



RAIL COMMITTEE FINAL MINUTES

Special Meeting
Thursday, December 5, 2013

The City Council Rail Committee Meeting met on this date in the Council Conference Room at 9:06 A.M.

Present: Burt arrived at 10:06 A.M., Klein, Kniss, Shepherd (Chair)

Absent:

Oral Communications

Herb Borock discussed how Greg Conlon submitted a tunneling survey study to Caltrain. The estimated cost was \$125-150 million per mile for a covered trench. He suggested the Rail Committee consider the information from this study and noted that he had comments from Mr. Conlon for the Rail Committee to review.

Agenda Items

3. Approval of Minutes.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to approve the minutes of August 22, 2013.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0 Burt absent

4. Updates

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

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist said the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) had their meeting and awarded a Sole Source Contract connected to Caltrain Community Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS), a contract where only one person or company was able to provide

WORKING MINUTES

the contractual needs to bid on a contract. The Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC) was meeting on December 6, 2013 and planned on discussing a draft letter to Caltrain on the Caltrain Policymaker Working Group. He noted that the PCC can only make recommendations for their own member cities to send letters out. The Caltrain Modernization group was moving forward with the CBOSS Project. There were not any updates on the Caltrain State Rail Plan. Regarding the litigation, there were two significant rulings set out on Monday, November 26, 2013 by Judge Kenny, a Sacramento Superior Court Judge, regarding California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA). First, Judge Kenny ruled that Proposition 1A, a ballot proposition that allocated funds for the CHSRA, required that all environmental clearances must be obtained, and all funding must be identified before CHSRA was issued the funding plan needed to begin construction. Judge Kenny ruled that the CHSRA did not satisfy all provisions of Proposition 1A; the State was not able to spend Bond money on construction until the provisions were satisfied. To come into compliance with Proposition 1A, the CHSRA needed to identify the funding necessary to complete the initial operating segment and to satisfy all environmental clearances necessary. The CHSRA was short on their funding by about \$25 billion. Judge Kenny did not make any ruling on the Federal funds, as it was not his jurisdiction. The second court ruling dealt with the CHSRA filing litigation against all interested persons in the State of California; Judge Kenny ruled that CHSRA was not able to make the proper finding because the committee designated to authorize bond issuance had no evidence to justify issuance of bonds. If the CHSRA attempted to issue bonds without validation, the State Treasurer was going to refuse to approve the issuance. It was unlikely that CHSRA would move forward.

Chair Shepherd asked what level of court the litigation was at, and what the perspective action to be taken was.

Mr. Hackmann said the decision could be appealed, but he was unclear about how that would take place.

William Grindley said Tos Fukuda could be appealed when the second part of the trial was finished, which he thought would begin on December 13, 2013. Only when that part of the trial was complete was there authority to appeal. Regarding the validation lawsuit, an appeal was not to be made twice for the same lawsuit; it was very difficult for a judge to make the same ruling.

Council Member Klein clarified that generally a judge's ruling could not be appealed until the case was over, which was not going to be until sometime in 2014.

WORKING MINUTES

Chair Shepherd commented that in order to complete an Initial Operating Section (IOS) of a project, there was a timing period. She clarified that the Rail Committee (Committee) did not discuss whether the timing for the Federal funding was lost.

Mr. Hackmann noted that the trial was in the Superior Court.

Chair Shepherd said the critical piece for High Speed Rail (HSR) was being able to access the shovel ready project for the Federal dollars, as the timing was unclear.

Mr. Hackmann confirmed that the Stimulus Funds for HSR had deadlines associated with when construction could begin. There was no firm statement from the Federal Government as to what level of variance they had in changing the date of construction. One provision was that the money must be spent by 2017. He noted that if the money did not begin to be spent by now, there would not be enough time to spend it.

Council Member Klein wanted to discuss the ruling on the National Rail Board.

Chair Shepherd said the trigger was not on spending the money but on starting the project.

Mr. Hackmann remarked that Chair Shepherd was talking about the "start trigger", but said there was no language in the legislation authorizing the stimulus funds and forcing them to stick to that; there was language about what date the money must begin to be spent.

Chair Shepherd clarified that the project was based on ballot language in connection to the IOS.

Mr. Hackmann said correct.

Chair Shepherd wanted clarification on what was considered Caltrain money, between Federal and State Bond issuance dollars.

Mr. Hackmann understood the money was State money, \$600 million delegated to north, and \$500 million to southern California.

Chair Shepherd asked if that was for the Bookend Project.

WORKING MINUTES

Mr. Hackmann clarified that \$1.1 billion represented money for the Bookend Project, which came from the State's \$8 billion Bond Fund. The Surface Transportation Board (STB), a United States Board housed within the United States Department of Transportation had jurisdiction over the spending of the Federal dollars, and they wanted the funds to go toward to the HSR project. Based on the ruling of the litigation with Judge Kenny, the CHSRA was able to try to change that. On December 4, 2013 the STB ruled to deny the CHSRA's request for a decision on the transportation aspects of the project before the environmental review of the project was complete. The decision extended the time for the comments on the transportation merits of the proposed construction project. Additionally, Judge Kenny ruled that all clearance for environmental planning needed to be complete before construction began. The STB pushed out their decision until there was more resolution at the State level.

Morris Brown referred to a Los Angeles Times article which talked about how there would not be significant delay going forward for the HSR project. The same article noted an interview from someone from the STB who said that there would not be a decision made until September 2014.

William Grindley remarked that a Council Member for Kings County and plaintiff for the litigation announced that there was going to be a memorandum read regarding how the CHSRA requested that they be exempt from environmental provisions and how they did not agendize or vote on the request for exemption publicly.

Mr. Borock understood that the STB held closed session's related to CHSRA's request. He added that there was another court case involving an appeal to the environmental approval. At the last minute, the CHSRA had arguments about whether the STB preempted the initial environmental review, and therefore California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) did not apply. The CHSRA was delayed because there was confusion about how the STB's ruling preempted the environmental review.

Council Member Kniss remarked that the City was dealing with the litigation as a State issue and wanted to know if the electrification dollars from the State were in jeopardy.

Chair Shepherd thought it was good to agendize Caltrain at a further date and suggested having a representative from Caltrain come before the Committee.

WORKING MINUTES

Mr. Hackmann relayed that Caltrain was in the process of evaluating the impacts of the litigation and were working with CHSRA to sort out the effects; Caltrain did not have an answer at this time.

Council Member Kniss inquired about where the money was at this time.

Mr. Hackmann relayed that some was in the bank.

Council Member Klein remarked that the bonds were not issued yet.

Mr. Hackmann answered that the bonds were part of where the money was coming from.

Council Member Kniss remarked that the Committee was concerned about HSR from a State standpoint, but at the same time, she had concern for Palo Alto as the second highest ridership for the HSR line.

Council Member Klein said the funding for HSR was at serious risk and added that if Judge Kenny's rulings stayed, and if the CHSRA was not able to meet the requirements, then the funding for the HSR project was not going to be available. This was an opportunity for the CHSRA to rethink the whole project and to possibly go with the original train route along Interstate Five because if Interstate Five was used, there was no need for the rail line to go through the peninsula.

Council Member Kniss added that electrification was an essential part of the HSR project, and reiterated that Caltrain did not have any funding; she felt these were huge issues.

Chair Shepherd asked whether the funds for King Street and Third Street in downtown San Francisco were separate from the Proposition 1A bonds.

Mr. Hackmann remarked that construction at the Transbay Terminal in San Francisco began, but the one and a half mile Downtown Extension train tunnel did not start; this project did not yet have identified funds.

Chair Shepherd requested revisiting the STB as more information on regulatory decisions came up. She remarked that the Committee hears CEQA information and wanted to follow any other information that CEQA was challenged with. She wanted any other related Boards flagged and identified.

WORKING MINUTES

Mr. Hackmann replied that he would follow up.

5. Report From the Professional Evaluation Group, Inc.
 - a. Update on California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA)

John Garamendi Jr., Professional Evaluation Group remarked that Senate Bill (SB) 559, a Protection Act was completed and signed into law by Senator Hill. SB 731, a Bill related to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) reform was phased out. There was continued coordination with environmental groups in the valley and with Kings County groups that made a lot of progress with the court ruling. The court ruling promised to be an obstacle with regard to funding and environmental clearances. The question was what the impact was going to be on the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA). Everyone in Sacramento was unsure of what the outcome was going to be; as long as the money was there, people were trying to find ways to spend it. There was a proposal almost two years ago that dealt with CHSRA changing their contracts with the Federal Railroad Association (FRA) and moving the funding to the book endpoints. There was the possibility of legislative fixes that might come forward in 2014; those were rules put forward to the legislature by CHSRA to fix the complications with CHSRA project. Additionally, there was the possibility of the bond being put back on the ballot, but that was a determination for the leadership team. Putting the High Speed Rail (HSR) project back on the ballot was in line with the Guiding Principles of the Rail Committee (Committee) in Palo Alto. He did not think there was going to be any CEQA reform for 2014. The Guiding Principles were good and it was good for elected officials to discuss what was to be done and what the goal was for 2014.

Council Member Klein asked when the leadership in the legislature changed.

Mr. Garamendi said it would be at the end of this legislative session.

Council Member Klein clarified the end of next summer was the end of the legislative season; he asked who would take their place.

Mr. Garamendi said it was not clear.

Council Member Klein quoted a Senator's comments on the probability that HSR would move forward, the Senator said it was low. It was important to stay in touch with whoever was going to be in the leadership role.

Mr. Garamendi agreed that people follow the leadership role.

WORKING MINUTES

Chair Shepherd asked if a follow-up letter from the Mayor of Palo Alto to the State or to some leadership official was appropriate, requesting that HSR be revised for needs regarding the Palo Alto peninsula.

Council Member Kniss thought it was good but was unsure that it would make an impact.

Council Member Klein wanted to be clear on what the Committee was suggesting.

Chair Shepherd suggested that there might be ways to continue moving forward on the HSR project because she understood the funding needed to be spent by a certain time.

Council Member Klein said the State funds could not be spent at this time. In addition, the Federal money was not clearly seen, due to a ruling of the Surface Transportation Board (STB), a United States board connected to the Department of Transportation.

Chair Shepherd suggested the Committee declare how they interpret funding.

Council Member Klein suggested sorting through different alternatives before a new position was taken.

Chair Shepherd added that the Committee had Guiding Principles set in place that allowed for conveying the Committee's stand.

Council Member Kniss asked if the proposed letter was to be given to the legislature.

Chair Shepherd wanted the letter to go to decision makers.

Council Member Kniss asked if the letter would go to a broad group of legislatures or certain designated people.

Chair Shepherd remarked there was a list of people that were usually notified and suggested the CHSRA and or the Governor. During the holiday season people were preoccupied and having significant issues come forth during a down-time when there was no one available to meet and discuss issues was problematic.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Klein remarked that the CHSRA did not choose their timing.

Chair Shepherd remarked that there was a time of rest going on and suggested the Committee take this opportunity to restate their thinking on how the HSR needed to operate, based on the Guiding Principles.

Council Member Kniss asked Mr. Garamendi and Mr. Hackmann what they suggested.

Mr. Hackmann said a letter of this kind would usually be sent to the 120 elected officials in Sacramento and prominent figures in the rail community. A letter based on Judge Kenny's ruling, due to the complexity, was best sent in the format of a draft by Staff, and then brought before the Committee for discussion. Another option was to state Palo Alto's historical position and in accordance with that, request what was always promised be done.

Council Member Kniss liked reiterating the Guiding Principles, and thought additional information made the letter complicated. She liked option two and said it kept the Committee involved. She wanted to know when the Senate was going to have recess.

Mr. Garamendi said the legislatures came back early January 2014.

Council Member Kniss questioned whether a letter would make an impact.

Mr. Garamendi did not think a letter would make much of a difference to the legislatures overall, and suggested communicating with local representatives. He thought it was good for people to know that Palo Alto was actively pursuing HSR.

Council Member Kniss thought it would benefit Palo Alto.

Mr. Garamendi reiterated sticking with Palo Alto's Guiding Principles, continuing with Caltrain funding, and clarifying that this project was a priority for the local representatives. He stressed letting people know that Palo Alto was still actively pursuing HSR.

Council Member Klein noted that in general, the Committee's action was limited to time factors and he did not see that there was a time factor involved. He suggested the letter be approved by full Council.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Kniss suggested addressing local elected officials, which did not require the decision of full Council. She thought it was good for them to know where Palo Alto stood on this subject.

Chair Shepherd was unclear whether a letter was limited to timing and did not want to go outside the Guiding Principles.

Mr. Hackmann suggested reaching out to the Senator and their representatives with the Guiding Principles in mind, and saying that when they evaluate their next steps based on recent court rulings, please keep in mind the approved Guiding Principles of the Palo Alto Rail Committee. He remarked that drafting a letter was limited to timing and the Guiding Principles.

Council Member Kniss asked when Caltrain funding ran out.

Mr. Hackmann clarified funding meant "operating funding".

Council Member Kniss thought the current Caltrain funding ran out in one year.

Mr. Hackmann said the funding needed to be addressed in 2014.

Council Member Kniss thought the discussion of a letter needed to be connected to the discussion on Caltrain funding and wanted to discuss this further down the Agenda.

6. Update on the Communications Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) Installation Process.

Chair Shepherd remarked that the community was informed by way of a letter that the Community Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) was going in effect.

Council Member Kniss inquired about the CBOSS letter

Chair Shepherd clarified that a letter was sent out to the community about CBOSS re-signaling going into effect.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist remarked that the Planning Department sent the letter to the PAN group, a construction company, and

WORKING MINUTES

notified all people within on eighth of a mile from the railroad tracks of the beginning of the CBOSS work; notification was also mentioned in the City Manager's comments. December 10-14, 2013 and December 17-21, 2013 was when construction was going to begin. This project did not include the installation of the radio frequency tower, which was to take place at night.

7. Discussion of the Caltrain Representation Structure.

Chair Shepherd remarked that Caltrain permanent funding was not agendized but wanted it agendized during Future Meetings and Agenda's.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist remarked that in late June 2013, Staff sent a letter advocating for a spot on the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB). Valley Transportation Association (VTA) has three seats on the PCJPB and Palo Alto advocated for the VTA Group Two seat, which was made up of Los Altos, Los Altos Hills, Mountain View, and Palo Alto. Palo Alto requested advocacy because they represent high ridership but did not have direct representation on that Board. Staff forwarded this request letter to the City of Mountain View. VTA responded that they were confident with their representation and a new chair was to be selected at the end of the year; the new Chair had the choice of who would represent Palo Alto and who would represent VTA. Once the new chair was selected, Palo Alto was able to reach out for VTA Group Two selection.

Council Member Kniss remarked that a seat for this Board was one of the most political and that waiting was the best option.

Council Member Klein thought it was good to keep this Item agendized and hoped that there would be a proposal on the ballot for Palo Alto to have a permanent seat on the VTA Group Two selection.

Council Member Kniss suggested advocating for a different board construction and remarked that once a person was appointed, as long as they stayed in their seat, the term was lengthy.

Chair Shepherd reiterated that the seats were political and personality driven at times. She believed it was good to go back to the history of how the Board was built and suggested reconfiguring the thinking about the Board in order to initiate a change. The next steps were tied to when the next Caltrain Board member was appointed, the ownership of ridership, and the interests of Caltrain. She wanted to bring back historical pieces that put this

WORKING MINUTES

together in order to better understand where the snags were for the understanding of the Rail Committee (Committee).

Council Member Kniss spoke from a standpoint of a person that previously served on the PCJPB and said the Capital Corridor Joint Power's Board did receive funding through Sacramento on a regular basis. When looking on how to permanently fund Caltrain, it looked like there needed to be support from the three counties, and each of the three Counties had separate issues. San Francisco, San Mateo, and the Peninsula had many Cities within each county to consider as well.

Mr. Hackmann remarked that in Santa Clara County, Caltrain ran through Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, Santa Clara, San Jose, and Gilroy.

Council Member Kniss remarked that receiving permanent funding was a difficulty and there was not sufficient support.

Council Member Burt remarked that the Santa Clara County Leadership Group Committee responded to a proposal to create a committee to discuss the funding short-fall. There were scenarios that had possibility and there was prospective State legislation that might have created a lower threshold for some of the funding options. Since the short-term problem got solved, they waited to see what was going to happen at the State legislature level. Another point was that support did not always come from San Francisco County, but Caltrain was now viewed as an essential asset to its economic future. He thought the alignment amongst the three Counties was better then was ever seen and although the entities outside of Caltrain started the conversation, the solution later came with Caltrain executive staff and other transportation agencies.

Council Member Kniss remarked that VTA was very involved in discussions and the funding situation was risky at best. She suggested bringing the discussion back since Palo Alto was in a better economic situation; she asked if the Californians Advocating Responsible Rail Design (CARRD) Group would take up the discussion.

Council Member Burt clarified that many of the CARRD members were active in the Friends of Caltrain group and that was the guiding force in involving multiple stakeholders. Once Caltrain received electrification dollars, their deficit model changed and the limit on trains per hour and ridership was going to be a contradiction to the future demand. He said if money was taken from High Speed Rail (HSR) and if HSR limited Caltrain's ability to

WORKING MINUTES

have more trains, then there was going to be a conflict between demand and supply for local rail. On November 29, 2013, Caltrain announced that their ridership figures were at 54,000 boarding's. He thought Caltrain was going to eventually run up against their capacity. If there was an increase in electrification or Electric Multiple Unit's (EMU), then there was an expected increase in ridership. He thought there was a big disconnect between what the reality of what people were facing as a result of the constraints connected with accepting the HSR electrification dollars and the true needs of the regional rail system.

Council Member Kniss suggested asking the Friends of Caltrain group to come before the Committee.

Chair Shepherd agreed on discussing that during Future Meeting's and Agenda's and suggested recalibrating the Committee's interests for rail corridor, including scheduling, boarding, and funding.

Chair Shepherd remarked that a problem with Caltrain was getting to downtown San Francisco. The interests of Palo Alto really aligned for a different purpose and they expanded too.

Aaron Akin, Assistant Planning Director remarked that office spaces were being bought up near transit spaces and that was part of the culture now.

Council Member Burt did not think property investor's realized that their attraction was capped. Relating to San Francisco's change of interest in Caltrain, San Francisco now realized that Caltrain was vital for the community's economic growth and connection to the business and technological districts. Their economic plan was centered on the viability of Caltrain. San Francisco had much political power and was now highly supportive.

Council Member Klein thought Palo Alto should take the lead in discussions regarding Caltrain and felt that the rail system needed to be redone on the peninsula. The Committee did not endorse electrification in the past and purposely held back due to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). He felt that an advocacy approach was the best for getting other groups involved. He suggested having something on the ballot to reconstitute a new revenue source and to change the governance system because a bond issue was needed in order to accomplish electrification, if that was desired. If the money came from HSR, it was going to be at a price that people did not want to pay.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Burt added a Plan B concept by Senator DeSaulnier presented before the legislative vote for funding on HSR was that Federal dollars could be redirected toward the end points without being linked to the HSR requirements.

Council Member Klein said there were quotes from the Surface Transportation Board (STB), a committee connected to the United States Department of Transportation, regarding the Federal Government taking back all of the money.

Council Member Burt noted the STB's denial of HSR from an independent utility aspect.

Chair Shepherd reiterated that she wanted this agenda item in Future Meetings and Agenda's.

Council Member Klein said the City Council has never endorsed electrification.

Council Member Kniss remarked that she was unaware of that.

Chair Shepherd clarified that the term was "Modernization of Caltrain," not "electrification," in the Palo Alto Guiding Principles.

Council Member Klein stated there were three reasons: 1) Palo Alto was concerned about the impact of electrification; 2) there was testimony on the EMU and how the diesel was more efficient and less costly; and 3) an increase in electrification through HSR dollars. He noted that the review of the Palo Alto Caltrain EIR was due soon.

Mr. Hackmann stated the EIR was due in March or April of 2014.

Council Member Klein wanted to work with various advocacy groups to revolutionize Caltrain. He thought it was a three part program: 1) to develop the permanent revenue stream; 2) to have sensible governance system to modernize what was needed; and 3) to have a bond issuance to raise whatever money was necessary.

Council Member Kniss added having the three part program passed by three Counties.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Klein felt that raising a bond issuance was the most important because he did not believe the money would be available from HSR.

Council Member Kniss reiterated the most important point that Council Member Burt brought out was that there was no urgency, and when there was no urgency it was hard to be motivated.

Council Member Klein thought the urgency resulted from the loss of money from HSR.

Council Member Kniss thought the loss of money was not evident yet.

Chair Shepherd wanted to make sure people understood that the EIR from Caltrain only mentioned six trains for one direction per hour. She asked if the EIR discussed scheduling for the future and wanted to know if Caltrain thought the six trains was the need for the next 50 to 100 years.

Mr. Hackmann explained that the mention of six trains per hour was part of an agreement with the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA). This specific EIR only addressed the impact of moving from five to six trains per hour; it did not address impacts beyond six trains per hour. If the CHSRA moved to San Jose, they needed to do a separate EIR.

Chair Shepherd asked if there was a way for Caltrain to expand their scheduling now.

Mr. Hackmann clarified that the question was to have the study go from five to seven trains for example.

Chair Shepherd remarked yes. The Caltrain schedule shows that there was only one hour that they were running five trains.

Council Member Burt noted that based on the financing agreement with HSR, Caltrain was locked at a six train maximum.

Chair Shepherd wanted to follow up on the letter to the legislature based on the Guiding Principles and wanted to know if the Committee wanted to discuss that now. She thought it was important to state Palo Alto's interests clearly and to decide to postpone the letter until next year.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Kniss wanted to keep the letter high on the Agenda.

Chair Shepherd clarified that Council Member Kniss was talking about the letter Caltrain.

Council Member Kniss said she was talking about both letters in general and stressed implementing a point in time to be referenced. Sending the letter early in the year was a good time.

Herb Borock did not think the voters would support funding for Caltrain until the connection to HSR was done away with.

Council Member Burt made a presentation statement to Caltrain Joint Power Authority Board on funding and thought it needed to be redistributed to the Committee as an update on the Committee's position.

Council Member Klein said the elected officials have argued that the only way to get the funding was to endure HSR. He thought the only way to get support from the public was to do away with HSR because many people saw Caltrain as a step before HSR.

Chair Shepherd did not disagree but said Santa Clara and Sunnyvale had different interests than Palo Alto. She suggested articulating Palo Alto's interests without being linked to HSR.

8. Discussion of Caltrain Local Policymaker Working Group Structure.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist said on December 6, 2013, at the Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC) meeting, Council Member Burt wanted his drafted letter to be discussed, then brought back to the Rail Committee (Committee) for review and approval.

Council Member Burt relayed that when the High Speed Rail (HSR) system was in effect, there was a Policymaker Working Group (PWG) formed. It was less and less effective due to the participation, so Caltrain wanted to make things better. The PWG was reformulated a year ago, and was chaired by a member from the Joint Powers Board (JPB), but the group did not improve. The last few months, Staff sought information from the members of the group but it was to no end.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Kniss asked who the liaison was for Caltrain and who attended the meetings.

Council Member Burt remarked that senior Staff was there.

Council Member Kniss asked if Maryanne Lee was the connectivity.

Council Member Burt remarked that Ms. Lee was the lead staff. The PCC wanted to discuss their concerns in a letter stating there was a lack of representation. The PCC cities wanted to express their concerns; they produced a draft letter to be taken back to the respective cities to be discussed expressing the common concern. There were cities represented that were not PCC cities. It was possible to bind cities together that have common concerns regarding Caltrain.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to have the City Council Rail Committee approve the letter addressed to Mike Scanlon entitled "Caltrain Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG)".

Council Member Klein did not see controversy over the letter and thought it was within the purview of the Committee. He wanted the letter agendaized in January 2014 before Council.

Council Member Burt remarked that the purpose was to reconstitute people together.

Council Member Kniss asked what the hope was for the outcome.

Council Member Burt hoped that cities would lead this group, rather than follow it.

Council Member Kniss remarked that the group would influence the Agendas and the Caltrain Board.

Chair Shepherd agreed with the principles but thought the letter was a little hostile. She suggested reiterating what Palo Alto wanted and thanking the groups for being responsive; the primary principle needed to be developed because Palo Alto agreed with the vision but it was not meeting the needs right now. She suggested relaying a "we help you, you help us" message in the letter.

WORKING MINUTES

Council Member Burt thought it was better to commit to a statement.

Chair Shepherd suggested partnering on the letter to make it a better product and believed the letter could be organized better.

Council Member Burt experienced that being more deferential got people less, rather than more. He felt the cities needed to stand up for themselves.

Council Member Kniss did not think these details made a big difference. She wanted to know how many cities would actually send the letter.

Council Member Burt remarked that the letter would first go to PCC cities, and then all cities that were part of the Local Policy Maker Group (LPMG).

Council Member Kniss thought the intent and message of the letter was clear.

Council Member Burt thought that depending on whether the members of the LPMG got what they wanted, he thought Palo Alto would get what they wanted.

Chair Shepherd asked if the discussion could be agendized with the Policymaker Working Group.

Council Member Burt noted that the final paragraph in the letter suggested that it be agendized for the first meeting of the year.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Chair Shepherd asked if this letter would go before full Council.

Council Member Klein remarked that the letter fit within the delegation of the Rail Committee's charge.

9. Discussion of Future Meeting Frequency

Chair Shepherd thought the Rail Committee (Committee) would meet in January.

Council Member Kniss felt there was no great need to meet.

WORKING MINUTES

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist said the Committee could meet bi-monthly and suggested changing or adding meetings to that structure, or having the Committee move to a quarterly structure and add in Special Meetings as needed, as the Agenda Items were some times out of the Committee's control.

Council Member Klein added that the Committee members changed in January and thought there might be more clarity on decisions of the Governor, the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA), and the Judge's rulings after the first of the year. There was a need for more than quarterly meetings.

Chair Shepherd thought it was a good time to work on Palo Alto's interests, regardless of whatever else happened.

Council Member Kniss noted that if there was too much change on a Committee, the institutional memory was diminished and the ability to work together effectively was gone. She suggested having Committee members serve maybe two years in a row.

Council Member Burt had two requests for discussion at the next meeting: 1) to receive the data from Caltrain on the breakdown on ridership statistics by stations; and 2) a discussion of how Caltrain staff included lengthening platforms on their studies at the request of the Committee. He noted that the Committee requested the real estate availability at the high volume stations from Caltrain.

Chair Shepherd remarked that there were comments in the Environmental Impact Report.

Council Member Burt said there was no feedback and Caltrain agreed to present a preliminary analysis to the Committee.

Council Member Kniss said this subject was discussed frequently.

Council Member Burt wanted to know if there was data he did not know about.

Council Member Kniss was told there was no way to extend the platform.

WORKING MINUTES

Chair Shepherd asked if the platform study needed to be agendized for a future meeting.

Council Member Burt asked if Aaron Akin, Assistant Planning Director would request whatever analysis Caltrain did.

10. Future Meetings and Agendas

a. Update on Quiet Zones in Palo Alto

Chair Shepherd reiterated a list of future topics to discuss:

- Update on Quiet Zones for Palo Alto
- Caltrain Permanent Funding
- Recalibration of the Rail Committee's Interests for the Rail Corridor, including Scheduling, Boarding, etc.
- Letter's to Decision Makers
- Caltrain Platform Length

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:01 A.M.