



CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE TRANSCRIPT

Special Meeting
Wednesday, January 27, 2016

Chairperson Burt called the meeting to order at 8:33 A.M. in the Council Chambers, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Berman (Chair), Burt, DuBois, Scharff

Absent:

Oral Communications

Herb Borock: Good morning Chair Berman, committee members. On Monday, I had advised you about an initiative measure that will receive this title and summary from the Attorney General's office. There was a second one that receives this title and summary by the same proponents of the first one. This is a measure for a water bond storage, which includes reallocation of \$8 Billion of higher-speed rail funds to water bond storage purposes. I'm concerned that having the same components of both measures, they may just use High Speed rail opposition to collect signatures for the water bond initiative and never turn in the High Speed rail one. My second concern is that I believe the water bond proposal violates the constitution's prohibition on more than one subject in an initiative because it's essentially telling people if they're waiting to defund a High Speed Rail they have to support the water bond funds and if you want to support the water bond funds you'll also want to support defunding High Speed Rail and that would then essentially coerce people to sign the initiative to get the one thing they wanted and to vote for the measure to get the one thing they wanted and forcing them to vote for the other one, and therefore that I think would be an invalid initiative. I provided the clerk with a copy of the title and summary and the Fiscal Affect Impact report. Unlike the previous one, I didn't bother to copy the text of the initiative, it's twenty-five pages long and if you wanted to take a look at it it's on the Attorney General's website. Thank you.

Michael Brady: Good morning. For those of you who don't know me I'm Michael Brady from Redwood City, I'm an attorney. I wanted to bring you up-to-date on some very pertinent things that are going on. I'm the attorney that file the proposition 1A Lawsuit against High Speed Rail

TRANSCRIPT

Association five years ago and I've been working against High Speed Rail on the Peninsula and in the State for nine years. Our case goes to trial in two weeks, Sacramento Superior Court. If we win our case, High Speed Rail project will be stopped in the State of California, so that's the significance. That's two weeks from now. The second thing I wanted to tell you about, in all of your deliberations, consider Union Pacific railroad very importantly. What I want to tell you is that in 2006 & 7, I studied in detail, the legal contracts between Union Pacific and Sam Trans. Sam Trans, theoretically, owns the right-of-way between San Jose and San Francisco, but Union Pacific, under those contract agreements, has all the powers and rights of an owner of property. The Union Pacific Railroads can veto, entirely, the entrance of High Speed Rail on the Peninsula; veto it. Or can set any conditions that it desires. High Speed Rail cannot enter the peninsula unless Union Pacific gives its full written consent. Please consider that and you better talk to Union Pacific before you make any particular plans. Thirdly, as the previous speaker mentioned, these initiatives have now been approved by the Attorney General to go out for signatures. These initiatives, which I fully support, do two important things; abolish the High Speed Rail project; abolish it. Secondly, you take all the money, which remains in the bond for High Speed Rail, \$8.5 Billion, and you transfer it to California Water Projects. A great measure. You've seen the recent polls that people that turn against High Speed Rail; they certainly support water relief for drought-stricken California. And lastly I want to tell you something that just happened that is humiliating for the High Speed Rail authority. Last week, the Los Angeles Times published an article saying they are just about to abandon Southern California, so all of you people in Palo Alto that have sat back and said "We'll never see High Speed Rail during our lifetime", well, wake-up. They decided to go to San Jose rather than to Los Angeles. They're going to switch. The IOS South will be abandoned, IOS North will be chosen and the Peninsula will be impacted. So this will be with us. If these initiatives pass, the High Speed Rail project will be dead in 10 months, that's the way to get rid of it and prevent from coming to the peninsula. Thank you.

Agenda Items

1. Railroad Grade Separation: Background, Program Manager, and Community Engagement.

Chair Berman: Thank you Mr. Brady and now Richard, I apologize for interrupting you a second ago.

TRANSCRIPT

Richard Hackmann, Management Analyst: No problem. Thank you Chair Berman and council members. Richard Hackman, City of Palo Alto Management Analyst. Just wanted to briefly recap sort of how we got here today. In December we had a Rail Committee meeting after it was re-commissioned by the City Council. At that meeting there were a number of requests; one of them was from staff which was to discuss bringing on board a Rail Program Manager following the presentation by Mike Canepa of Hatch Mott McDonald, our engineering consultant. Josh Mellow, the Transportation Manager for Planning will give that presentation on the program manager and we can take your recommendation. However, we did receive some questions at that meeting regarding the history of the Great Separation Analysis work that had been done by the city. Hatch Mott McDonald has been working with the city since 2011. They're most recent presentation to the City Council was in late 2014 where they presented their findings, including the financial figures many of us had been using, such as, approximately \$500 Million for two percent Grade trench that would go below Meadow and Charleston and so we reached out to Mike, who's with us today. He not only is going to represent for both you and the community the findings of that analysis, but he also pulled some comparative figures of Great Separation projects that are occurring in the region and will present those as well to put what we're looking to do in context with what other cities have already moved forward with or are in the process of moving forward with. And from there we hope that information will help you make an informed decision regarding the Project Manager that we're proposing. So with that, I will hand it over to Mike.

Mike Canepa, Senior Project Manager, Hatch Mott McDonald: Okay, the Rail analysis that we have performed the design criteria we used was for Caltrain electrification, and for their current tracks, UP's current design criteria, and High-Speed Rail through the area. The design criteria took--you can see there that we used a preferred maximum grade of 1% grade for rail grade and then we also looked at a 2% grade at the request of the city for the rail going under the road waste. The cost comparisons that we ran; the 1% rail trench, 2% rail trench, and then various configurations of roads going under the existing rail line. As you can see the 1% rail grade came up to about \$1 Billion for rail trench through the area and then the 2% came out to about \$500 Million. Also with the rail trench, the right-away impacts were quite a bit less to the area. There was none to residential areas. The rail--the roadways, excuse me, going under the existing rail line had various degrees of right-away impacts to existing parcels. This is the grade separation [Churchill] once you go under the exist grade, sorry, the existing railroad and the parcels that it would impact and the dash circles there are also the

TRANSCRIPT

traffic impacted areas. Also we looked not just taking Churchill under, but keep a connection to Alma, which would depressed Alma down and basically move the intersection below grade with retaining walls coming up. As you can see, the impact is quite a bit more on the surrounding community here and on the traffic part.

Mr. Hackmann: Just to clarify one thing, the difference between the slide that you see here and the previous slide, was this slide right here shows the impact if we submerge the roadway below Alma and we no longer have turning movements to and from Alma. This slide here, is if we maintained turning movements and the reason the footprint is expending so much as Mike just said, is because you have to depressed Alma in order to maintain those turning movements. So I just want to clarify why the footprint's larger.

Mr. Canepa: Next one was the same analysis for Meadow with Meadow going under Alma and the railroad and then that would be Alma depressed to meet Meadow underneath. This is the same analysis for Charleston. And then we also looked at keeping Alma depressed all the way from Charleston through Meadow with both roadways submerged with keeping the intersections together and this is the impact to the area on that one. This is the start of where the one percent trench would start being depressed. This is for the rail trench only, so the rail going underneath the roadways. One of the main issues we have here is that Oregon Expressway would be impacted and need to be raised back to grade by taking the rail trench underneath. And then one of the issues we have either with, especially with the 1 percent, is trying to get underneath each of the creeks and maintain a clearance underneath, so it does drive the depth of the trench quite deep. This is where we started work with the two percent trench. It's actually at 1.75 coming down because we started out the creek to mellow out the slope a little bit, so we didn't have to go down to a maximum of two, but with the two percent maximum, which would require a variance in UPRR permission to do so through the area. It's not standard for them, but has been done in certain places. It does get it down underneath and we can go over the creek so we don't have to keep it down underneath it and there's quite a bit of cost savings; about half by going to two percent instead of one percent grade. The target with getting both of them down, was Baring Creek and then underneath Meadow, underneath Charleston and Adobe Creek and then coming back up. With the two percent grade, we can get up about at San Antonio interchange. With the one percent, train carries all the weight (Rainstorve), so there would have to be some partnering with Mountainview. Also just the cost comparison we did. Now these have happened in various

TRANSCRIPT

stages. Some have been built, some have not been built, some are still in the planning stage, some have been studied for years and to death. The San Bruno Grade Separation that we've just completed in April 2014, which is an elevated railway, over three at Grade streets. The approximate cost was a \$155 Million. That one was sponsored by Caltrain itself. The mission warrant Grade Separation, which is a Bart SPRT project that the VTA was working on, where the roadway goes under the rail, which would be similar to the depressed streets that you saw was a \$151 Million. Currently in design and planning is the City of San Mateo is looking to elevate the railway over, at grade roadway, which is about \$165 Million. Rainstorve, which is the one I referenced earlier that has been studied quite a bit is a roadway under using a rail bridge. That was estimated \$45 Million, but that was approximately 12 years ago that one was studied. I know there's been some updates to it, but I don't think I've seen a re-costing of that sense then. Broadway, in the City of Burlingame is still under alternative considerations, so I've summarized and these costs are approximate. They're still in the study phase also as we are. Broadway with a split, which means an elevated railway on a berm and then lowering the partially the roadways underneath. That alternative was \$260 Million. Broadway grade separation in a rail trench, similar to what we were looking out here, was about 400 to \$600 Million. Broadway with roadway modification, which means the roadways would go underneath the rail and not elevating the rail at all, so it's completely underneath, would be 210 to \$250 Million. And then an elevated railway on a berm over at Grade roadways would be a 180 to \$240 Million.

Mr. Hackmann: So with that, we welcome any questions or comments you have for Mike.

Chair Berman: Great. Thank you, very much. So in the interest of time and the in the interest of the fact that agenda Item Number 1, there are kind of a couple of different elements to it that create complicated if we save council member questions and comments for all at once. Let's go to the public for comments on item number one and then come back to the committee for questions and comments at the same time. And then, we're going to move on to the next element, which is the program manager and community engagement piece after we ask questions for this. I'd like to ask the public and my colleagues to keep in mind that we are in a bit of a time crunch this morning and there's a lot that we're trying to get to, so if everyone could keep their comments as brief as possible, but we'll stick with three minutes for the members of the public. The first member of the public

TRANSCRIPT

to speak is Herb Borock and that will be followed by Stephen Rosenblum and then Adina Levi.

Herb Borock: Thank you Chair Berman. I believe that the consultant Hatch Mott McDonald has a potential conflict of interest because of they work for High Speed Rail. I mean, normally, it is the project proponent for a project under the California Environmental Quality Act that is required to prepare a complete and adequate EIR and that would include all of the mitigation that are required and identify who's going to do the mitigations and do these kinds of studies and that is the agency that should be paying for them. And in the same situation is for (council members), so I do have a concern both with the process as to where and what stage the studies are being done and under which agency is doing it, who is taking the responsibility for funding them as well as the fact, as I previously brought to the predecessor rail committee that I thought this particular consultant was both a funder of Proposition 1A and repaid and contracts a hundredfold after it was approved is somehow also our consultant. I think that's a conflict. The second concern I have is with Grade Separations is something that also brought up with road widening. We have congestion; some people say, well, we should widen the roads and then the response says, well, that's just draw more traffic. And the question is with Grade Separations that will facilitate a traffic movement, to what extent is that then tied to more intensive development within Palo Alto itself? And so as you proceed on that in the council, it seems to me that's something one has to bear in mind that you can do that piece meal. You can't be talking about Grade Separations separate from the impacts that would have on future development within the city. Thank you.

Chair Berman: Thank you, Mr. Borock. And our next speaker is Stephen Rosenblum and that will be followed by Adina Levi. Thank you.

Stephen Rosenblum: Good morning Members of Rail Committee. I've spoken many times before the council and the predecessor of this rail committee about the importance of grade separation for Caltrain and eventually for High Speed Rail to the future of Palo Alto. This is a decision that's going to face the council, which will affect the ecstastic's and cohesiveness of the community for the next century at least. I think the council and the rail committee are pursuing a correct path on this to figure on their own what they would like to happen, to come up with a well substantiated concept about what they would like to see so that when Caltrain and High Speed Rail come back to us with their counter proposals, which presumably will involve spending much less money and having more impact on our residential lots. We'll be able to say look, this is doable and

TRANSCRIPT

we should consider it doing it that way. I fully support staff's recommendation of hiring Rail Project Manager. As I say, I think this is a crucial subject for the future of Palo Alto and people will look back at this council as having made the decision, which will affect the way Palo Alto looks in the 22nd century. I envision a community where people in bicycles and cars can cross the train tracks whenever they want and that we don't have train noise or other problems of suicides on the tracks, which plagues us now. It is also opportune--if I can speak for a moment on Item 2, that the Santa Clara County sales tax allocates money to Grade Separation for Caltrain. I think this is a nice confluence of events and will allow us to have some synergy in our efforts. Thank you very much. I wish you well in your deliberations.

Chair Berman: Thank you, Mr. Rosenblum. And our next speaker will be Adina Levi, followed by Roland Lebrun.

Adina Levi: Good morning Council Members. Adina Levi (Inaudible) Counseling. Thank you very much for working on this Grade Separation including the next item, which is bringing in a consultant to work on a context sensitive solution with the community regarding the desires of the community and also really grappling with some of the design and cost and revenue issues. With regard to the specifics here of the study, a couple of things. Burlingame had a city council meeting reviewing the various different alternatives about a week ago and we're leaning toward the split option, which had the least side effects in terms of enabling the station to be restored, which the trench should not actually do for them and having better access to side properties and side streets and had the lowest relative costs in the 210 to \$260 Million range. It's not a done deal and there's questions in San Mateo County because they're running out of their pot of funds. Lastly, in terms of the Grade, one of the issues and opportunities is with freight because there's a potential that if there was a different freight operator that might be able better to tolerate the 1 percent Grade and at the local policy maker working group where all the different cities will be getting together and talking to High Speed Rail, that might be an opportunity starting on Thursday, tomorrow, to get different cities to work together to get High Speed Rail and potentially this may meet our representatives in Congress to be able to work on freight and see if we might be able to get changes that would allow the less impactful and less costly project. Thank you.

Chair Berman: Thank you, very much. And next up is Roland Lebrun.

TRANSCRIPT

Roland Lebrun: Yes, good morning Committee Members. So there's a couple of things I want to touch on. First is the issue of cost and second is where are we going to find funding to do this and the one to two percent is really important as far as that is concern. The first thing I like to touch on is I entirely agree with the comment Borock made, which is a conflict of interest between Hatch Mott McDonald and High Speed Rail Authority, and this is how you end up with having those preposterous proposals over the quieting the noise, for instance the San (Inaudible) brand new Caltrain station, you know, that's somehow buried in that cost. You're about to get the same situation in Hills (Inaudible) when we (Grade upgraded), by the way, we do not need Grade upgraded. We're going to blow \$200 Million someday to have a brand new Hills (Inaudible) station, so we can develop Hills ([Inaudible] of Santana. That's got to stop. We need to bring some new people in. Now with regard to Bart, we took the worst case, which is mission warrant, okay. My advice to you is to look at the (Cato) Road, Dixie Landing, Cierra Landing, which are going to be a lot closer to what you're trying to do in Palo Alto. You're going to find out, you're probably closer to \$50 Million of Grade Separation. To wrap up, one thing you may want to look at is actually four tracks and the reason you want to do that is because-actually, building a trench and keeping the line open is really, really, really difficult. You're going to have (shoefly) and God knows what else. You might just as well go for four tracks, but the kicker there is that if you do agree to four tracks, Grade Separation now become mandatory, so whoever wants to put four tracks, they have to provide Grade Separation, that's a rule. Three tracks, yes, you can have Grade Crossing; four tracks, no. So to wrap up on the funding, you may want to look at a fast act. You know, there's a lot of funding in there for transportation, which mean you need to look at one percent and basically be ready to have more freight going to the Peninsula. The kicker is that you have to be ready to start construction in 18 months. And the last thing I like to look at is the AB1591 by assemblymen (Inaudible) here, is got \$1.3 Billion in there for freight corridors. Once again, if you somehow figure out a way to have more freight going to the Peninsula, you're going to have massive funding coming in there. Thank you.

Chair Berman: Thank you very much and I'd like to now turn over to colleagues for questions and comments for Mr. Canepa and then we'll move on to the program manager and community engagement piece. Any takers?

Mayor Burt: Sure. This is really the process going forward on evaluating alternatives. First a question. You referred to the one percent as the preferred max grade. Preferred by whom?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Canepa: That's by Caltrain, but UP requirements are different.

Mayor Burt: Why do you say Caltrain prefers it?

Mr. Canepa: Well, the flatter the slopes, the better it is for the trains.

Mayor Burt: Yeah, but Caltrain also has shares, concerns on communities how to best design grade separations. I've had those discussions with Caltrain, so I guess I just say that I'm not sure at all that's their preference. That may be what they believe is somewhat a constraint, but not a preference.

Mr. Canepa: And that's true. It's because they are a shared carrier, it's a shared rail line with UP.

Mayor Burt: Okay. So I just want to make sure we get clarification.

Mr. Canepa: That's true. It is their criteria, which covers UP run.

Mayor Burt: And it's not--I can tell you, it's not High Speed Rail's preference either.

Mr. Canepa: Correct.

Mayor Burt: So we had studied in this, what we engaged with you a year plus ago, several scenarios. One of the things going forward we'll need to look at as a committee is what, if any, additional variations or scenarios we want to have evaluated and what would be the best process to try to identify them. We've talked a lot about how much we value the CSS process. We've wanted High Speed Rail to do it, and for Caltrain to do it, but it's a process that would be prospectively valuable for us to utilize on perhaps a narrow focus basis to begin to identify kind of what are the alternatives that might be available for us and which of those we might want to have evaluated at and to what degree in near terms versus one that we may then, at a later date, kind of iterative process look at certain other alternatives. So for instance, we saw a drastic reduction in trenching cost when we went from one percent to two percent. Three percent is more challenging with freight and certainly would need their consent, but it's not off the table, and that is something I'd be very interested in is seeing at a three percent Grade, what would be the length of that and what would be the estimated cost and how

TRANSCRIPT

close do we get in cost of conventional Grade Separations with land taking-- the cost of land taking versus if we had a three percent Grade trench and set aside for the moment the almost unattainable political ramification of trying to take the neighborhood of 50 residences to put in conventional steps here. So there's that added dimension, but I suspect we'll see at least a significant narrowing of the difference in cost between those two scenarios and maybe a narrow limitation, but we don't know, until we've done that. But there's other possibilities as well and so we've developed in this community last half dozen years a whole bunch of folks who are both either residents or neighbors who have engaged in this, developed their own expertise and they're own insights. This why CSS has Stakeholders involved, so I think that's something we want to consider not only what we want to have evaluated but the process by which we narrow those options and get best thinking on it.

Chair Berman: Thank you. Greg.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I think we really need to figure out if a two percent Grade is possible. Not only possible, but whether or not it's politically feasible, whether or not we can get done cause if so why are we only talking about a one percent grade? I mean, if that works, let's look--I agree with Pat, we should evaluate a three percent grade, but I mean don't know what's the constraint on a two percent. I understand is it--primarily a UP constraint, isn't it?

Mr. Hackmann: Correct.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So I mean, how do we move forward from here and say, you know, obviously, we rather do a two percent or possibly even a three percent, but how do we, you know, get that sense that two percent works? I mean, obviously given the constant, I think we should, I think we need to figure that issue out. That seems like almost the number one issue to figure out frankly on moving forward. I frankly don't see any of these scenarios where we take huge amounts of properties. I'm not sure if it's even worth spending a lot of time on this scenario on which we take 14 properties here--I don't have it in front of me--I mean, if you look at each individual crossings, you start looking at this, it's a huge number of individual properties on a lot of these--yeah, here we go--so yeah, on the Churchill for instance, where we take 16 properties on the full take, I just don't see that. I also, what would that look like? I mean, when you see on the thing that say impacted area? So what visually would you look like when

TRANSCRIPT

you drive through there? I mean, that's a huge part of that neighborhood goes away, so I don't know. Is there a reason to be looking at these really large takes? I mean, that's just going to get people really concerned.

Mr. Hackmann: Thank you for raising that point. If I may, the reason we looked at these in the past was because that's the "traditional" method of Grade Separation, submerging the roadway below the tracks. The Palo Alto is unique compare to some of our northern neighbors in San Mateo County in that our neighborhoods are built very close to the corridor and, so you're exactly right that up north, you have El Camino running parallel to the Caltrain corridor many places, which allows a lot of these Grade Separations to occur in commercial districts, not residential neighborhoods and that leads to your point why there's such a large takers.

Vice Mayor Scharff: The question is, if we take the large takes off the table and say, we're not going to do that, what does that do to traffic flow? That means you lose what on the turning rates on the partial takes, you lose the turning connections to Alma. I have that right, right?

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Yes.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So why couldn't you look at putting--turning right on Alma is not a problem ever. I mean, you could always do that. You don't have to go down Churchill, you can always go down one of the other streets. The hard part is turning left on Alma during--so why couldn't we put a light somewhere else rather than do all that taking? Well, the light is basically just a left hand turn, where you turn left on Alma.

Mr. Hackmann: In the scenario where Alma's left at Grade, that removes all turning movements and that still requires 16 full partial takes and 4 partials. The one that contains all turning movements requires 33 parcel takings and three partials, so if we did a solution where we maintain some turning movements, it would be somewhere between that 16 and 33 figure.

Mr. Mello: And if I can jump in to clarify. The option that has Alma at Grade would look similar to the embarcadero under cross where there's actually no connection between Embarcadero and Alma without using side streets. That's why the turning lane movements are removed.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So it would look like embarcadero?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: Yeah.

Vice Mayor Scharff: At Churchill?

Mr. Mello: And the other one would look like Oregon, more or less.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So if all of that is unacceptable, what do we do at Churchill? No, but I mean, right, we talked about the tunneling, which goes up to--it doesn't go to Churchill. I think it goes--I mean the train stops where? Somewhere around Oregon, it come up--?

Mr. Mello: So I think you'll see in my presentation about the program manager. I think these are some of the questions that we need to answer in the next year or so through our contact sensitive solution process. I'll talk a little bit about how we see the process in my presentation.

Chair Berman: That's a good point, thank you. So let's try--for this, and this is a complicated item because there's numerous different pieces. For now, let's just try to keep the questions maybe for Mr. Canepa and then some of the bigger kind of questions, we can take up in the same item, which is the next section, if that makes sense.

Mayor Burt: May I just add something. I don't think if we try to weigh in to determine design alternatives at this time, we don't have that. That's really part of why we should look at process perhaps to identify that we think that there are other alternatives, but not attempt to preliminarily design it.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Right, but I do think that the notion that we're going to do with all those properties, that could make the process very difficult. I mean, I think in some ways if you take off the table most extreme versions of things, you often get a better process because you don't have people really freaking out and so that's really what I'm asking is, is there a way to streamline the process a little bit so that we don't go through huge community inks if we're not going to do something. Is that extreme?

Mayor Burt: Richard mentioned basically a referenced point and I think we haven't done a good enough job identifying that's not one of our preferred alternatives, but just a reference point if we didn't do one of the alternatives, this is what we'll be left with as opposed to this is the directions we're headed. So I think that's a good point, that we need to make sure

TRANSCRIPT

even if we still need and value a reference point, it's not misconstrued as to what it is.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I mean, I think for me, there's several things. I think we need to move this process forward where we start cause the context solution is going to take a long time and we have the most complicated, I think at the Grade septs in the area, so other cities will be moving forward lighting up, getting the money. I know we've asked that we don't think whoever get it done first should get the money first, right. But you know, just because we say that, doesn't mean it actually goes that way. So I think, \you know, on the two percent, the one percent, it seems fairly obvious that if we can do a two percent Grade, rather than a one percent grade, that's the decision we should make and move forward. And I'm not saying we should look at three percent, but then we should stop talking about and one percent, but that may not be possible, so how do we get through that road walk? How do we figure that out so that we can actually move the process forward? I mean, a lot--that's where outside the context seemed the solution question, that's the question of how do we actually do that? Are we going to be able to achieve that or not? I don't know. Maybe you think it's within the context, that seems the solution, but--

Mayor Burt: And CSS is not--it's an iterative process, so I would envision that whatever's the next phase of an analysis we do, is not after we complete the CSS, it is part of the CSS, so there'd be perhaps some preliminary alternative analysis that would feed in to what we might want to have technical studies done and then iterates.

Chair Berman: I don't mean to interrupt, but let's--I think we're going to have that discussion in 10 minutes. I want to let (Inaudible) get a chance to get his presentation once we get--everybody gets a chance to ask questions of Mr. Canepa. Greg, you have any more questions?

Vice Mayor Scharff: No, I'm good.

Council Member DuBois: Without designing a solution, I'm really interested in understanding where there's option, maybe anything that's change in terms of construction techniques, in terms of the assumptions and maybe I can suggest a couple of areas I'm interested in hearing about. You know, we have several creeks, are there any improvements to tunneling or trenching under creeks, you know, boring versus trenching, you know, is there any innervations in borings? And also, the idea of shoeflies, is there

TRANSCRIPT

construction techniques where the tracks could remain in place for a period of time while work was proceeding around them and below them? And then lastly, if we were to advance the idea of Silicon Valley trench that was significantly longer, and extended state Menlo Park or (Inaudible), would change your approach in any way or are there economy of scale to dealing with a larger project or is it really just continue what you're doing but further distance? And the last question on the property takes, if you know, did you guys look at always to minimize? Are there any construction techniques where there would enable us not to take as many properties?

Mr. Canepa: The construction technique--I mean some of these properties that we're looking at for takes are because the driveways are gone. Now, when you take a piece of property, there would be a way to reconfigure it, but you'd have to take out what is existing to their access to the home. That's the problem. So in the 10 percent design, we look at if you're taking out somebody's driveway and access, then it's a full take. Partial take means, we're kind of--you can still get to the property, but we have to encroach into their frontend, so that was the difference. Now, where that property can be redeveloped is something that's a different story. It's not like it's just going to stay there dormant, I'm sure. The problem is the retaining walls and we can go down with the streets at about eight percent, but we also need to get the pedestrians through to at five percent because of ADA restrictions, so it kind of lengthens it. Now, we did in the study looked what happens if we raised the rail and there was analysis of what happened if we start raising up the rail Grade to how many properties that save, and it wasn't significant, let's put it that way. I mean, there's a couple, but it wasn't dramatically decreased that. As to your question on the shoefly, the one item that is not included in this study wasn't considered at the time because it was done a little over a year ago, was the electrification. At that time, the assumption was that the rail trench would be build, it would be set up for Caltrain to come through and electrify, so that was not considered in the cost. I did talk to our system folks and the additional cost is probably, because you do have to build the electrification when you shoefly, if it's electrified before you start construction is approximately another \$4 Million a mile to go through that, which is basically you got to rebuild the system.

Council Member DuBois: Is there any way to leave the tracks in place and start to build?

Mr. Canepa: Not really. We did to our internal group and that's part of what our company's known for, to get underneath the--the tunneling and

TRANSCRIPT

structure folks--what this is based on is actually driving C-camp pile type piles down so you don't have an excavation that goes out at one to one or two to one, that deep. So what it does is drive the piles down with a (slurry) mixture and then you can trench out in between that. So the shoefly, what that saves is pushing it further into Alma Street, so you can probably keep Alma open partially while the shoefly is in place and while the trench is getting excavated. To go underneath the creeks, now granted, this was just a 10 percent concept design, but we did talk to our tunneling folks on that too. They can get a structure underneath with only five feet of clearance from the bottom of the structure without disturbing it. That was our rule of thumb on that. Otherwise, we'd have to brace or rebuild the creeks. So one of the things that we wanted to do is stay out of the creeks because that launches a whole environmental process that could get very sticky, so that was the rule of thumb for us, to stay five feet below the invert and they can get a structure going.

Council Member DuBois: And then the idea perhaps a longer trench.

Mr. Canepa: The longer trench, what it does do--I have worked with contractors, it does--there is economy to scale, but you still have to stage it in areas, so you still have the shoeflies and everything else. Cost wise, you'd have to look at a bigger contract to do that and the procurement strategy, the feeder design build, or design bid build or in the packaging in phasing, that would have some ramifications on it, I'm sure. What it is, I couldn't tell you at this time.

Council Member DuBois: And then, again, find out if the question can address here, but this issue of Union Pacific, you know, I think the rail system (Inaudible) some issues with the economy, but I don't know who talks to Union Pacific, if the city's ever talked to them, but sounds like we need to talk to them to understand this two percent rate issue.

Chair Berman: Thank you, Tom. Greg, you have a follow up?

Vice Mayor Scharff: We looked at raising the train, putting the train in the air?

Mr. Canepa: I'm sorry, raising the grade of the--?

Vice Mayor Scharff: No, just putting the tracks in the air? Elevating the train?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Canepa: Not fully, no.

Mr. Hackmann: If I may speak to that. In San Bruno, for example, excuse me, San Carlos, they have sort of a Hybrid approach, where the tracks are slightly elevated and the road is slightly submerged. That's how they achieved their grade separation, so in Palo Alto, I said--when Mike and I was just talking briefly, do we achieve anything if we raise the grade by three feet or so, you know, a moderate increase like that, and it just wasn't--the parcels are so closed to the corridor, that the raise of the corridor has to increase so much to achieve sort of the parcel saving we would want to that it doesn't really fit with our vision or the Rail Committee and Council stated vision of how they want the corridor to look in the community. So three foot, six-foot raise of the grade doesn't achieve much in terms of partial savings.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So I guess I'm going to say that I'm going to say that I don't think running embarcadero or the expressway like grade separations through our residential neighborhoods is my vision of the community either.

Chair Berman: Thank you. So love your questions, love your comments and I agree with Greg that--if staff were to come back to us what is the process for determining whether or not we can get approval on two percent, and to Tom's point, who do we talk to? Do we need to talk to UP during, you know--that would just be helpful to--and that's kind of the high level issue we need answered before we really know what our options are? Does the estimates that involved takings--do those include the cost--we talked about this a year and a half ago, it does include the cost of taking as of a year and a half ago?

Mr. Canepa: Yes. That was assumed it's on--there's actually a second page to the--as the right of way in it.

Chair Berman: Okay. To that point, can we--and Richard, you and I talked about this whole last night, is it possible to get this presentation electronically to the council members?

Mr. Hackmann: We can have it post online. It can't be emailed because it's so large, but will have it posted online.

Chair Berman: Okay. If that's possible, that's great. And then, quick comment, to Greg's point, I said this a year and a half ago. I was looking at

TRANSCRIPT

my quote, I was quoted in the paper where I said, taking the 50 parcels is an absolute non-starter. It would be devastating to the community, that hasn't changed in a year and a half. So, I do agree that you should have it out there as, you know, what would happen if we were to use that alternative. We should make it clear that it's really not one that we're seriously considering, which is why it's all the more important we figure out what the process is on getting approval on two percent and studying the possibility of three percent. So let's move on to Joshua and his presentation so we can talk about the program manager and the engagement piece of this. Thank you.

Mr. Mello: Good morning. I'm going to give you a brief overview of our proposal to bring on a Rail Program Manager. Back in October, City Council made two motions related to rail in Palo Alto and outlined in this presentation, I'm going to talk about how we addressed some of the elements of that. You remember at our last community meeting, we talked about some of the other elements of that motion from October 13, and how staff was working to address those. And then following the presentation, we'll take your directions on how to proceed, you know, with or without a Rail Program Manager. So the part of the motion on October 13, that were aiming to address with the Rail Program Manager, is to develop a first phase circulation study and also develop a preliminary plan for a CSS approach to addressing the rail impacts and the future of Palo Alto and the mid-Peninsula. An overview of our recommendation is that we developed an RFP immediately following this meeting for a Rail Program Manager and we hope to retain an individual or a firm with rail expertise to take the lead on these items and I'll go through the tasks that we envision for this Program Manager. The goal would be to find someone who is, you know, both experienced in the intricacies in rail engineering, but also have effectively managed large infrastructure planning, community engagement projects and ideally does not have a conflict of interest with High Speed Rail, which could be, you know, a tough sell, but we'll do our best to find appropriate candidate. The first task that we envisioned for the Rail Program Manager would be the staff the City Council Rail Committee, so this person would prepare agendas, take notes, prepare presentations and then provide you with updates on Grade Separations, High Speed Rail and the Envision Silicon Valley sales tax measure. The second, and this comes directly from direction that you gave us from the last rail committee meeting. The second task would be to convene a rail technical group and this would be a standing group of local rail experts to serve as technical advisors to both the program manager and the rail committee. And the Rail Program Manager would manage this group, prepare agendas, take notes, prepare presentations,

TRANSCRIPT

convene regular meetings of this technical advisory group and bring, you know, issues such as the grade of the rail corridor and technical issues like that to our local experts. The Rail Manager would also give you updates on those meetings as they were necessary. Task three would be to manage a Grade Crossing Circulation Study. So our vision of this Grade Crossing Circulation Study and we would welcome your comments on whether we've kind of scope this appropriately, but based on your directions on October 13th, I think this would be a step back for Palo Alto, where we look at every single grade, existing grade crossing within the city and we analyze you know, how important is it to maintain motor vehicle, bicycle and pedestrian circulation and each one of those if we did not have, you know, a circulation for motor vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, what would that--how would that impact the remaining grade crossing in the city circulations at work and the ultimate outcome of this circulation study would be kind of a prioritization of our grade crossings. How important are they, how important is grade separation at Churchill versus Meadow and Charleston and what does Churchill looks like future? Does it become a bike pedaling crossing? If so, how does that impact, you know Embarcadero and Charleston? This would be a community driven process, it would be a community conversation and managed by the Rail Program Manager, but likely conducted by a separate consultant that specializes in these type of studies. So the Rail Program Manager would serve as the kind of the program manager while other, more specialized consultants would actually conduct the work of the circulation study. Task four would be to manage the context sensitive solution process, so feeding directly out of the circulation study would be a focus on specific grade crossings so, you know, the priority crossings that were identified from the circulation study, those would immediately feed into a larger community conversation around what the impacts would be of different alternatives to separate those grade crossings. If we are seeking state and federal funding, ultimately, we need to follow, you know the SEQR and NEPA process, which you know, require that we look at all feasible alternatives and then twiddle those alternatives down onto the, you know, the community preferred alternative to locally prefer alternative and that would be this process. So we would put everything on the table with the understanding that some alternative would have impacts that are just not acceptable to the community as a whole and those would quickly be rolled out to through the environmental process. Just to clarify, the Rail Program Manager would be preparing the RFP to procure a well skilled community engagement consultant that is trained in context sensitive solutions to conduct to that CSS study. So I see kind of concurrent with the CSS study, we would also be working on preliminary engineering so council may have heard, you mentioned that's an interactive process. One of the things we're

TRANSCRIPT

going to need moving through the process is to be able to look at the impact of different design decisions, so the goal would be to have a rail engineering firm onboard that could do some preliminary engineering and also start work on a project study report, which is kind of the first step at getting the project moving forward in California, typical transportation project and we would wrap up kind of this first phase with a preparation of environmental impact report. Another important task that we envision for the Rail Program Manager is to represent the interest of the city during the High Speed Rail environmental clearance phase, so this Rail Program manager, you know, ideal would be someone who could talk the talk, you know as the ERR progresses and High Speed Rail starts to look at some of these, you know, issues around noise and community impacts and this would be somebody, we would have somebody on board that can go toe to toe with the High Speed Rail Authority. Review documents in detail, comment on them, prepare information for you to consider at your meetings related to that environmental process. And we've done kind of the back of the envelope a good estimate what all of this would cost. It's about \$1.8 Million over two years, two and half years. The Rail Program Manager would likely be at half time to three quarter time position. We don't see it full time. It would likely be a contract position. We could probably find enough work for someone if it was full time, but based on kind of a half to three quarter time estimate, we think it would be about a \$100,000 per year. We have 50,000 reserve from our transportation contingency this fiscal year to cover the--if we were to bring somebody onboard immediately, we have \$50,000 to cover between now and June 30th. We have asked for a \$1000,000 next fiscal year and the following fiscal year to fund that position. Our back of the envelope estimate for the Grade Crossing Circulation Study is 100,000 to \$200,000. We've submitted a request in CIP funding for fiscal year 2017 to cover those cost. And then the Context Sensitive Solution Process would run somewhere around \$500,000. That's for a very robust community engagement process, lots of public meetings, lots of back and forth about what the appropriate solutions are and we've also requested \$500,000 in CIP funding and FY 7 gene for that and then the final piece would be the preliminary engineering project study report and the environmental impact report. Our best guess at that is about \$1 Million and we've requested CIP funding and FY 18 for that, so basically a year and a half out. We have not looked beyond that. I think we would need to have a discussion about what occurs after we wrapped up the environmental study, but this is the first step as we envisioned of getting Grade Separation moving along the appropriate path.

Chair Berman: Thank you very much. Now I'll open it up to colleagues for questions and comments.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member DuBois: Just real quick, I think I understand the surplus for study, but it sounds like it would look like changes in traffic based on changes to configurations. Is that correct?

Mr. Mello: It would look at, you know, how the current Grade Crossing are operating. How important are they as a connection for motor vehicles transit, bicycles and pedestrians and then you, know, I can see looking at what happens if it's closed? What happens if it's converted to just bike pad only? What is, you know, it's four lanes today, became two lanes in the future? What does that--you know, that may save money, but it may not handle the traffic demand and then it would seek to prioritize based on how valuable the Grade Crossings are to the community, you know, which one should we be focusing on in order to wisely invest in Grade Separations.

Council Member DuBois: I think one item of concern there would just be that we really look at impacts on side streets and maybe not immediately, you know, sometimes it seems like we look at that subset at the intersection site. I think everyone who's here feel really strong at bottom up modeling piece Palo Alto condition, not using kind of top down regional forecast, but take a look if we shut down Churchill cars, you know, what happens at Embarcadero? Would people have to cut through side streets to get to Stanford, for example. On the manager, right now, we're covering some of the work going to High Speed Rail meetings and keeping with kind of train activity. Who does that work now and are they going to be freed up to do other things?

Mr. Mello: Currently Richard, myself, Assistant City Manager Ed Shikada and Hillary have kind of been sharing the burden, but to be honest with you, I don't feel like we're able to give it the attention that it deserves and I think we really need to get a program manager on board to help, especially as the environmental work for high speed rails starts to ramp up.

Council Member DuBois: Okay. And it sounds like--one of the questions I have is kind of full time, part time. Sounds like you're thinking it's kind of half time.

Mr. Mello: That's our thinking. The RFP would have a scope of work and it would really be up to the consultant to propose what their work plan would be to deliver that scope of work.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member DuBois: One of the decisions here is whether we're really hiring an individual or a firm and I think that's a big topic for discussion. There could be a phase approach where the consulting firm, because we have a lot of work here, over a long period of time, I'm not sure what we're going to do.

Hillary Gitelman, Director for Planning and Community Environment: I thank you Council Member Dubois. That's a point I wanted to interject. We're in a really tight hiring market right now. Also a lot of transportation expertise and firms around the state have been focused on getting work on High Speed Rail and obviously, we want to find someone who is not conflicted in a material way. I think we would be opened to either hiring an individual or a firm and if it is a firm or a collected of individuals who bid on this, they can potentially do some of the work and save us a step of having to procure additional services. And we'd be really open to either solution. I think the tight hiring market right now in recruiting talent--the fact that's so difficult is going to end up informing which direction we go.

Council Member DuBois: How quickly do you think we would get somebody. Is this going to be nine months before we--

Ms. Gitelman: Well, we see this as really urgent. The Committee wanted to see the scope of work, but if you're okay with it, this is a City Manager kind of administrative decision to release a request for proposals. We would get that out as soon as we could and try and get someone on board as quickly as possible.

Council Member DuBois: Question about the rail technical group in terms of how necessary it is and I'd like to hear from my colleagues on that, but I'm thinking that we could have a lot of local expert's participate in this meeting and you know, could we do it all as part of the Rail Committee or do we need a separate technical group. There's also some comments on here that focused down Palo Alto would be easier to manager and I get that, but I really think there's an opportunity here and a lot of benefit to starting off with a larger view of the regional effort and I understand that's harder, but I believe it's really important. We shouldn't just give up on that right away. If you want to comment, you can. I think a multi city effort potentially between Santa Clara and San Mateo Counties. It's really looking at, again, improving the rail corridor in the heart of the Peninsula potentially from Mountain View to Atherton and Redwood City. We could do something to

TRANSCRIPT

solve our own problems, but I think we could maybe come up with a streamline solution that would involve other cities.

Ms. Gitelman: Thank you for proposing that question. I think this is something we would really like to hear from the full committee on and potentially the full council. I think, you know, we as professionals, do feel like if we broaden this to try and solve the problems of the Peninsula, we're not going to make the kind of progress that we could make if we focus like a laser on Palo Alto Grade Separations and so, you know, this becomes kind of a policy and a strategic call I think the full council would have to make and I don't know whether now is the right moment to pose that question or whether it's at some point once we start in on the circulations study.

Council Member DuBois: I agree, it's a full council, but I want see us push on it before we just default to Palo Alto only. As I was thinking through the consultant, I think some goals, for me, a goal is a regional solution. I think, again, a quick path to being shovel ready is to see who's going to get funds. I think we need to keep that in mind and to Council Member Scharff's point, you know, if we could eliminate options because they're not palpable, that will save time. I think we need to be focused on that. That should be made clear in the RFP. Leveraging funding, you know, we have a electrification coming, but I think the cost on that is rising. It's not clear when that's going to start, so if we're able to do work once and you know, not be going back and redoing electrification, for example, that would be great. I think another point though that was embedded in here with the consultant, is the ability to write grants and secure funding and didn't really come out, but there was a lot of engineering in there, but I think ability to go out after federal grants and look at things like maybe some of the freight opportunities like those in the trench, that would be pretty interesting. Thanks.

Mayor Burt: Thank you. Pat.

Chair Berman: Just a couple of comments. When Josh spoke a couple of times on in the circulation evaluation looking at whether we need to retain everything we have. But actually, i want to make sure we add we're considering where we might be able to improve circulation, in particular if we have a trench, that opens up a lot of alternatives in particular biking. Ped crossings, we've had a long term goal to have a grade separating crossing in South Palo Alto roughly between East Meadow and Oregon, and so I'd certainly would want to have that on the table as a consideration.

TRANSCRIPT

Falling on what Tom had talked about on grants, also I think that in particular, the EIR aspect of this and maybe more would be potentially eligible for funding or reimbursement from the VTA tax measures if that go through and having the buckets of funding that we're hoping to see. The CSS process funding strikes me as high having gone through this with fair amount of work on looking at what it would entail for the whole Caltrain system five years ago. I know that (Nadia Niak) from Card did a great deal of work and really brought in experts on this so we can begin the draw for that. And then we are going to have a dilemma finding firms that don't have a conflict. I mean, in particular High Speed Rail when Prop 18 went through, the organization pushing that ballot measure basically insisted that virtually every perspective contractor in sub-contractor contribute to funding the ballot measure and then most of those have subsequently worked directly or indirectly for High Speed Rail sense and there aren't a whole bunch of experts sitting out there who aren't in the category unfortunately. So we're going to have that challenge.

Chair Berman: Thanks Pat. Greg.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So I do think that the way we scope out the circulation, you're planning on bringing that back to the committee before you move forward on that?

Mr. Mello: We could that. I think we can also write the scope of work broadly enough that we could, you know, after we retained a firm that we feel is qualify, we could help shape the work plan with them.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I thought Tom had some good points on the circulation study. I also thought, for instance, if we return Churchill into a bike and pedestrian only, then what we may want do to is on Embarcadero, make sure it goes four lanes all the way through because right now, it turns to three, bottom of the bridge. I mean, I'd like to see those kind of things in the study determine how do we improve circulation because I agree, the goal should be to improve circulation, you know, everywhere. I think that circulation study is really important. I had some concerns about the hiring manager. I guess I totally got the sense you haven't quite thought it through yet in terms of--so you're thinking of hiring a part time person, right, that's what you said, three quarters, have time person or a firm, but assume you hire a person for now. Is that right, three quarters, half time?

TRANSCRIPT

Ms. Gitelman: Yeah. I think we're talking about bringing in a rail expert. Someone who's worked in this field who has time to contract with us (Crosstalk)

Vice Mayor Scharff: They wouldn't be an employee; they'd be an independent contractor?

Ms. Gitelman: They'd be a contractor.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Okay. That's an important distinction. So they're an independent contractor--so what you're doing is hiring a firm or an individual consultant.

Mr. Mello: I'm sorry if there's confusion around that. The number that I presented, was just a best guess based on, you know, what the billing rate would be for someone working not full time, but somewhere around half or three quarters.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So there'd be no benefits. They wouldn't be a city employee. They'd be a consultant on an hourly based.

Ms. Gitelman: Contractor, yes.

Vice Mayor Scharff: And then you'd look for someone who, you know, this is a multiyear process. Right? So you really want someone who commits over the multiyear process for this. And so the notion is if we get out an RFP, were you thinking of going to full council to get authority to get the RFP out or--I heard something about, well the city manager can get that out.

Ms. Gitelman: I think we're interested in committee's input on the scope of work, but then we would issue the RFP and the contract would come to the council.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Okay. I think if we're really going to do this, I agree with you, we need a hiring manager. I mean, I think that's--cause frankly how this actually works, will have a lot to do with who you hire as the hiring manager and how that process is run. And are they going to be doing the Context Sensitive Solution as well or is that going to be someone separate? I mean, I'm thinking about the skills. All the skills that you need, I mean, there's a big difference between understanding rail and having the technical

TRANSCRIPT

expertise and how to handle the community engagement. This strikes me as a--

Mr. Mello: If they end up being an individual, I think from that perspective, our ideal candidate would be someone retiring, you know, who just worked on the central subway project in San Francisco, for example. Someone with, you know, a boat load of experience with large infrastructure projects. If it ended up being an individual, I think they would need to contract out the Context Sensitive, so they would prepare an RFP and you know, find a firm that could assist them with the Context Sensitive Solutions. If it ends up being a larger firm, that's not conflicted, which would be pretty hard to find in California, then they may have the ability to the circulation study and the CSS work in house and we would be contracting with the firm. So I think, as Hilary mentioned, we probably have to leave it open because of the way the market is today. We don't know who's out there, we don't know if we'll get a candidate like the one, you know, the preferred candidate that we'd like to get.

Vice Mayor Scharff: And I just wanted to comment on Tom's notion of making it broader in Palo Alto. I don't really understand it to be honest. We can talk about it more offline maybe, but I think we need to immediately move this forward and have a laser focus on Palo Alto on our Grade Separations. I wasn't quite sure what you wanted to achieve on that, so-- my big concern is that we don't achieve anything and that we don't move forward quickly enough and we don't get our share of funds, while going through a long process frankly. I think if we open it up--I don't quite see how you open it up to the community, talk about other people's Grade Separation and broadly in the community, so I would just, for now, advocate for definitely keeping incentive in Palo Alto, focusing on that.

Chair Berman: Thank you. If it's quick yeah, and then let's kind of assume we're going to put that to a further conversation amongst the council.

Council Member DuBois: I'd definitely like to talk to you offline, but a big part of my thinking is set in terms of national, state level funding solving Palo Alto's problems, whether or not it rises to that level. (Inaudible) in Silicon Valley's problem, again considering changes in the economy, the freight on the Peninsula, but also just the transportation issue along the entire (Inaudible). We might actually tap into much bigger set of funding and I just want to consider that. The piece meal solution, the train

TRANSCRIPT

potentially going up and down as it goes to different cities doesn't seem like a good solution. Let's talk about it more,

Chair Berman: In the interest of moving this along, I'll save any questions I have for the next time this comes back up whenever and what they are, but you know, I think the need is clear and obviously, one of the biggest issues on whether or not we're regional or laser focus is timing and what that would mean in terms of and what we might jeopardize the longer this process takes. So staff was looking for I guess comments and suggestions. Do you need anything more from us at this point or--I mean, is the plan to come back to--

Ms. Gitelman: I think we've got the input we needed. I guess there's one outstanding question, which is Council Member Boise pose this question about whether we really want the scope to include this additional outreach committee, you know, technical committee.

Chair Berman: Is that something that would have to be determine early on or is that something that could be--

Ms. Gitelman: I guess we could put in the scope and request for proposals and then if we decide to defer to later, we can.

Chair Berman: Yeah, I think that makes sense. I mean I think a lot of colleagues all comments on that, but we don't necessarily have a time to address it right now. You guys don't need anything else from us on this item?

Vice Mayor Scharff: You don't need any motions or anything? You're just going to go ahead and do the RFP?

Ms. Gitelman: On this one, I think we just appreciate the committee's input and we'll proceed.

Chair Berman: Do you agree with that?

Council Member DuBois: Well, before I make a motion, I have a strong preference for a firm if we can find one.

Chair Berman: Understanding the challenges of--

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: I think thinking about how we structure it, I think we'd have to release two separate RFPs; one for an individual with a descript scope of work and for a firm and we'd have to see what kind of responses we got.

Mayor Burt: So what staff's next step based on what has occurred today?

Ms. Gitelman: We will work prepare the balance scope of work and get an RFP out on the street. Then when we get responses, we'll be able to determine, you know, which approach makes more sense and bring in a contract to the council.

Mayor Burt: I don't know if we're ready to support that based on the amount of discussions we've been able to have and I'm just wondering whether we should continue this to our next rail meeting. It would me we lose a month, but I found this interesting, informative, but it's--and certainly going out for the RFP doesn't bind us, but I just don't know if we're ready to have authorized direction of the RFP to the extent that--

Vice Mayor Scharff: I guess I understood it that we really weren't authorize it, we were going to let them go do it. We could stop it, I supposed, but we weren't going to take a vote or anything like that. They were just going to go to it and then if we had a real problem with it, we could obviously pull back. I guess I'm not seeing any really other alternatives to having somebody run the rail program. I think we should move forward, do the RFP. but if you think about it, you come back and (Inaudible) do it and say, you know, here's another approach, but I don't really see a viable--I mean, staff told us they can't do it. That's what I've heard.

Mayor Burt: And I'm not saying I'm opposed to the concept. I'm just questioning whether we're ready to give our support to staff moving ahead based on what has been thought through today and maybe it's fine, I just have that concern.

Council Member DuBois: I'd like to get moving on the circulation study. I think it likely be phased, but--that's my two cents. We should move forward.

Chair Berman: Do colleagues want to vote on this or are we okay with just kind of saying all right--

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Scharff: Pat, you're okay with moving forward if we--

Mayor Burt: Yeah, I supposed so. I sort of thing I want to--I prefer to think more about--we didn't get really chance to either have information, discuss it much in advance, so.

Chair Berman: We haven't talked about it. Our committee meetings schedule, but this is something that we can come back in early February if folks need more time to get comfortable with it. I mean, I guess--

Mayor Burt: Well, it sounds like I'm the one who has the undefined reservations. So I'm okay with them going ahead with an understanding that we may come up with questions or so in the upcoming weeks.

Chair Berman: Perfect. Thank you. So we're going to move on then to item number two, which is Envision Silicon Valley County Sales Tax Measure; North County and West Valley Cities Position Advocacy. Now a quick time check, Council member DuBois has mentioned that he has a hard stop at 10, which is in five minutes. But obviously this is something that's timely, so I don't know, Tom if you have a--

Council Member DuBois: I just pushed it back to 10:30.

Chair Berman: Perfect. So let's have the staff presentation then. I know we have currently three members of the public who want to speak to this. If any member of the public wants to speak to this item please turn in your speaker guard as soon as possible, so that we have an ability--we all have a hard stop at 10:30, so there will be no going past 10:30. Thank you.

NO ACTION TAKEN

2. Envision Silicon Valley County Sales Tax Measure: North County and West Valley Cities Position Advocacy.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Great, thank you. I will keep my presentation extremely brief because I think you're all relatively familiar with what's transpired recently. I don't have a presentation; I'm going to walk through the staff report that was prepared. Basically, back in August 17, 2015 City Council gave staff direction as to which projects to submit for the upcoming Envision Silicon Valley Sales Tax Initiative. And then in

TRANSCRIPT

October 13th we had another follow-up meeting where we presented the status of the Envisioned Sales Tax Discussion; Envision Silicon Valley Sales Tax Discussion and you gave us direction to advocate for and support putting in the county-wide funding measure, funding for county-wide Caltrain Grade Separation in the order of 15% and that was a minimum that you set. And that was separate from any additional funding that was requested from Cal Train for the sales tax revenue. And you also asked us to check in with you when the measures started to take shape and there's been some recent developments and thus, we did want to check in with you at this time. On January 8th, Mayor Burt, City Manager Jim Keene, Assistant City Manager Ed Shikada, and myself attended a meeting of the North County and West Valley Cities at Mountainview City Hall. And at that meeting there was a draft framework for purposed allocations under the Envision Silicon Valley Sales Tax that was presented to the group. This framework was based on, kind of discussions that have had occurred over the last several months between the North County and West Valley cities. There were minor modifications made to this framework at the meeting on January 8th. And the end of that meeting it was kind of confirmed that each of the North County and West Valley cities that were open to it would bring it back to their respective City Councils and get direction on this framework, so on page five of the staff report we have included a table which shows what that, you know, what the allocations are within that framework. And since that January 8th meeting, Mountain View City Council has endorsed this framework that occurred on January 19th. Campbell and (Cooperation) have scheduled council meetings to consider approving this framework for February 2nd. (Sunnyvale) is also going to consider this framework but they have not set a council date. And (Mosquitos) has a study session on February 22nd, where they will also consider this framework. And I'll just briefly give you a quick overview of what the proposed allocation includes. There will be a ceiling of \$1.2 billion established for Bart to San Jose. Cal Train improvements would be allocated \$400 million. A comprehensive county-wide Railroad Grade Separation Program, similar to what's in place in San Mateo County, would be allocated \$900 million which is 15%. That meets the threshold that you established for staff on October 13th. The Congestion Relief Transit Mode shift category, which would basically implement the recommendations of the regional transportation study that was requested by the North Country, West Valley cities would be allocated \$500 million. And then expressways; County Expressways and key highway interchanges would receive \$1 billion. Street and highways; 500 million, and then the local streets and roads Formula Program, which would be flexible for cities that have a high pavement condition index; they will be able to flex that funds to other uses, like bicycle and pedestrian improvements; would

TRANSCRIPT

be allocated \$1 billion. And then finally, there is a line item for bicycle and pedestrian improvements, which is shown at \$500 million. The direction that we received at the meeting of the North County and West Valley cities was just to bring this forward to City Council and see if you are willing to, you know, establish this framework as our advocacy position related to allocations under the Envision Silicon Valley Sales Tax.

Chair Berman: Okay, thank you very much. We're now going to the members of the public, and I apologize because I hate doing this, but due to the time constraints we're going to do two minutes for public comment, as opposed to three minutes. The first speaker is Herb Borock.

Herb Borock: Yes, Chair Berman. My first comment is "I'm surprised this is before the committee". Mello said-- summarized what the council did; they wanted staff to come back to council. When the council reformed the rail committee it didn't change the (preview) of the committee. This was originally a High Speed Rail Committee and then the committees' recommendation it was expanded to be the Rail Committee (plus) the committee also wanted to be also discussing Cal Train. And so, while there are a bunch of rail issues in the (VTA) tax proposal, they're not all about rail. And if the committee wants it's (preview) extended it can recommend that to the Council, and if the staff wants to do that; the staff can recommend that. But just because there is a committee existing and they want to get four people to go along with something, I don't think you just bring it to the committee. My second comment is you do have the advocacy position that's being recommended, but I suggest you look back earlier in the report where it says the discussion on bark is also possibly to Santa Clara. When Carl Guardino was before the council, he neglected to say anything about Santa Clara, just talking about money to San Jose, so I think that should be firmer especially sense the money is fungible. Finally, I think the measure should legislative component and that is having no bus rapid transit in the North County. I believe the north and west cities can agree to that. How it's phrase in the language legislator language, such as would there be a specific time period or what we require for the future vote are details. But a supervisor subcommittee adviser you, the one thing that could probably defeat the CVA sales tax measure is the concerns about bus rapid transit and therefore, I think it would be worthwhile as an advocacy position to include language in the measure that would prohibit that for a period of time. Thank you.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair Berman: Thank you very much. Next up we have Adina Levin follow up by Roland Lebrun. I don't see Adina here. She is here? She's out so let's move on to Roland Lebrun.

Roland Lebrun: Thank you and another CEI supporter (Inaudible), but you've got to be realistic and \$400 Million is basically a drop in the bucket, is a down payment. I hope you'll give me a little bit of leeway because I'd like to then follow up with what you discussed earlier. I support Mayor Burt's concern earlier. You really got to wait until February to decide what you want to do. This is potentially going to be a game changer. When you get to that, at the end of the day, you got to ask what are we trying to do here and people are going to say, well you can't possibly go from San Jose to San Francisco in 30 minutes, which is what they're planning and that's a fact. That's what's going to be transpiring in court and having listened to your members here, your concern on impacts on Palo Alto, you should actually consider working with both the north and the south because if you do that at that point, you can actually have tunnel all the way from Sunnyvale to Redwood Johnson. It's going to cost you a \$1.5 Billion, but then add up all the Grade Separation for the others, you know, it might actually be cost effective. The only problem you got, now you can do 140 a line in the tunnel, okay, you can run Churchill in either direction. The problem is you don't have any stations anymore, okay. It's going to go Zoom and in Palo Alto, you're never hear it, you'll never see it. If you own a station at that point, it's going to be \$0.5 Billion. Now you've got to start thinking about Mountainview. This is the reason why you want a rail technical group because we need more than two or three minutes to address you and propose alternate solutions that you might want to consider. Thank you.

Chair Berman: Thank you very much. Our last speaker is Chris Lepe.

Chris Lepe: Hello good morning. Did everyone received--I sent a letter a couple of days or yesterday. Did everybody receive the letter? I have a few extra copies if you like one. So I just wanted to refer a letter from myself and several Palo Alto residents and I just want to start off by noting that this is--what's obvious here is this is a huge opportunity here, which really only comes around every 15 to 20 years. Given the population growth and the strain on the existing system and existing demand and other social environmental consideration like climate change, this is a really important process and I like to thank the City of Palo Alto for its advocacy thus far and really pushing more funding for transit and really looking at other innovative ways then just widen up our roads as a way to address traffic congestion and population growth. We know that you can't widen your way out of

TRANSCRIPT

traffic congestion based on what we've seen. Other cities have embraced similar concepts in Mountainview, actually, just a little bit of a note about the mountain view council meeting, other they did recommend continue to work with other cities on existing proposal, they did also say that they wanted to put more money for transit and less for expressway highway category, which is one of our recommendations. So you'll see in the report that we have a recommendation today to reduce the funding in that pot and increase funding in the pot for transit outside of Caltrain and Bart because there are huge amount of needs outside the Caltrain and Bart corridors, including for example increasing the frequency of the VTA Transit Network outside of--or in the areas of greatest needs and demand. Some of the other recommendations are including a complete street requirement for local streets and roads paving to make sure that there are multi-level benefits with the investments that we make. Maximizing benefits across multiple social and environmental goals and allowing for flexibility use of the express way funding. Thank you.

Chair Berman: Thank you and Chris, can you have a copy of the letter? I mean to print it out, but forgot. So I'd like to always have a copy, so with that, I'm going to turn it back to--is there any other comments to go over to colleagues and some of you folks might have updates on certain meetings I've attended?

Mayor Burt: Let me start with a couple of comments and framing. One is that this proposal is likely part of an ongoing initiative process and we don't want to have it misunderstood that we're assuming that there won't be back and forth and there're really three principles, four principle parties involved; the VTA, the County Board Advisors, the local cities and Silicon Valley Leadership Group. So we want to continue to have just ongoing discussions and moving forward on that. We've heard that, I think Josh had shared with us and we've heard otherwise the leadership group has concerned that north and west county cities had gone forward with a specific proposal as Josh explained as going before various council for their support without engaging with leadership group. Out of fairness, the leadership group had been engaging with the cities and to some extent had modify their original proposal from both a year ago and a few months ago. So I think that's something we'd want to bear in mind and collaborate on even while we recognize that each of these parties, you're not going to have identical interest, nor identical proposals. I do think that we're going to want to think about how at a high level to make a stronger case for why the interest of Caltrain improvements are as strong as we believe they are. I think they can be centered around three arguments that we frankly haven't heard for a

TRANSCRIPT

long while from San Jose and the leadership group. They basically acknowledge that Caltrain has importance and they support additional funding for Caltrain, we just happen to think it's more important, so on a comparative basis, if there is a third measure for which Bart has had major focus then previous ones, overwhelming focus, and that is Caltrain, for the capital dollars that would be invested in the Bart extension and the Caltrain improvements, the number of passenger miles you get per capital dollar invested or additional passengers, whichever metric you want to use. The second is the economic value to silicon valley and the region of each of these and (Inaudible) council a year and a half ago when they reached out to the corporate community and Sanford was involved in this, made a strong case for how the percentage of patents that are generated in the Caltrain corridor and the whole bunch of other arguments that were very persuasive about the importance of Caltrain and I think it actually is much stronger than the importance of Bart to San Jose, although we've agreed that Barto San Jose is an important element of the regional transportation system and it needs to be completed and we've supported that. And then we've heard from the leadership group several times that the polling support shows even greater support for the Bart completion to San Jose then for the Caltrain improvements and I think one of the things we haven't really talked about is that there has been 20 years of basically marketing around the value of the Bart extension with millions, and millions, and millions of dollars promoting a series of ballot measures to convince the public of the importance and no comparable campaign around the importance of Caltrain. So I think that's another comparison. I also just want to say that I think that the fifth item on Expressways--if I recall correctly, there was discussion at the north and west county meeting that Josh mentioned about congestion relief around Expressways and I think we should expand what we're supporting on that item of the perspective billion dollars, which came from some of these items were basically acknowledged in the interest of other parties. We weren't driving this, but as we had discussed in our council meeting with the VTA, we want to see those dollars be able to be used toward expressway congestion relief in the broad sense of traffic management and TDM measures rather than merely expressway expansions in capacity. I think that would be important to add. Thank that covers most of my comments.

Chair Berman: Thank you, Tom.

Council Member DuBois: So I was hoping Pat, you would explain a little where these percentages came from because that's pretty murky to me and I think it's a pretty huge decision in terms of relative funding in these different categories.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Burt: Well, they're not decisions. Essentially, you can think of them as bargaining positions that the North and West County cities are taking at this point and time. And there's an acknowledgement that, that's--this is going to be somewhat of a bargaining process, so don't think of them as--

Council Member DuBois: Okay. (Crosstalk) other cities were having their councils pass these percentage allocations.

Mayor Burt: But in the context that I just described.

Council Member DuBois: I'd like to comment on these. I'd like to see a relationship between (Inaudible) usage amount of funding and you know, I think it would be useful to look at San Mateo Alameda, which had recent tax measures where they broke it down into categories. I just think it's a useful comparison. Not that we're identical by any means, but in terms of relative magnitude of categories.

Mayor Burt: I should have added one other thing if I can because it's important for the context or our conversation. There was an acknowledgment by all those cities in attendance that we can take this back and each council come up with their own variation and undermine the consensus.

Council Member DuBois: Okay.

Mayor Burt: And so the notion was for us to not at this point in time, the city's try to put our variations on it, but to recognize that this isn't the end of the process.

Council Member DuBois: Okay. But we need the comments from the community about shift and priorities and-- When you look at this and Pat, I'm sure you're going to disagree, but the bike amount seems very high. It's higher than the amount for Caltrain, what surprised me. Most of the numbers are actually fairly inline. If you look at, for example, San Mateo, they have 30 percent for transit, we have 27 percent if you add Bart and Caltrain together, they had 15 percent for Grade septs, we have 15 percent for Grade septs. They had one percent for congestion, we had eight. They had 27.5 percent for expressway streets and highways, we have 25 percent and they had 22 percent for local streets, we have 17 and they had three for bikes, we had eight. So they're fairly borderline, maybe some minor shift, I understand that may change during negotiation. I would like to say when

TRANSCRIPT

we talked about the county plan for the expressway, that was as study session we didn't take a vote. I think it's still a very dangerous situation at 280 (Inaudible) cars backed up to the freeway and I supported the county plan with the bike improvements. Again, I think it really changes the flow more than capacity to get people off the freeway. So we never did really vote on that and I would actually support that and I think increasing congestion relieve to eight percent is a good amount. TDM programs are cheaper than construction, so. The other part of this was in terms of maintaining consensus with other cities. I think that's a good goal, I am concerned about how realistic that is given everybody's different situation. Our focus on Caltrain where perhaps (Inaudible) has different priorities. I think we should have that as a goal, but you know, I would like to see us maintain our focus on Grade Separations, you know, and again, we would remain online and we get this change to the tax, but we still have potential conversation about, you know, if we don't get money for grants substance for Palo to do something different.

Mayor Burt: I should add that this concern over whether, we'll call West Valley City's that aren't on the Caltrain Corridor, whether they're interest are align with the Caltrain cities. It's important to acknowledge that they actually ended up supporting this proposal that has a lot less in it for the West Valley cities and has a Caltrain emphasis. When you say it's \$400 Million for Caltrain, it's actually \$1.3 Billion because the Grade Separations are Caltrain.

Council Member DuBois: Yeah, but again, looking at other counties, they have separated trains improvement from Grade Separation, so. I think the right (Inaudible) is in there. The last comment I have is just I think we should bring this advocacy direction to the full council as an action item.

Mayor Burt: I thought that was what is being proposed to us.

Mr. Mello: This is just a recommendation to full council. If I could just clarify one item, the Bart to San Jose line item. That's purposely written as Bart to San Jose. Bart to Santa Clara, the estimated funding gap, you know, that was presented by the Silicon Valley Leadership Group is \$1.4 Billion. So \$1.4 Billion was the gap to go all the way to Santa Clara. In our current proposal, we have Bart to San Jose, \$1.2 Billion. I just want to make sure the Committee understands that if they elect to move this forward.

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Scharff: I also support the idea, but I'll make it clear this is not an endorsement of the DRT.

Mayor Burt: One quick thing Josh. Whether it 1.2 or 1.4, do you know if that takes into account the reason announcement of the gas tax shortfall and the cut back on the state transportation authority funding?

Mr. Mello: The funding for the Bart to Santa Clara extension that was outlined to me did not include gas tax revenue. It was cap and trade funding the \$1.4 Billion projective sales tax revenue and then the (Inaudible) by the USDOT to provide new start funding and also \$1.1 Billion in cost saving from the various Bart Extension. So my understand is that there was not any gas tax revenue allocated, but we can check on that before the council meeting.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Josh, I just want to confirm that the \$1.2 would get Bart to San Jose built and the extra \$200 Million is purely to go from San Jose to Santa Clara?

Mr. Mello: It's \$1.4 Billion to go (Inaudible) to Santa Clara, that's the funding gap when you've taking all the identified funding and subtract that from the total cost. I don't have a cost estimate on just getting to San Jose, but the argument against the \$1.2 Billion will be that it can get us all the way to Santa Clara and I think the logical response to that is go to San Jose with \$1.2 Billion and then, you know, find additional funding to go to Santa Clara. We could change that to just Bart to San Jose/Santa Clara, which I think was in the Mountainview proposal, but I think it's up to the committee to decide how to structure the Bart allocation.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Do we have the stats? I never really understood the benefits and the offset--and that's not --of going to Santa Clara, I mean-- some people have said it's closer to the airport, but I've never seen anyone actually lay it out the argument of why it's important to go to Santa Clara. Do you understand what the arguments of what's--?

Mr. Mello: I don't, but we can look into that before the council meeting too if you like and we can include that in the updated staff report.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I would like to understand that. I attended this meeting with Carl Gardino yesterday and a bunch of representatives from the North County, West Valley cities, and I think where they are seemed to

TRANSCRIPT

be somewhat flux and I will say that Carl took a very collaborative approach to wanting to work with the North County and the West Valley cities. I think that this is influx with their point of view, I mean, at least they were there advocating that they definitely agree that we should put Grade Separations for Palo Alto, Mountainview and Sunnyville in the ballot and that should be to the tune of \$600 Million, so I viewed that as a real positive step forward. It was unclear to me though how all that money breaks out because of a lot of the focus was on how much money are going to the North County and West Valley and Carl's indication was he thought it was somewhere in the order of 38 percent of the ballot money and went through that we're only at 37 percent of the vote, 20 percent of the voters, that kind of thing. And so we're actually doing better on that. I think this is a fluid and--I sort of see this as Pat said, iterative process. I see we talking about this, I see the Leadership Group looking, recalibrating their numbers, and the different cities talking about--one of the things that Carl did talk about up there, which I thought was interesting was a line item of \$250 Million for the West Valley cities for undefined transportation improvements, which is not on here. And the other number, which I think they had in their original numbers, which he was asking about why it's not on here, was \$300 for mass transit, which I take to be bus and stuff for seniors, disabled, and workers I think was the way it was phrased. So there was some of that there. There was a lot of discussion of, you know, Bart meets \$1.4 Billion and there was some representative from Sunnyville that indicated that they couldn't support this without \$1.4 for Bart.

Male: From Sunnyvale?

Vice Mayor Scharff: Yes, form Sunnyvale. I think that--I guess the question is some timing issue. When do we bring this to Council? When are we going to have an updated publicly release numbers or whatever, how this breaks down that we can talk about at the Leadership Group is putting force and responses because what I heard seemed very different to what they had before. Pat correct me if I'm wrong, I don't remember them having \$600 Million for Grade septs at all. I remember there being zero in for Grade sept. At least that's my recollection of it. And I didn't remember the West Valley think. I think that's new. So I'd like to see them break down the categories where they are now. I think this has to do a lot with timing when we go to council. I think we can go to council prematurely, but it may improve our bargaining position to go to council sooner. I think those sort of things need to be thought about and I don't really have good answers for that. I was going to sort of turn it back to Pat a little bit, talk about, you

TRANSCRIPT

know, the timing and the process you might want to see on this. What you think works.

Chair Berman: Sure. I just want to flag for colleagues that it's 10:26.

Mayor Burt: Well I think the consensus among the North and West Valley cities was to get it to the council right away so that basically it would be then be out there as a joint bargaining position and that's what's its primary focus was. So I would say we want to get it to the council as soon as possible.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So when are we thinking about going to council? That's really the question.

Mr. Mello: We were shooting for February 8th currently.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I also do not want to see us add in frankly to Tom's point about where we are on the expressways or anything into this. I may very well be supporting the county plan in my mind, with where I'm on this. I have to think about it a little bit, but I think it muddies the waters on this and creates us moving away from here's our bargaining position, here's what we want in terms of it. I think we can if you want, but I think that opens up (Crosstalk).

Mayor Burt: So my suggestion language would not bind us in any way. It just gives us more latitude to how cities and the county might use that expressway related dollars. It doesn't make that determination.

Vice Mayor Scharff: I'm not sure about that, I'll have to think about it. It may, but it may actually undermine the plan. There's like three components to that plan; there's you know, the 280 interchange, which I fully and absolutely support, I think we need to fix that 280 interchange. I think that's like \$300 million or something of numbers. Then there's the page mill to (Inaudible), there's another stretch of it. I'd have to have delve into the details to understand it a little better before I'm willing to say what we should do. I don't; necessarily think I want to mix all that up as we move. I think it's a complicated issue. What was the other?

Council Member DuBois: I just heard the \$600 Million versus the \$900 Million in Grade septs. From a negotiating position, should we actually be

TRANSCRIPT

asking for more than \$900 Million if we're going to negotiate down. I mean, it sounds like at a max \$900 (Crosstalk.)

Vice Mayor Scharff: Well, the \$600 Million--it was interesting, the \$900 Million was for a countywide. They were talking about was \$600 Million just for our three cities and I don't know how the numbers break out. I have no idea.

Chair Berman: One of the question is what are the needs of the other parts of the county? So I mean, if I can weigh in here. So it's 10:28, you know, clearly there's a lot of questions, there are still a lot of unknowns. Pat, correct me if I'm wrong, but the goal is to kind of set an early marker on this is generally what the North County, West Valley cities support knowing that it's going to change. I'm comfortable doing that at this point. I agree that, you know, at some point there needs to be, you know, more definition on expressways and streets and highways and the fact that that's just railway expansion, but it is transportation demand management, other transportation management initiatives. If there's a need for all of North County, West Valley cities to kind of show a unified front, at this stage, knowing fully that this is not written in stone, I'm comfortable with that. I do think we need to clearly schedule more time on this at council. Let's keep in mind this is something we all have issues about. There's no way I can sum up my comments in the next now zero seconds we have for this time and so let's make sure that we have enough time to have a good conversation about it, but I don't want us to necessarily stop the progress.

Vice Mayor Scharff: So let's recommend moving this forward to council.

MOTION: Vice Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member DuBois to recommend the City Council:

1. Approve advocacy direction to City representatives regarding the proposed Santa Clara County sales tax, including general funding levels within expenditure categories, as developed in coordination with other North County and West Valley cities.
2. Authorize the City Manager to engage with VTA and other stakeholders and refine the City's position and maintain consensus with other cities while supporting maximum regional funding for rail grade separations and non-automobile transportation improvements.

TRANSCRIPT

Vice Mayor Scharff: I do think we should have a council discussion. I think this is useful. I think this will actually move the Leadership Group substantially and I think we should move forward to council.

Chair Berman: I think Josh had a question.

Mr. Mello: Just so the direction is clear before you vote. Typically, an item forwarded from the Committee would go on the Consent Agenda. I'm hearing you want it to be an action item?

Vice Mayor Scharff: Absolutely.

Mr. Mello: Okay.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Well, the motion is for this council. It doesn't actually set--

Chair Berman: As an action Item.

Mayor Burt: I'll just add that right about the table it says it's recommended as advocacy position, so I just want to make sure once again that it's understood that we don't have to--

Council Member DuBois: Once again, that's worded strongly. Again, if at some point, we differ, I guess we're reserving the right to advocate for Palo Alto?

Mayor Burt: Yeah, but one of the things that need to--I mentioned it before, this proposal is--compared to what San Jose's interest would be and compared to what West Valley's interest would be, even though this may not be everything that we think would be are greatest preference for say the Caltrain, it's more than what is in the narrow interest to West Valley, for instance and it's different from what San Jose perceives to be in their interest, which may be different from their interest.

Vice Mayor Scharff: And let me just follow up with that. I think Pat is really right. I'd say it even stronger than that. I'd say, this--and I know Pat, you're really involved during this. This is a really positive West Valley, North County Palo Alto proposal compared--we would never do better than this really in my view the way the whole--I think we should strongly support as

TRANSCRIPT

close as we could get to this as possible and I think that when you write this to staff report to the council, I think that what Pat's been trying to say and what I'm advocating well and I think that's our little push back is that, if we all sit here and say, you know, I think we should have \$250 for bike pad and an extra \$250 for Caltrain, I actually might think that. What we'll do is we'll undermine the entire negotiating position and we have to be really careful about that. Mountainview passed that as it, to my recollection. Cupertino, I suspect will pass as is and I don't know what Campbell is, but that's sort how I think that's going. And so I think we need to basically move forward on this without nick picking it.

Chair Berman: I think that's good perspective and definitely correct. One quick comment on what you mentioned earlier Greg about Carl's point of we'd be getting 38 percent of the funding, but only 20 percent of the voters, you can't just pick and choose which ballot issue you want to talk about, so let's talk about all of them if we're going to be doing that, not just this one. So there's not a lot of weight there.

Vice Mayor Scharff: Excellent point. I wasn't during an advent sale, more reporting out.

Chair Berman: I totally understand. So, if we're already to vote, all in favor. That passes unanimously, thank you.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Future Meetings and Agendas

Chair Berman: And with that, do we have--we can schedule another meeting via email or something like that.

Richard Hackmann, Management Analyst: We can work it with the clerk for our next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:33 A.M.