



## City Council Rail Committee DRAFT MINUTES

Special Meeting  
February 28, 2013

Chair Shepherd called the meeting to order at 9:03 A.M. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Burt, Kniss, Klein, Shepherd (Chair)

Absent: None

### 2. Approval of Minutes

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to approve the December 6, 2012 minutes.

**MOTION PASSED:** 4-0

### 3. Meeting Updates

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

Vice Mayor Shepherd noted updates included the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) State Rail Plan.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist did not have any updates since the prior City Council Rail Committee (Committee) meeting.

Vice Mayor Shepherd requested an update of the Caltrans State Rail Plan.

Aaron Aknin, Assistant Planning Director reported Caltrans released a draft Plan for public review through March 11, 2013. He described it as a public relations piece, a strategy to obtain federal funding for High Speed Rail (HSR) and other rail improvements. It was also described as a comprehensive plan for future rail improvements. A comprehensive review of rail service was required by State and Federal law. The plan indicated all future improvements were required to have an environmental review. If the City submitted comments, those comments needed to be reiterated to say that future improvements needed environmental review. The plan used much of the same text that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and legislation used. A Comment Letter needed to be mentioned to say that the environmental review for improvements as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), needed to be consistent with the plan; a consultant was hired to review the plan.

Council Member Kniss asked when the plan was released.

Mr. Aknin indicated the plan was released less than a month ago. The review period ended March 11, 2013.

Vice Mayor Shepherd inquired about the deadline to submit comments.

Mr. Aknin answered March 11, 2013.

Vice Mayor Shepherd noted the process began in June 2011. The Committee did not have a meeting scheduled prior to March 11, 2013. She inquired whether the Committee preferred to draft comments or allow Staff to draft comments.

Council Member Kniss assumed the Committee reviewed the plan because it was released more than a year ago.

Council Member Klein stated the Committee did not review the plan.

Council Member Kniss questioned whether the plan had been available this past year.

Vice Mayor Shepherd reported the Committee just received a notice on scoping.

Council Member Kniss noted the Committee obtained the plan on February 28, 2013; the plan was released at the beginning of February 2013 but the

plan was drafted over the previous year. She questioned why Staff was not aware the plan was being drafted.

Mr. Akin was not certain. He said John Garamendi, Professional Evaluation Group Inc. was not aware of the plan either.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether the State had purposely kept the plan quiet.

Mr. Akin did not know.

Council Member Kniss suggested Staff provide responses indicating whether the plan complied with Committee discussions, policies, and Guiding Principles.

Vice Mayor Shepherd asked if Caltrain reviewed the plan.

Council Member Kniss reported that Caltrain did not review it as a specific item but asked a representative in the audience from Caltrain if they provided a position on the plan.

Casey Fromson, Government Affairs, Caltrain Modernization Program at San Mateo County did not recall Caltrain having a position; however, Caltrain staff was aware of the plan.

Council Member Kniss did not believe Caltrain formally reviewed the plan.

Vice Mayor Shepherd agreed with Staff drafting responses, which she wanted to review.

Council Member Kniss suggested circulating responses to the entire Committee, if there were concerns.

Council Member Burt thought the review should comply with the Guiding Principles.

Vice Mayor Shepherd indicated a Motion was not necessary, as the topic was not specifically agendaized.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain reported one red flag was the proposal to have additional Amtrak trains from San Francisco and Santa Clara.

Council Member Burt did not see that aspect. He thought the Committee needed to remember the needs of Caltrain's capacity, and the capacity that HSR reserved. The MOU restricted Caltrain to a peak of six trains per hour. If additional trains were needed to meet passenger needs, Caltrain was not able add trains. Adding Amtrak trains further compounded the competition for capacity.

Council Member Kniss felt the MOU was tight at this point.

Vice Mayor Shepherd recalled it was six trains per hour one way. She requested Staff address that issue in the draft responses. The Guiding Principles addressed the Caltrain corridor as supplying a need in the peninsula.

#### 4. Report From the Professional Evaluation Group, Inc.

John Garamendi Jr., Professional Evaluation Group Inc. reported he attended the February 14, 2013 California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) meeting. CHSRA briefly discussed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Caltrain. The next CHSRA meeting was on March 6, 2013. The City Council Rail Committee (Committee) considered having a representative present to make a statement. One of the primary Agenda items was the Caltrain MOU. He monitored the hearings in the Senate and Assembly regarding High Speed Rail (HSR). The attitude seemed to be that the Legislature agreed to the deal, and was now moving beyond it. There were a few questions about future funding. The deadline for submitting Bills to the Legislature passed.

Council Member Kniss inquired where in Redwood City the meeting was held.

Mr. Garamendi did not recall. In the week prior, more than 2,200 Bills were submitted to the Legislature. Many of the Bills were placeholders and there was a sorting process that happened after that; however, 8-12 Bills were related to HSR in some form. He wanted to closely monitor those Bills, as him and his staff were working on a matrix to show how those were going to come together. There was also Senator Hill's Bill, Senate Bill 557 (SB) and a Bill regarding the flexibility of CHSRA to buy land; there were some regarding changing the voting members in connection with the composition of the CHSRA Board as well.

Vice Mayor Shepherd requested Mr. Garamendi repeat his last two comments.

Mr. Garamendi noted that the deadline to submit those Bills was the previous Friday. There were over 2,200 Bills that were submitted by opponents to HSR, which were probably dead. Those Bills included a limit on future spending of CHSRA, which did not say what they were going to do, but were going to be filled out. The Bills ranged from SB 557, which was a Bill presented by Senator Hill to another Senator about how HSR was going to be able to purchase land; there were also Bills that talked about changing the membership of the CHSRA Board. There were 26 Bills related to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) changes, and he wanted to monitor those Bills. A few Bills were highly relevant to HSR including SB 525, performed by Senator Galgiani. SB 525 called for a CEQA exemption for HSR over the Altamont Pass; his staff thought that was very problematic. Additionally, Bills were submitted that required non-English communities to be able to reach out for CEQA changes. He and his staff were sorting through the Bills to determine which ones were viable, which ones were placeholders, and which they thought would die.

Council Member Klein inquired whether specific language was provided for CEQA legislation.

Mr. Garamendi reported the intent was available, but not the language.

Council Member Klein asked if there was a reason for the delay.

Mr. Garamendi indicated Senator Rubio's resignation had a major impact on CEQA legislation and major changes to CEQA. Exact language for the Bill was not available because a deal had not been reached.

Council Member Klein asked who would succeed Senator Rubio.

Mr. Garamendi was not aware a successor was chosen.

Council Member Klein meant the successor to the chair of their committee.

Mr. Garamendi reported the successor was not appointed that he was aware of yet.

Council Member Klein inquired whether any environmental groups were involved in the negotiations on the language of the Steinberg Bill.

Mr. Garamendi responded yes. Interesting coalitions were forming between labor and environmental organizations. Those groups were more organized than the prior year; there was coordination with the Senate Pro Tem's office.

Council Member Burt asked if Mr. Garamendi had appraised Senator Steinberg's intent language, compared to his anticipated language.

Mr. Garamendi assumed the actual language was more tempered than what Senator Rubio was going to provide.

Council Member Burt inquired whether the Central Valley Rail segment was going to proceed given the challenges.

Mr. Garamendi noted CEQA lawsuits continued to move forward in the Central Valley. CHSRA recently settled another major lawsuit between Merced and Fresno. CHSRA now considered the movement of Highway 99 breaking ground. Objectively, proceeding was going to be a major challenge; however, CHSRA did not appear to be concerned.

Council Member Burt was interested in revisiting whether Senator Hill's legislation included a reference that the bookends retained funding if the Central Valley failed. Seamus Murphy, Director of Government Affairs for Caltrain was interested in that issue, and Senator Hill's staff was interested in hearing specifics of the proposal. He inquired whether Mr. Garamendi felt the issue was of value if Senator Hill was able to accomplish it. Within the elements of Senator Hill's Bill, there was a push back on allowing the nine parties to the funding of the MOU to veto expansion beyond the blended system; issues that CHSRA committed to needed to be included in the legislation.

Mr. Garamendi believed the money transfer was difficult. For example, he said a loss under the Brady lawsuit would stop the whole project. He understood the money for Caltrain came from the Proposition 1A, a proposition that approved the issuance of \$9.95 billion of general obligation bonds to fund an 800-mile high speed train under the supervision of the CHSRA. Some other monies came from bond monies, and some federal money. If the court proceedings stopped HSR, that funding was lost.

Council Member Burt agreed. He did not assume State funding legislation was going to supersede a court ruling, but focused on other reasons for the project failing.

Mr. Garamendi believed the Central Valley project was going to continue in some shape or form over the next five years. He thought it might not be successful or move quickly, but the current Administration was not going to allow it to fail. A court ruling was the only thing that stopped the Central Valley project. He did not hear of any push back regarding veto power by the nine parties to the MOU; however, he said he would not be surprised to hear it.

Council Member Kniss stated the Administration was committed to HSR; she thought HSR might not go forward with alacrity, but it was to go forward.

Mr. Garamendi agreed the Administration would move forward.

Vice Mayor Shepherd requested Mr. Garamendi provide a list of legislation related to HSR or CEQA as soon as possible.

Mr. Garamendi indicated the list would change as Bills changed. He needed to work with Staff to draft letters of support or opposition for certain pieces of legislation. The City needed a letter of support for SB 557 for Senator Hill. The Committee needed to decide how to respond to Bills like SB 525, the CEQA exemption.

Vice Mayor Shepherd reported the Committee reviewed the California Intercity and HSR Network Master Plan's for Caltrans. She noted the elimination of the Altamont Pass part of Phase 2, and requested Mr. Garamendi determine whether this was a shift from CHSRA or a Caltrans agenda item. Without that corridor, it seemed the Peninsula was the one link between Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Mr. Garamendi understood CHSRA was making a significant investment in the Ace train over the Altamont Pass, but did not know it was not included in that plan. He wanted to review it.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain indicated Senator Hill's Bill did not have official CHSRA support, which added risk to its passage. She asked if, after the loss of the Senate supermajority, and after Senator Rubio's departure, were potential passage of the 55 percent threshold Bills going to be affected.

Herb Borock Senator stated Senator Steinberg's Bill, SB 731, contained intent language. Funding for Caltrain was for capital, not operating expenses. The best way to obtain support for stable funding for Caltrain was to terminate HSR. He inquired whether a federal lawsuit was filed.

Morris Brown reported Representative Denham wrote a letter to the Surface Transportation Board (STB) inquiring about STB's jurisdiction over HSR and whether STB was going to issue a ruling. Comments concerned CEQA and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) evaluations. He said an STB ruling could cause delays in the project.

Mr. Garamendi did not see the letter.

Roland Lebrun believed funding for Caltrain was safe. The \$2 billion viaduct increased the speed to San Jose by 30 miles per hour. San Jose was building support for SB 557, especially the veto power provision. The bottom line was how many Senators supported the legislation.

Vice Mayor Shepherd inquired whether the Committee intended to adjourn at 10:30 A.M. or 11:00 A.M.

Council Member Burt hoped to adjourn by 10:30 A.M.

Vice Mayor Shepherd requested a time estimate for Agenda Item Numbers 5 and 6.

Mr. Hackmann suggested 15 minutes for Item Number 5 and 30 minutes for Item Number 6.

#### 5. Status of Litigation Against the California High Speed Rail Authority

Molly Stump, City Attorney focused her comments on the Brady lawsuit against Proposition 1A, a Proposition that approved the issuance of \$9.95 billion of General Obligation Bonds to fund an 800-mile high speed train under the supervision of the California High Speed Rail Authority(CHSRA). Palo Alto's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) lawsuit was fully briefed at the Court of Appeal. She was awaiting a date for argument of the case. Various environmental lawsuits were filed against activities of the CHSRA in other jurisdictions. Staff was aware of the lawsuits, but was not following them closely. One lawsuit was resolved, and at least one remained pending. Of particular interest was the lawsuit challenging spending on the Central Valley segment, with respect to Proposition 1A. Supporters of the lawsuit visited local jurisdictions and sent correspondence to Palo Alto asking for certain types of concrete support. The case was filed in 2011, and the Attorney General demurred to the lawsuit on procedural grounds that it was immature. The Court dismissed the lawsuit with leave to amend. An amended complaint was filed, and the Attorney General answered it. A briefing scheduling was set; the Superior Court heard the case in May 2013.



The suit raised a number of large questions regarding planning efforts, questioning the way CHSRA preceded and whether or not plans complied with Proposition 1A. The colorable question was whether current plans complied with Proposition 1A. The case was set for trial.

Council Member Kniss asked which judge was assigned to the case.

Ms. Stump answered Judge Kinney, but thought the case was assigned to another judge for sequential briefing.

Council Member Kniss requested Ms. Stump provide the name of the judge when it was available.

Council Member Klein inquired whether the case had a testimony, or just a briefing as of now.

Ms. Stump indicated Mr. Brady wanted both; however, the State wanted to have just a briefing, or to have a briefing first, in order to possibly resolve the issues. It appeared Mr. Brady agreed to proceed with briefing initially. She thought there could be an argument that live testimony was needed before a jury, if there were factual questions.

Council Member Klein inquired whether expert testimony was needed to resolve the question of plans meeting the speed test between San Francisco and Los Angeles.

Ms. Stump explained the case was a hybrid case, with regard to writ, or summons relief and declaratory relief ruling. Often writ cases were taken up by the Court based on declarations. The Court sometimes required live testimony to assess credibility of witnesses. The briefing schedule was set; however, the final hearing date in May 2013 was characterized as a trial.

Council Member Klein asked if the Court had 90 or 120 days to make a decision after the last brief was submitted.

Ms. Stump said she would confirm the time for the Court to issue a decision.

Council Member Klein inquired whether a decision on briefs alone allowed for an appeal.

Ms. Stump answered yes.

Council Member Klein asked if an appeal could require a year or longer to resolve.

Ms. Stump explained that if the case was resolved on the administrative record, then a briefing schedule at the Court of Appeal ran for 90 or 120 days. Typically decisions were issued many months after that.

Council Member Klein inquired if the ruling was yes, was the CHSRA able to move forward; he asked if there was middle ground.

Ms. Stump requested a clarification of middle ground.

Council Member Klein wanted to know if there was a middle ground.

Ms. Stump stated the plaintiffs requested an injunction to stop the expenditure of funds under Proposition 1A. She said the Court could order some relief. The complaint was complex against both individuals and the State. There were procedural, as well as substantive issues.

Council Member Burt inquired whether the Court determined that certain aspects of the plan violated Proposition 1A, and rule that the CHSRA must correct those aspects in order to move forward.

Ms. Stump thought the State might discuss the issue of the degree to which the Courts involved themselves in matters concerning legislative and executive discretion. If the Court determined that some of the State's activities were not consistent with Proposition 1A; she thought there could be a incremental response from the Court. She did not anticipate the Court required specific steps, if it determined some aspect of the plan was noncompliant.

Council Member Kniss indicated that the political aspect played out in the background of the lawsuit.

Vice Mayor Shepherd requested Staff contact Mr. Garamendi to determine which groups supported the Bill.

Herb Borock reported the Court ruled the latest Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was fine. The Brady lawsuit was scheduled for May 31, 2013. The Chowchilla lawsuit was settled and dismissed. A CHSRA press release indicated the land speculator lawsuit was dismissed. Correspondence to the

Mayor from Mr. Brady needed to be placed in the Council Packet for public review.

Morris Brown stated Mr. Brady's brief was due on March 15, 2013; the Attorney General's brief was due on April 15, 2013, with trial set for May 31, 2013. A few cities contributed funds, Palo Alto was requested to contribute funds as well.

#### 6. Discussion of the Caltrain Electrification Environmental Impact Report

Aaron Akin, Assistant Planning Director provided a summary of Palo Alto's comments regarding the 2009 Caltrain Electrification Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Generally the scope of work for the current EIR was consistent with the scope of work for the 2009 EIR. Conditions changed and necessitated a full EIR. He suggested the City submit comments similar to previous comments, while elaborating on issues discussed in City Council Rail Committee (Committee) meetings. The first concern was aesthetics and the impact of catenary wires on the tree canopy

Council Member Kniss noted posters were present.

Mr. Akin stated Caltrain was reviewing Federal and State standards relating to catenary wires and the required setback of trees. He thought the issue would be worked out in the environmental process.

Council Member Klein inquired whether Staff knew what the two standards were.

Mr. Akin answered no. Caltrain did not provide information regarding the two standards.

Vice Mayor Shepherd indicated Casey Fromson from Caltrain brought visual representations.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist reported Caltrain was considering one of two standards, and was going to provide details on the canopy standards within the EIR. He said Staff could press Caltrain to provide standards as early as they were able to.

Council Member Klein felt sooner was better, because the canopy was a concern for constituents.

Mr. Hackmann said he would communicate with Caltrain.

Mr. Aknin believed Caltrain would at least provide a range for the canopy.

Council Member Klein indicated the Committee could provide its preference of the standards.

Mr. Aknin stated the Scoping Letter should stress the traffic analysis for intersections near grade separations and the cascading effects of traffic onto residential neighborhoods.

Mr. Hackmann was going to include a request for consideration of alternative wire structures.

Mr. Aknin reported the Scoping Letter could refer to the Rail Corridor Study, as it had officially been adopted.

Vice Mayor Shepherd inquired whether comments should include grade separations because the community was interested in other options such as trenching or grade separation.

Mr. Aknin recalled grade separations were proposed as part of the EIR, and could be required through mitigation measures; he thought they should be included in the responses. If mitigation measures had additional impacts, there was going to be subsequent environmental review of those mitigation measures.

Vice Mayor Shepherd wanted to know when different analyses were needed.

Council Member Burt inquired whether it was appropriate to ask that the EIR review the consequential traffic impacts of train riders taking their cars when trains were at capacity.

Mr. Aknin suggested including that as an aspect that needed to be considered.

Casey Fromson, Government Affairs, Caltrain Modernization Program at San Mateo County noted photos were on the Caltrain website and present at the Scoping Meeting in Palo Alto.

Vice Mayor Shepherd asked if photos of the catenary wires were included in the information.

Ms. Fromson answered yes.

Council Member Kniss asked to see the photos of Green Meadow.

Ms. Fromson indicated the photos posted were examples so the public could express an opinion on the different configurations of wires.

Council Member Kniss felt removing and trimming trees was a major concern.

Vice Mayor Shepherd read the three different configurations were of side pole, cantilever, and center pole.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain suggested comments include the impacts of station area planning and development, level boarding and shared platform heights, and the Coast Daylight Concept.

Herb Borock indicated the Guiding Principles should be timely amended in order to provide input on the Caltrain EIR and legislation. Staff needed to consider electrification through a third-rail system in addition to the catenary system.

Roland Lebrun stated the maximum speed for a third-rail system was 100 miles per hour; the specification of tree clearance was discussed in the Scoping Letter. The type of design used depended on the speed of the train.

Vice Mayor Shepherd felt the Mountain View substation located in the Green Meadow neighborhood was a concern.

Mr. Hackmann reported that Staff had conversations with Caltrain about moving the station.

Vice Mayor Shepherd wanted to know if Caltrain considered longer platform lengths in the EIR, and expressed concerns about removing all vegetation along tracks for a catenary system or trenching.

Council Member Kniss emphasized the review of the two overhead contact systems. The two-track system arrangement for retaining vegetation on either side was a preference. Engineers did not prefer that method because it limited vision of the tracks.

Council Member Klein inquired whether Council Member Kniss was referring to the engineers when she mentioned men driving the train.

Council Member Kniss answered yes.

Council Member Klein did not wish to use the term "vegetation".

Council Member Kniss requested an alternate term.

Council Member Klein suggested trees.

Council Member Kniss agreed. She wanted to know how trimming existing vegetation was integrated into the joint use alignments.

Council Member Klein hoped this was a revised EIR, rather than the 2009 EIR with the dates changed.

Mr. Akin indicated Caltrain decided not to update and recirculate the 2009 EIR. Changes in environmental factors were important for a new EIR.

Council Member Burt requested comments include 1) evaluation of lengthening all platforms and the high ridership platforms; 2) evaluate the level of the boarding platforms; 3) environmental pros and cons constraining Caltrain to a maximum of six trains per hour; and 4) the impact of transit-oriented development and other growth impacts along the corridor. He added that many of the trees in the canopy were actually tall shrubs.

Council Member Kniss felt that warranted the use of vegetation rather than trees.

Council Member Klein suggested using the term trees and tall shrubs.

Vice Mayor Shepherd thought the comments should address maintenance of sound and vibration standards in neighborhoods.

Council Member Kniss noted some trees and shrubs were used as noise barriers, as well as visual barriers.

Mr. Akin mentioned Staff would use the term trees and other significant vegetation.

Vice Mayor Shepherd asked if Staff needed a Motion to draft the comment letter.

Council Member Kniss requested Staff discuss platform length with regard to easements.

Mr. Aknin agreed.

Council Member Burt stated Caltrain included that topic in the capacity analysis in Phase 2, but did not provide a report.

Vice Mayor Shepherd requested that Staff circulate the draft letter to the entire Committee for comment.

Mr. Aknin inquired whether Staff should make oral comments at the Scoping meeting later in the day. He said they would attend the meeting whether or not they made oral comments.

Council Member Kniss wanted Staff to comment on the two-track versus center pole system.

Council Member Klein indicated Staff should speak at the meeting.

Vice Mayor Shepherd suggested Staff comment on the multiplier effect of fully loaded schedules and grade separations.

## **NO ACTION TAKEN**

### 7. Agenda Setting

Vice Mayor Shepherd stated future Agendas should include Guiding Principles, Grade Separation Issues, and Below-grade Alternatives.

Council Member Klein agreed to an in-depth discussion of grade separations; however, the expense of below-grade alternatives did not merit an in-depth discussion.

Vice Mayor Shepherd wanted Staff to discuss how the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) could obtain accurate information regarding below-grade alternatives.

Council Member Klein reminded the Committee of Staff's workload.

Council Member Kniss indicated other jurisdictions had used trenching, and suggested Staff discuss trenching with one of those jurisdictions in order to determine general cost.

Council Member Burt agreed to a high-level preliminary analysis. He remarked that the community may be receiving misperceptions, but the Committee needed to determine realistic boundaries in order to frame expectations.

Vice Mayor Shepherd reiterated future Agenda items were Guiding Principles, Grade Separations, and Grade Alternatives.

Council Member Klein wanted to limit Staff work on underground trenching.

Council Member Burt suggested agendizing a discussion only.

Vice Mayor Shepherd clarified she wanted Staff to prepare a plan to address trenching.

Council Member Klein requested the Committee discuss all alternatives prior to Staff performing any analysis.

Council Member Burt agreed.

Council Member Kniss suggested a high-level discussion only.

Council Member Burt did not support a Committee decision to request Staff to prepare specific information.

Vice Mayor Shepherd clarified her intention was to create a path for discussing all alternatives; the grade separation issue flowed from that conversation.

Council Member Klein clarified that grade separation was a separate issue from trenching.

Vice Mayor Shepherd asked how Council Member Klein would discuss grade separations.



Council Member Klein understood Jaime Rodriguez worked on grade separations.

Aaron Akin, Assistant Planning Director reported Mr. Rodriguez reviewed traffic impacts.

Council Member Klein indicated that led to a discussion of the point at which existing grade crossings became impassable.

Vice Mayor Shepherd stated that was the course of Caltrain traveling through the City.

Council Member Burt explained grade separations could be addressed independent of track elevation, through depressed tracks, or a combination of the two. He thought the Committee should discuss grade separations independent of trenched tracks; in a discussion of trenched tracks, he thought those issues would interplay.

Council Member Kniss noted there were a number of examples of grade separations throughout the City and said trenching was a different issue.

#### Future Meetings and Agendas

- Discussion of Touring the Stanford Research Park by Interested Staff, Legislative Advocates, and Rail Committee Members
- Discussion of Inviting Governor Brown to Palo Alto for a Tour of the Stanford Research Park
- Discussion of Palo Alto Grade Separation Issues
- Discussion of Below Grade Alternatives for Palo Alto
- Update of Efforts to Obtain Dedicated Funding for Caltrain
- Discussion of PCJPB Member Configuration

Vice Mayor Shepherd inquired about date and time of the next meeting.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist announced Thursday, March 4, 2013, at 8:30 A.M. was the next regular meeting.

Council Member Klein recalled at the prior meeting that the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) agreed to change the time to 9:00 A.M.

Mr. Hackmann asked if 9:00 A.M. was a permanent change.

Vice Mayor Shepherd thought the meeting time was in the afternoon.

Mr. Hackmann explained the afternoon time conflicted with another meeting.

Council Member Kniss concurred with the 9:00 A.M. meeting time.

Mr. Hackmann inquired whether there was one or two meetings in March, due to the number of Agenda items.

Council Member Kniss indicated three members were unavailable for a week in March.

Vice Mayor Shepherd suggested Staff poll for an emergency meeting if it was needed.

Council Member Burt wanted clarification of the next meeting time and date.

Mr. Hackmann responded March 28, 2013, at 9:00 A.M.

Vice Mayor Shepherd asked if Staff preferred March 14 or 21 for an additional meeting.

Mr. Hackmann was flexible to either.

Vice Mayor Shepherd changed the meeting date from March 28 to March 21, 2013.

Council Member Klein did not think that relieved the numbers of items on the Agenda.

Vice Mayor Shepherd inquired whether Council Member Klein preferred two meetings in March.

Council Member Klein replied yes.

Mr. Hackmann agreed two meetings was necessary to discuss all the Agenda items.

Council Member Kniss suggested extending the meeting to three hours, rather than meeting twice in March.

Council Member Burt preferred meeting for only two hours at the next meeting.

Vice Mayor Shepherd wanted to move the date to March 21, 2013.

Council Member Kniss felt 1 1/2 hours was not realistic for a full discussion.

Council Member Klein preferred to meet for 3 hours on March 28.

Vice Mayor Shepherd reported the next meeting was scheduled for March 28, 2013 from 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M.

### Adjournment

This meeting was adjourned at 10:52 a.m.