



# CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Special Meeting  
Thursday, August 22, 2013

The City Council Rail Committee met on this date, in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue at 9:01 A.M.

Present: Burt, Klein, Shepherd (Chair), Kniss arrived at 9:03 A.M.

Absent:

## ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval for May 23, 2013 Rail Committee Minutes

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to approve the minutes as presented.

**MOTION PASSED:** 4-0

Chair Shepherd announced the City Council Rail Committee would discuss Item Number 4 prior to Item Number 3.

4. Report From the Professional Evaluation Group, Inc.

a. Update on California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA)

John Garamendi Jr., Professional Evaluation Group Inc., announced he was tracking relevant legislative bills closely. Senate Bill (SB) 557, the Peninsula Protections Act, continued to move through the legislature; with no organized opposition to the bill. He was working to ensure the Governor was aware of and open to the plan. Initially the California Department of Finance was concerned about the financial portion of the bill; however, those concerns were mitigated. SB 731, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) bill, continued to move slowly through the legislature; the working group and environmental groups had concerns with it. The bill would be heard in the Legislative Committee the following week. It was not a major

# MINUTES

overhaul of CEQA that the Governor wanted and many were speculating whether the bill would survive the session.

Council Member Kniss requested a summary of concerns regarding SB 731.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, was drafting a letter under the legislative Guiding Principles to emphasize continued local control and not to place additional unfunded mandates on communities.

Chair Shepherd noted Item Number 5 was an update regarding CEQA.

Mr. Hackmann requested input from the Rail Committee (Committee).

Council Member Klein indicated Item Number 5 was the application of CEQA to the High Speed Rail (HSR).

Aaron Aknin, Acting Planning and Community Environment Director, reported one primary concern was the requirement for an additional public hearing. Cities typically adopted findings related to the environmental review at the same time they approved a plan. The bill would require a city to adopt CEQA findings then wait 15 days to hold a second public hearing related to the plan. The second primary concern was a requirement to post monitoring of environmental mitigations. With a requirement to post monitoring, lawsuits could be filed over an extended period of time. The third concern was related to Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) standards. The bill removed aesthetics from CEQA review in TOD standards and incorporated parking as a potential environmental requirement for TOD projects.

Council Member Kniss reiterated that aesthetics had been removed.

Mr. Aknin was not aware of how that occurred. He assumed cities would retain architectural standards through a separate process. Aesthetics would not be an environmental finding for TOD projects.

Council Member Klein assumed that the bill did not have specific provisions for HSR or other large projects.

Mr. Garamendi indicated that was correct.

Council Member Klein inquired about the reasons for the removal.

Mr. Garamendi believed the last large carve-out for the stadium in Los Angeles resulted in opposition. Certain things in the bill could be crafted for TOD that would easily be transferrable to a downtown arena in Sacramento.

# MINUTES

He was working closely with the League of Cities on the bill. There was no exact carve-out for HSR.

Council Member Burt wanted to ensure there was nothing in the CEQA bill that would preempt a city's ability to have aesthetics as part of a review process.

Mr. Aknin's understanding was the provision related to CEQA and not other requirements.

Council Member Burt felt local jurisdictions should have aesthetics as part of a review process.

Mr. Garamendi reported Assembly Bill (AB) 481 concerned in-house administration matters between the Department of General Services and the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA).

Chair Shepherd noted AB 481 was in the news because the State was beginning to acquire land.

Council Member Kniss agreed that was an administrative matter.

Chair Shepherd added AB 481 provided rights of the person under eminent domain to have a rebuttal.

Mr. Garamendi continued to work with the League of Cities on AB 325, a housing bill that the City opposed. Allies requested the City's assistance; therefore, he would represent the City's letter to the legislature. The main item was the judicial ruling issued in the Kings County lawsuit; the ruling was a major victory for CHSRA. He believed the key components were permitting and funding.

Chair Shepherd inquired how the ruling was a victory for CHSRA.

Mr. Garamendi corrected himself in that the ruling was a victory against CHSRA. The Governor and CHSRA did not appear to be concerned by the ruling. Kings County would continue the case through the appeals process.

Council Member Klein read the decision and inquired about the judge.

Mr. Garamendi indicated the attorneys knew the judge very well.

Council Member Klein asked about the judge's background and appointment.

Mr. Garamendi did not have that information.

# MINUTES

Council Member Burt relayed the judge's work history prior to joining the bench. The judge had an extensive background in environmental policy and was very deliberate in crafting the ruling.

Council Member Klein agreed the ruling was cautious.

Council Member Burt heard that attorneys were impressed by the judge's ability to absorb the complexities of the issues.

Council Member Kniss requested the judge's name.

Council Member Burt responded Judge Kenny.

Mr. Garamendi heard no disparaging remarks about the judge who appeared to be honorable and intellectual.

Council Member Burt was interested in the judge's response to the Governor's dismissal of the impact of the ruling. The second half of the case could bring additional rulings against CHSRA regarding travel time and ridership.

Mr. Garamendi agreed, but was unsure when the case would proceed.

Mr. Hackmann did not know if the hearing date was scheduled.

Chair Shepherd announced the meeting could extend to 10:30 A.M.

Council Member Klein read statements by Governor Brown and Dan Richard, but wanted to hear if there were other public comments.

Mr. Garamendi reported CHSRA staff indicated the ruling was not important and they were moving forward. He heard speculation that the ruling was very damaging and the remedy would add delay. The new hyperloop was a great idea for exploration and a good means to transition from a bad situation; however, he was unsure whether the political will was present.

Council Member Burt recalled his efforts to assure funding for the bookends and Caltrain modernization. Funding for the bookends was unclear under current legislation. He inquired whether the judicial ruling would allow funds to flow to the bookends. The federal government could choose to move funds from the initial construction segment to the bookends. He asked if the Committee should renew its suggestion to Senator Hill to strengthen SB 557 in order to retain Proposition 1A funds for the bookends.

Mr. Garamendi explained that under Scenario B, funds short of \$300 million could be used for other projects; however, he had not heard that discussion

# MINUTES

reopened. Something from the judicial remedy would have to break through such that people would have to search for other funding opportunities. He could speak with Senator Hill's staff regarding the issue, but they could be hesitant to make changes because the bill was moving well.

Council Member Burt suggested additional interest in strengthening the bill was possible in light of the ruling.

Mr. Garamendi agreed additional interest was possible; however, the bill might not cross the Governor's desk in the correct manner if the bill changed at this point. The State of California's declaration that HSR was subject to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) rather than CEQA was surprising and no one felt that was a good idea.

Mr. Akin indicated that was a separate Agenda Item.

Chair Shepherd stated the case remained in the initial stages; therefore, the City needed to continue its diligence.

Council Member Klein requested Staff provide information on the scheduling of the next events in the lawsuit.

## NO ACTION TAKEN

### 3. Updates

- a. Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB)
- b. Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC)
- c. Caltrain Local Policymaker Group
- d. Caltrans State Rail Plan

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, reported the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) and Caltrain meetings were scheduled for September 5, 2013. Caltrain was proceeding with the Community Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) implementation separate from electrification. Casey Fromson, Government Affairs for Caltrain Modernization Program in San Mateo, offered to present information at the next Rail Committee (Committee) meeting regarding CBOSS. She would make the same presentation to the Caltrain Local Policymaker Group later that day.

Council Member Kniss strongly suggested the Committee invite Ms. Fromson to speak at the next meeting. The results and safety impacts were important for the City. The Committee could also discuss funding for CBOSS.

# MINUTES

Mr. Hackmann indicated Caltrain scheduled release of the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in late 2013 or early 2014 with approval scheduled for fall 2014. Caltrain worked with the City and County of San Francisco to incorporate preliminary evaluations of the 4th and King Station into the EIR. The Peninsula Cities Consortium's (PCC) next meeting was scheduled for September 6, 2013. The PCC would likely consider the frequency of meetings. The Caltrain Local Policymaker Group's meeting later that day would include updates regarding CBOSS, electrification and the 4th and King Station.

Council Member Kniss reported Caltrain was more comfortable regarding funding with the passage of Measure A in San Mateo County. The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) funding was reasonably stable. San Francisco's allocation was insignificant compared to its overall budget. For the next two to three years Caltrain was comfortable with the budget; however, long-term problems still existed. Ridership was well above expectations.

Mr. Hackmann added Caltrain was excited about Measure A and the implications for stabilizing the operating budget. SamTrans will receive \$10 million in San Mateo County Measure A funds over the next two years to support operations and services for the disabled. The five-member Board voted unanimously on July 23<sup>rd</sup> to approve the funding allocation, which was expected to be finalized when the Supervisors approved the county budget in October. Measure A would fund a number of county programs including services for at-risk youth, a bicycle transportation coordinator and parks and recreation programs. The \$10 million funding allocation for SamTrans would be split into \$5 million allocations over the next two fiscal years and there was an option to extend the subsidy for an additional three years. County officials said the allocation was necessary because of SamTrans' financial struggles and the bus agency's essential role in meeting the needs of the community, particularly low-income residents. Due to a combination of factors, including its annual contribution to Caltrain and payments for the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) extension construction, SamTrans was facing a structural deficit in its operating budget. The bus agency also had an unfunded federal mandate to provide paratransit services, which cost \$13.6 million last fiscal year. The bus agency's paratransit services carried over 3,000,000 riders last fiscal year, 62 percent of whom were older than 70. Without the funding subsidy, SamTrans would likely have to reduce its services, including eliminating Coastside Route 17 and its adjoining paratransit operations. To help reduce its structural deficit, SamTrans had reduced bus service by 7.5 percent, increased fares, implemented furlough

# MINUTES

days and hiring freezes, and required greater employee contributions to pension and health plans.

Council Member Burt explained San Francisco was comfortable with the amount of the allocation to Caltrain; however, Caltrain did not present their request prior to the adoption of San Francisco's budget. Caltrain needed to revise its request process. In addition, Santa Clara County was concerned that Caltrain would request funds after adoption of its budget.

Council Member Kniss noted that Santa Clara County's contribution amount tended to be stable.

Council Member Klein was pleased that Caltrain's finances were better; however, that reduced the pressure to change Caltrain's governance. He was disappointed with Caltrain's response to the City's request for better representation.

Roland Lebrun reported that PCJPB knew CBOSS could not meet the 2015 deadline. A few hours after the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) appropriated \$53.5 million for CBOSS, Senate Bill 1462 was proposed to extend the deadline to 2020. The current format of the Caltrain Local Policymaker Group meeting was purely informational and not conducive to policymaking.

## NO ACTION TAKEN

### 5. Update on California Attorney General's Brief Claiming High Speed Rail is Exempt from CEQA

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, reported the California Attorney General's Office argued that High Speed Rail was not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) after the Surface Transportation Board (STB) ruled in June 2013 that STB had oversight of the project. STB's decision fundamentally affected the regulatory environment for the project. The State asked the court to dismiss the five-year old lawsuit. The court canceled oral argument in the case and ordered supplemental briefing on the preemption of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) over CEQA. The Attorney General filed its brief supporting preemption. The opposing brief was due in mid-September.

Herb Borock added the opposing brief was due September 17, 2013. He understood Representative Denham involved the STB, which led to the lawsuit. The lawsuit was an unintended consequence of following Representative Denham's lead.

# MINUTES

Council Member Burt agreed careful consideration was needed prior to action. He inquired whether the City's opposition to the Pacheco Pass route was based on inadequate evaluation of the Highway 5 alignment or on the Pacheco Pass itself.

Mr. Hackmann did not recall.

Council Member Burt understood new data showed subsidence was a significant issue in the Central Valley. The Highway 5 route apparently had significantly fewer issues. He inquired about the impact of the court ruling that NEPA preempted CEQA.

Aaron Akin, Acting Planning and Community Environment Director, explained that NEPA was more of an advisory report at a 35,000 foot level. CEQA was a mandatory mitigation study. Under NEPA, there was no requirement that an agency follow NEPA guidelines. CEQA had more legal consequences.

Council Member Burt asked if that substantive difference would be a key basis for the argument that NEPA should not preempt CEQA.

Mr. Akin did not know.

Mr. Hackmann indicated efforts were being made to resolve the issue.

Council Member Klein noted another difference would be that NEPA preemption would move jurisdiction from state courts to federal courts.

Chair Shepherd interpreted the NEPA issue as a first step to determine whether HSR would be exempt from CEQA and as a political move to eliminate mitigations. She inquired whether Caltrain modernization was affected by the NEPA lawsuit.

Mr. Hackmann was not aware of any connections between the lawsuit and Caltrain electrification.

NO ACTION TAKEN

## 6. Update on the Caltrain Gate Crossing & Traffic Analysis Study

Jaime Rodriguez, Chief Transportation Officer, reported Caltrain had an active railroad advanced preemption project in Palo Alto at two crossings; Churchill Avenue at Alma Street and Alma Street at Meadow Drive. The advanced preemption project would allow the track clearance sequence to begin earlier providing approximately 4 seconds at Churchill Avenue and 8 seconds at Meadow Drive. The time required to clear the tracks of vehicles



# MINUTES

was 5-7 seconds once a train was detected. At the Meadow Drive crossing, the tracks would clear before the gates began to flash. The Caltrain report reviewed impacts in terms of service of traffic signals. Level of Service (LOS) was defined as the measurement of the average delay at an intersection. Staff needed to know the delay per approach of the intersection and would request that information from Caltrain. The report focused more on the Churchill Avenue intersection, which was the only intersection where Staff had not implemented sequence changes. Sequence changes would be implemented as part of the larger California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) project. This report reviewed older operations rather than the changes Staff implemented. Staff would ask Caltrain to update the report to include those changes.

Council Member Kniss noticed the number of children riding bikes to school and hoped the schools were providing bicycle education. She asked if a discussion of school traffic should be held at the City/School meeting.

Council Member Klein reported the City/School Committee held an annual session on school traffic.

Council Member Kniss expressed concern about children crossing streets and railways. She requested Staff interact with Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD) regarding changes at street and railway crossings.

Mr. Rodriguez indicated Staff worked with PAUSD Staff.

Council Member Kniss noted the City/School meetings were not broadcast.

Chair Shepherd could provide information obtained from Penny Ellson.

Herb Borock suggested the Council establish quiet zones at crossings to mitigate the negative effects of train horn noise. Seeking mitigation through the Caltrain Electrification Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be independent of the Federal Railroad Administration's process.

Roland Lebrun stated Caltrain should have a system called constant warning time, but it did not work. The Community Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) basically would stop trains from hitting each other.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether Staff wanted Caltrain to update its information once the sequencing at the Churchill Avenue intersection was complete.

Mr. Rodriguez answered yes. The signal sequence changes at Churchill Avenue were being implemented by Caltrain.

# MINUTES

Chair Shepherd asked when the sequencing might occur.

Mr. Rodriguez explained the project was funded by Caltrain; therefore, he did not know the project schedule. He suggested the changes could be implemented in the next four to six months.

Council Member Burt recalled considerable discussion regarding quiet zones and local control. He asked Staff if the Rail Committee (Committee) should review quiet zones.

Mr. Rodriguez would consider quiet zones as part of the Charleston-Arastradero Corridor Design Project. The report mentioned general parameters of the quiet zone program. At a minimum Staff would consider Charleston Road and Meadow Drive together to establish a quiet zone.

Council Member Burt asked if the plan would not include Churchill Avenue.

Mr. Rodriguez indicated Staff could consider Churchill Avenue as well. The types of improvements needed at the intersections were similar.

Council Member Burt requested an update regarding the benefits and detriments to establishing quiet zones at a subsequent meeting.

**MOTION:** Chair Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to request that Staff ask Caltrain to reconsider the Churchill Avenue intersection after they make the improvements and to have Staff update the Committee regarding the results.

Council Member Klein noted it would have to be presented to the Council as well.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, explained the report was informational. The report topics would have to be addressed in the electrification EIR. The impacts of moving from five to six trains under electrification would be addressed in an EIR. Any subsequent EIRs for a future blended system would also have to address the impacts of moving from six to eight and eight to ten trains per hour. All the information would have to be revisited at each step.

**MOTION WITHDRAWN BY MAKER**

# MINUTES

## 7. Recommendation on the Preliminary Cost Estimates for Grade Separation and Trenching Studies

Chair Shepherd noted the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) requested Staff return with this information once Caltrain performed its initial Crossing and Traffic Study analysis.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, reported Hatch Mott MacDonald's last proposal included a phasing option for studying grade separation alternatives in Palo Alto. Results from the Caltrain Gate Crossing and Traffic Analysis Study were as expected. In the Staff Report, Staff added specific scenarios for trenching and grade separations for discussion purposes only.

Council Member Kniss indicated the City of San Mateo did not provide the majority of funding for improvements.

Aaron Akin, Acting Planning and Community Environment Director, stated that was correct for San Bruno as well.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether Staff identified possible funding sources for grade separations.

Chair Shepherd noted San Mateo County had a sales tax which generated approximately \$200 million.

Council Member Burt appreciated the lack of funding for an option could influence the decision to study it. If funding was available in the future, the Committee might be more open to an evaluation of all options.

Council Member Kniss concurred.

Council Member Burt suggested the community, Santa Clara County, and cities in Santa Clara County could be willing to approve funding mechanisms. If grade separations were necessary to achieve system improvements, there might be State and Federal funding sources.

Council Member Kniss recalled the challenges in San Mateo County.

Mr. Hackmann recalled the purpose of the study was to provide information to the community regarding preferred grade separations. The study was not intended to determine a configuration.

Chair Shepherd felt the study would allow the community to move toward certainty and feasibility regarding grade separation possibilities.

# MINUTES

Herb Borock did not believe the Committee should proceed with the study. Trenching was too expensive with the sources of revenue available. Hiring Hatch Mott MacDonald, who was a financial supporter of Proposition 1A, would look bad to the community.

Roland Lebrun reported funding was available. The real issue was where the money was spent. He questioned whether Samtrans should be running Caltrain operations on behalf of the three counties.

Council Member Klein inquired about the scenario of trenching the corridor from Embarcadero Road to approximately San Antonio Road when the Committee discussed trenching the railway from border to border.

Mr. Hackmann explained the proposal considered trenching from south of the Caltrain Station because of the complexities of tunneling under San Francisquito Creek.

Council Member Klein indicated that was inconsistent with the Guiding Principle for all sections of the community to receive the same treatment.

Mr. Hackmann felt trenching from border to border made the study too complex.

Council Member Klein would not support proceeding with the study and felt Palo Alto should not provide funding. While some members of the community would like to know how much trenching would cost, Hatch Mott MacDonald provided an earlier report indicating the cost of trenching. The court's decision provided another layer of uncertainty as to whether High Speed Rail (HSR) would occur.

Council Member Burt believed Council Member Klein's comments referenced the prior report of Hatch Mott MacDonald under a four-track system.

Council Member Klein reported the prior report covered both the two-track and four-track system.

Council Member Burt stated the prior report did not provide the information under consideration and it did not contemplate feasibility of options. From the alternatives analysis, the feasibility and cost of trenching in the East Meadow and Charleston areas was more feasible and less costly than in north Palo Alto. He wanted to know the feasibility of trenching south of Oregon Expressway. The cost of trenching from Oregon Expressway to San Antonio Road could be equivalent to recessing the roadway; when considering the cost and political impact of land taking. Cities on the Peninsula with grade separations went through a long process of evaluation.

# MINUTES

The study would inform the Council of alternatives, technical barriers, opportunities and relative costs. With increasing demand for Caltrain, it was likely eight or ten trains per hour could be needed. With Caltrain electrification those demands would not occur as soon as projected.

Chair Shepherd noted the Staff Report suggested two phases of work.

**MOTION:** Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to recommend to Council the authorization of Hatch Mott MacDonald to proceed with Phase One:

1. Alternative evaluation and draft concept exhibits to identify potential project impacts to roadways, right of way, traffic, and the railway corridor
2. Draft concept level cost estimates for alternative comparison purposes
3. Attend a City Council Rail Committee meeting, and to request that Staff return with a more refined set of alternatives for Hatch Mott MacDonald to review regarding different trenching scenarios in the community.

Council Member Kniss felt the study would provide a general sense of how to proceed. Other communities took ten years to prepare for grade separation and the City needed to get started.

Chair Shepherd believed the study would provide a sound method for incrementally alleviating the community's anxiety. She wanted to have a broad dialog with the community.

Mr. Hackmann requested direction regarding the refined scenarios for study. Hatch Mott MacDonald agreed to study a trenching scenario and a grade separation scenario. He could utilize a scenario for each alternative based on the Committee's input or elaborate on a menu of scenarios divided by trench or grade separation.

Council Member Burt suggested Hatch Mott MacDonald recommend the most feasible and cost effective trenching scenario in addition to the scenarios listed in the Staff Report. He requested Hatch Mott MacDonald consider alternatives where grade separations were problematic.

Council Member Kniss agreed with Council Member Burt's suggestion.

# MINUTES

Chair Shepherd recommended the scenarios align as closely as possible with the Rail Corridor Study. She asked Staff to determine if the visions of the Rail Corridor Study were feasible.

Council Member Burt inquired whether Staff should return to the Committee prior to presenting the recommendation to the Council as there was no urgency.

Council Member Kniss did not have a preference.

Chair Shepherd wanted the Council to begin the discussion.

Council Member Klein was interested in reviewing Staff's recommendation. He felt there was no consistency in the Committee's comments.

Council Member Burt indicated clarity was the purpose of performing the study. Additional information was needed to evolve toward a better vision.

Council Member Klein stated the Committee was not in agreement as to what should be studied.

Council Member Burt felt that emphasized the need for a broader evaluation. The Committee did not have enough information to begin to narrow the long-term alternatives.

Chair Shepherd added that other Council Members had opinions as well and they needed to be heard prior to committing to what should be evaluated.

Mr. Hackmann inquired whether Staff should present the recommendation directly to the Council.

Chair Shepherd replied yes.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-1, Klein no

## 8. Agenda Setting

### a. Consideration of Meeting Quarterly

Chair Shepherd inquired about the possibility of meeting every other month. The next meeting could be scheduled for October or November 2013.

Council Member Burt liked the concept of not meeting monthly.

Council Member Kniss suggested if there were no problems, the Rail Committee could meet every three months.

# MINUTES

Chair Shepherd announced the next meeting would be held in October 2013.

Council Member Kniss agreed and suggested the following meeting be in January 2014.

Council Member Klein preferred to meet every two months with the number of items pending.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, suggested the meeting date within a month be flexible depending on events. Caltrain requested feedback on the Community Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) project.

Chair Shepherd wondered if the City Council Rail Committee (Committee) should schedule a community meeting because implementation of CBOSS would be a major interruption to the community.

Mr. Hackmann could work with Caltrain to schedule an informational community meeting. The only potential issue was policy direction on the issue.

Council Member Klein requested Staff poll for a meeting in the first week of October.

## NO ACTION TAKEN

### 9. Future Meetings and Agendas

- a. Update on Efforts to Obtain Dedicated Funding for Caltrain
- b. Status of Litigation Against the CHSRA

Chair Shepherd reported a broad policy discussion regarding the Caltrain Local Policymaker Group was removed from the Agenda.

Council Member Burt reported the issue remained unresolved. Caltrain did not want the technical working group to share information with policymakers. Whether the policymaker group played a stronger role in Caltrain decisions remained an issue. Meeting attendance was declining because participation was not meaningful.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether Council Member Burt preferred to work with Staff or the City Council Rail Committee (Committee).

Council Member Burt would meet with Staff, but requested the item remain on future agendas.

# MINUTES

Chair Shepherd placed the Caltrain Local Policymaker Group on the agenda for the next meeting. She inquired about action regarding quiet zones.

Council Member Burt noted the Committee directed Staff to return with preliminary information regarding advantages and disadvantages of quiet zones.

Chair Shepherd reported the agenda would include status of litigation with respect to High Speed Rail (HSR) and an update on dedicated funding for Caltrain.

ADJOURNMENT: This meeting was adjourned at 10:46 A.M.