tenant in the facility soon and proposed they could be potential riders.

Chair Klein said the Facebook facility had been designated for housing.

Council Member Burt said the upper half of California Avenue which was less than half of Facebook employees was what was destined to become housing. The majority of the Facebook employees were in the Page Mill Road location.

Herb borock spoke of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) routes 522, 22, and the 23. It was anticipated the Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) would fund to increase the service of the 522 but those funds were being shifted to create a new 323 route in the 23 line corridor. The VTA reported funding for the 522 line in the upcoming year.

Council Member Shepherd said in response to the Caltrain comment period she recommended adding California Avenue stops. She did not want to remove stops from other areas but she question whether it was more effective to have California Avenue and University Avenue be part of the same bullet line.

Chair Klein did not feel that would be effective.

Council Member Shepherd said Caltrain was adding a Palo Alto stop just after the Menlo Park stop which indicated Menlo Park and Palo Alto were on the same bullet line.

Margaret Monroe, Management Specialist said Caltrain was providing three more bullet lines in each direction. She asked if one of those stopped at California Avenue, would that be sufficient.

Council Member Shepherd said it appeared three of the added trains were new train routes.

Ms. Ackemann said yes, they were new train stops.

Council Member Shepherd confirmed according to the proposal there would be six new bullet trains. She identified 365, 373, and 383 from the current scheduled stops at Menlo Park so the additional train schedule would be adding University Avenue to the Menlo Park bullet. She questioned whether it was necessary to have three stops in Menlo Park and could one of those stops be shifted to California Avenue.

Ms. Monroe asked if a substitution could be one of the University Avenue stops.

Council Member Shepherd said there were currently two baby bullet stops on University Avenue so with the proposal there would be five stops in the same direction with none on California Avenue. Her theory was if a passenger missed the first baby bullet train they were able to make the second one and be dropped off back at California Avenue to pick up their mode of transportation rather than being left at University Avenue and needing to walk to California Avenue after a full day of work.

Council Member Burt agreed it was difficult to determine precise recommendations in this environment without accurate knowledge or information. The Committee could direct Staff to contact the Transportation Demand Manager (TDM) for Stanford Research Park to assess the need for California Avenue. He asked if the schedules being viewed were the current ones.

Ms. Ackemann stated that was correct.

Council Member Burt said with the proposed increases there were no increases for California Avenue.

Ms. Ackemann clarified there were mid-day increases at California Avenue.

Council Member Burt confirmed the mid-day increases stopped at every station.

Ms. Ackermann noted that was correct.

**MOTION:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Chair Klein that the City Council Rail Committee direct Staff to 1) look at whether there was some way there could be a modest shift toward peak hour coverage at California Avenue via local train or baby bullet and 2) to have engagement with the Stanford Research Park Transportation Demand Manager (TDM) to receive input on their recommendations for the Palo Alto train service.

Chair Klein suggested adding to the Motion to direct Staff to prepare a letter to Caltrain to complete the research.

Council Member Burt agreed and noted there were two parts. Prepare a letter to Caltrain on the issues outlined in the Motion. In preparation for the letter there should be input from the Stanford Research Park on Palo Alto needs and City Staff evaluation of what changes might be able to shift coverage to California Avenue.

**INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION BY THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER** to direct Staff to prepare a letter to Caltrain for them to complete the research with input from the Stanford Research Park on needs and a Staff evaluation on possible changes for coverage to California Avenue.

Chair Klein maintained his suggestion that the Staff send a letter to Caltrain exploring the recommendations in the Motion. He reiterated the letter needed to be written and distributed this week.

Council Member Burt felt the Stanford Research Park TDM would have insights on University Avenue and the research park not just between California Avenue and them. He noted if there was an increase in train stops but not shuttles the problem would not be solved just changed. He felt there should be a strong collaboration between Caltrain, VTA, and Samtrans regarding transit coordination on schedules of different transits modes.

Council Member Shepherd said the proposal was to have three additional stops in Palo Alto. The Motion was not asking for anything more.

Chair Klein said in essence the Committee was asking for Caltrain to carefully review whether additional services at California Avenue would be more appropriate.

Council Member Shepherd said that would be left to Staff to determine based on research.

Chair Klein said no, the recommendation was to write a letter which may be supported by testimony of the Stanford representative for Caltrain to re-review the additional services at California Avenue.

Council Member Shepherd strongly recommended the schedule be coordinated with the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) service so the Caltrain train was not arriving as the BART train was departing.



Council Member Burt suggested that BART be part of the collaboration with other transit services.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0, Scharff absent

6. Report from the Professional Evaluation Group, Inc.

John Garamendi Jr. joined the meeting via conference call. He informed the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) the High Speed Rail (HSR) selected Jeff Morales as Chief Executive Officer (CEO). During the last meeting Dan Richards mentioned there would be no change to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) but now there were significant changes. He mentioned there was an L.A. Times poll released a few days ago which sited the decline in enthusiasm in the HSR projects throughout the state.

Chair Klein asked Mr. Garamendi if there was reaction resulting from the polls.

Mr. Garamendi had not heard much chatter because of the close proximity to the election. He believed the poll would have an adverse effect on the upcoming budget negotiations. There was a move afoot attempting to link the CEQA exemptions for the HSR to the process for the Peripheral Canal; he did not see the move being accepted. Mike Brady's office was expected to be heard with respect to King's County on environmental issues.

Chair Klein had read the communication from the Sierra Club regarding the CEQA exemptions. He asked if Mr. Garamendi had reviewed the letter.

Mr. Garamendi had seen the letter.

Chair Klein asked if other environmental organizations had written letters in a similar vein.

Mr. Garamendi believed the environmental groups were fairly united in terms of the HSR. His understanding was they felt disheartened by some of the exemptions that had moved forward.

Chair Klein asked if Mr. Garamendi had thoughts or opinions on the other agenda items.

Mr. Garamendi had been speaking with Staff on a regular basis regarding the issues. It was best to respond to what Senator Simitian was requesting the City to do and pursue all legal revenue that was possible. He understood

there was a lot of work for Staff but the process was at a fevered pitch at the moment.

Chair Klein received a call from the group behind Senator Lamalfa and former Congressman Radanovich to terminate the HSR.

Mr. Garamendi did not believe there would be any loss by backing the initiative. Palo Alto had a straightforward stance on how they felt the HSR should be which appeared to be in line with the policies of the Lamalfa/Radanovich group.

Chair Klein noted he had written an Opinion/Editorial piece on the HSR to be released in the Palo Alto Weekly, Friday, June 8, 2012.

### **NO ACTION TAKEN**

#### 7. Reports on Meetings

- California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) Board
- Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC)
- Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB)

### **NO DISCUSSION**

#### 8. Future Meetings and Agendas

June 13, 2012 at 8:30 a.m.

Chair Klein requested Staff notify the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) if the meeting becomes no longer necessary.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.