



# CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE TRANSCRIPT

Special Meeting  
March 1, 2017

Chairperson DuBois called the meeting to order at 8:05 A.M. in the Council Chambers, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: DuBois (Chair), Filseth, Fine, Scharff

Absent:

## Oral Communications

Richard Brand: [Video Started Here] Good morning Council Members, Committee Members, and Staff. Thank you. Richard Brand, I live at 281 Addison and I'm here today to speak. I'm glad to see this Committee active. My whole thing of – I've been working with the San Mateo County which we know is just a mile away, on the renovation work of a long-delayed Dumbarton Rail Project. We all know from the work that's going on in the City with transportation that this is the priority and I would encourage this group – now that you're going to be active monthly, I'm glad to see that – to work in conjunction with the San Mateo County Transportation Commission on this project. There is an ongoing project with – in that organization and I've attended the meetings. They are supposed to have a report out in April and I made contact with the Committee – Council Member Berman last year and as you probably know, nothing really happens. I would encourage this year's Committee to take that under consideration. Last year I offered to be a liaison from the City to that group and there was no action. However, I think that San Mateo County people did contact somebody in the City. I don't know if that took place or not. I talked to Jim Keene about this and of course, we know Jim has been busy with other things lately but because University Ave runs from our border here – University down to Dumbarton Bridge, this is a big element for us and we all know the traffic conditions that exist in the City in the afternoon traffic trying to get onto that bridge. The vehicle bridge is overloaded. It's just insufficient to carry the demand and I encourage our Rail Committee to look into and actively reach out to the San Mateo County Transportations Commission to work with them on this project. Thank you.

# FINAL MINUTES

Chair DuBois: Is this on Oral Communications? Second speaker, Roland Lebrun.

Roland Lebrun: Yeah and is this working? Ok. It's very brief. There is quite a substantial communication from (inaudible) but the Packet that's on the table is incomplete. There's a – I mean there's a hand up, half way down letter and then there's a bunch of letters behind it that is missing. It would be nice to have the rest of the packet. Thank you.

## Agenda Review and Staff Update

### A. Receive and Review Rail Program Briefing Papers From November 2016, December 2016 and February 2017

Chair DuBois: Alright so we're going to move onto Item A which is the review of rail activity since our last meeting, which was in September of last year. I think it was 7 updates. Josh, (inaudible) (crosstalk).

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Sure. Included in your Packet – I'm Josh Mello, the City's Chief Transportation Official. Included in your Packet are three briefing papers, which cover a period extending all the way back to when we brought Mott MacDonald on as our Rail Program Manager. Our intent is to provide these to you at every Rail Committee meeting and key Action Items will be highlighted at the beginning of each briefing paper. This is part of the task that Mott MacDonald is charged with, to support the Rail Committee. Michele DiFrancia, Richard Davies, and Chis Metzger are here from Mott MacDonald today and Michele is going to give you a couple highlights from the briefing papers this month.

Michele DiFrancia, Mott MacDonald: Good morning. Michele DiFrancia with Mott MacDonald. There have been a lot of meetings that we've been attending as part of our program management service contract starting last fall; that's when we got started. I'll highlight a few of those meeting. The City and County Staff coordinating group for the Caltrain and High Speed Rail projects along the corridors has a meeting that occurs monthly. It supports the LPMG Group (Local Policy Makers Group), which I know some of you are involved with. The [CSCG] meeting met a couple of weeks ago, Caltrain and High Speed Rail Authority alternate each month with hosting those meetings. The one that was held a couple of weeks ago, and I'll give you a brief highlight. It was hosted by the High Speed Rail Authority. I think the big announcement at that meeting is that they have delayed yet again,

# FINAL MINUTES

the release of their preferred alternative for the San Francisco to San Jose section. It was originally set to come out early this year. They are now looking at August or summer time to release the preferred alternative. There's also a delay with the environmental document, that should be coming out – the draft document – in the fall, they note as October. Then the final environmental document will be sometime next year; still to be determined. Other meetings that we've been attending include Community Working Group of High-Speed Rail Authority as part of their project. There was a meeting about a month ago, I think those meetings are held quarterly. This one was hosted in Santa Clara – the City of Santa Clara. Other highlights just to give you a couple of other ones really quickly, include the Caltrain Electrification Project funding status. We included a briefing in our Packet to you on that. As you probably know, the funding at the federal level has been suspended. They've differed action on the 650-million-dollar funding – full funding grant and we're hopefully going to hear back I think, in the next 2 or 3 months. I believe Caltrain has sent out a press release since that time, noting that they're working with the contractor to extend their contract and working good faith together. There's also some information on recent announcements about Caltrain and UP Rail Road agreement. UP intends to hand over their freight operations to a short line operator and there's a lot of information in the Packet; I believe detailed agreements -- technical legal agreements that have been sent your way as well. I think that's it.

Mr. Mello: Alright, thank you.

Chair DuBois: I don't believe those were in the Packet, the agreements.

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: The agreements are not included. They were just tolling agreements that I think Molly can answer any questions on if we have – we couldn't get the actual agreement between UP and Caltrain.

Ms. DiFrancia: That's what we were told by Caltrain when we proposed the question to them. Does the tolling agreement include a language regarding the grade and they said, no. To their knowledge, there is no language specifying grades.

Chair DuBois: Do we have any other questions about the meeting so far? I had a few quick ones. What is the P3 procurement? It was mentioned in one

# FINAL MINUTES

of the reports for regional corridor approach it said it would be eligible for P3 funding. I wasn't sure what that meant.

Mr. Shikada: Is this for the HSR segment? (Inaudible) (crosstalk).

Chair DuBois: It was for grade steps, talking about multiple Cities. (Crosstalk).

Ms. DiFrancia: I'm not familiar – maybe it was Measure B funding?

Chair DuBois: No.

Ms. DiFrancia: No. I'm not sure about the P3 funding.

Chair DuBois: Since this is the first meeting with Mott MacDonald, what is Mott MacDonald's current status with High Speed Rail? Are you guys working on High Speed Rail?

Ms. DiFrancia: We currently are not, to the best of my knowledge.

Chair DuBois: If you were, is there a way we would isolate the City of Palo Alto from High Speed Rail activities within the company?

Chris Metzger, Mott McDonald: We have a formal methodology that we have done in the past for the previous studies. (Inaudible) something like that for the fire (inaudible).

Mr. Mello: If I could jump in. That was of one of the requirements in the RFP, was that they either have no work currently underway for the High Speed Rail Authority or that they form a firewall between the High Speed Rail work and the City of Palo Alto work.

Chair DuBois: Ok, great. Then just two other quick comments. One of the Reports, I think Page 11, mentioned other grade separation projects but it was mostly – it looked like Santa Clara County. It didn't include Menlo Park, Redwood City, and other San Mateo Cities so I would hope we would track those as well as they work on their grade separation.

Ms. DiFrancia: Yes, we've been in a data gathering process and so we have met with the City of Menlo Park and we're in contact with a Redwood City Representative and Burlingame, San Mateo are other ones that we're tracking. We can provide additional information in future Packets if you like.

# FINAL MINUTES

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I think that would be good. That last one, High Speed Rail – it mentioned that two of the three options would – could impact the passing tracks – could impact Palo Alto. Does that mean that those two options have four tracks in Palo Alto?

Ms. DiFrancia: Yes. I – we have not yet seen the track alignments because that was supposed to be provided as part of the preferred alternative that they are going to release in the summer. We could follow up with the High Speed Rail Authority and request the detailed design information. So far, they've just provided a conceptual line drawings at the meetings that we've been attending.

Chair DuBois: Yeah and that would be a huge impact to us. Great.

## Action Items

1. Review and Discussion of the Rail Committee Charter and Goals for 2017.

Chair DuBois: If there are no other questions, we'll move on Item 1 which is a discussion on the Rail Committee charter and goals. Thank you very much.

Hillary Gitelman, Director of Planning and Community Environment: Thank you Committee Members. Hillary Gitelman the Planning Director. Staff had a brief discussion with the Chair about starting off the Rail Committee's work this year with the discussion of the Committee's goals for the year. The Chair asked us to look at the charter that existed for the Rail Committee so we really have two options for you here. We went back and we found the charter and it's a little dated so we could either review and consider adopting a short list of goals and we have some suggestions on Page 2 of the Packet. Alternatively, the Committee could invest the time in reviewing and updating the charter, which would really have to go back to the full Council for adoption. Two choices ahead for you this morning and we're really at your disposal to discuss either one of these options.

Chair DuBois: If we have questions – I think we could do quick questions and then do we have any members of the public? Are there any quick questions?

Mayor Scharff: I have a quick question. I just want to make sure I understand what's Staff is suggesting. There are these high-level goals,

# FINAL MINUTES

which actually look fairly good to me. Then there's a bunch of stuff in the guidelines which probably should go back to the full Council because if we're going to embark on context sensitive solutions, I'm not so sure we should be so prescriptive saying not elevated alignment. I think if we are going to go to the community – we should basically go to the community with options on the table without pre-determined outcomes. I think that takes going back to the Council to relook at this so I'm not sure they are mutually exclusive.

Ms. Gitelman: Your right, the Committee could set its goals for the year and in parallel work on updating the charter with a goal of sending that back to the Council at some point during the year for an update. That's entirely up to you, we're happy to support either one.

Mayor Scharff: Ok, thanks.

Chair DuBois: We have one speaker, Herb Borock.

Herb Borock: Thank you, Chair DuBois, and good morning everybody. I sent you a letter that these guidelines as they refer to were last updated by the City Council. Since they are the City Council guidelines for the Rail Committee. Whatever the changes, if you make any, are recommendations to the City Council. Just as any other Committee of the Council, the normal process is to make recommendations to the Council. The Rail Committee originally had a section that granted the Committee the authority to act if it did not have the time to make a recommendation in a timely manner for the Council to act and according to the copy you have before you, that was deleted. Though I don't recall that process since it has been a number of years ago since it has gone through the previous Rail Committee. I believe that now that the local policy maker group of Caltrain has decision-making authority, it should also be treated in the same way and be included in the guidelines. It should be clear that this is Council policy that should be followed by Staff, as well as its Committees and its representatives. There was I believe, a local policy maker group meeting on the 23<sup>rd</sup>, last Thursday and I don't know what happen on that. Some of that is related to the next Agenda Item. I could talk about that in more detail at the time but just as an example, Mayor Burt last year reported what he was doing twice to the Council on LPMG. However, he did not provide the Council, which he had an opportunity to do, with a copy of the Resolution that he, himself, had participated in writing and that he did it at a time in the Council when nobody else could participate in the discussion and he took silence as

# FINAL MINUTES

consent. I think that's a reason, based on the history, to LPMG – I don't know who are representative is on the Committee. The Mayor is here so either he is or he has appointed somebody and since the roster for the first time has not been in the public Agenda Packet. When I checked it online, it doesn't indicate who's on that Committee. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Yes, I am on that Committee. Just so you know. The second speaker is Nadia Naik.

Nadia Naik: Hi. Good morning. I'm a little late. I may have missed some preamble but in regarding the guiding principles, I just wanted to say that the City made the commitment to contact Sensitive Solutions but I feel like since we are really embarking on this process, now that there is real money because of Measure B. I feel like we need to have a debrief for the entire Council about what CSS really is and we – there's an organization call Project for Public Spaces which is a non-profit that specializes in helping communities go through this stuff and it might be helpful to have them come out and speak to what CSS is so we can be sure that the guiding principles are supporting both the mission that the City Council has already decided on but then also, it helps us understand what types of guiding principles we need as we go through the CSS process. They may be covered by what we've done, we just wouldn't know but without having an expert in CSS to look at it, it's kind of a cart before the horse. I think there needs to be some updating but we should be open to the fact that it may need to be tweaked but I would also highly suggest that we bring in the CSS people. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Alright so we'll come back to the Committee for discussion. Anybody have any comments? Yes.

Council Member Fine: Just to a high level, when I was looking over these – the charter, it did seem a little narrow to me and I'm a little persuade by the one speakers comment that we need to be looking at things like Dumbarton also. I don't know if we want to make that a change here or if we go back to Council on that but I do think there are some expanded areas we should be looking at on this Committee. I'm also interested in what some of those speakers have said that we should be clear with our Council Colleagues about whether we want to be making policy here without their consent or explicitly with it that they are giving us the authority to do so. Then, Tom, you might do that for us on the Policy Maker Group and that's all clear from top to bottom.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mayor Scharff: I do think we should adopt these high-level factors. I do think that what Nadia said is interesting. We might want to consider having a debrief on what Context Sensitive Solutions means. I have some concerns about how long this will take and I think we need to get clarity on how the funds are going to be allocated. If it's going to be first come first serve? How soon do we need to have things that are shovel ready so we don't miss funds? I think we need to answer all these questions so we can make decisions. Then I think we have to have a timeline to make decisions and I think these are going to be difficult decisions about how we do grade separations. I don't want us to take this 5-year process and end up not doing grade separations. I think it's really incumbent upon Staff to look into this and tells us how this is going to work in terms of giving out the money; to the best, they can? We may not know yet, you may not know. Then to come up with a timeline and come up with a plan for how we go to the community, how we deal with choosing how the grade separations are done? I think that's – and what does – we say Context Sensitive Solutions and I think Nadia makes a good point. What is this exactly mean? I think we should understand that and we should understand the timing of that. I'm sure there are Context Sensitive Solutions – heavy in Context Sensitive Solutions—light and what that means? I think all of those should come before us and we should talk about it. The original Rail Committee – because things were moving too fast with High Speed Rail, did have the ability to write letters and stuff if they couldn't go to Council. To the extent that this Committee is not under a time gun, I think it should go to Council and should be the same as all other Committees go. If we come up with something that is an anonymous vote, we should try and put it on Consent. If we can't come up with it, then we should go to Council and talk about it. I am very concerned about our guiding principles that are here. I think a lot of them are really outdated and I think we should take the time at the Committee, frankly, to rethink of all these and maybe today is not necessarily the day to that but I do think we should agendize it. We should think through which ones we want if there are other ones we want and then we should go to Council. If we had unanimous agreement, then obviously, we could put it on the Consent but I do think we should spend the time to do that. There may be other ones we want to put in here. My other thought is, in listening to what Nadia said. I was wondering if that would be worthwhile to have – before we do a full Council on that, maybe we have the person come to the Rail Committee and explain Context Sensitive Solutions. We spend the time here to understand it and to vet it and then see if it's



# FINAL MINUTES

worthwhile to schedule a Study Session or whatever, for Council and we can make that decision. Those are my preliminary thoughts on this.

Chair DuBois: Eric.

Council Member Filseth: Just really briefly. I think that would be a good idea. I would love to have somebody come and discuss Context Sensitive Solutions with the Rail Committee here so that I have a better understanding of it. The only thing that I was going to say is that I'm stuck in here by the fact that other Cities in the region are already moving on grade separations strategies and we are still congealing on how we're going to approach this. I think we need too – I think that is the highest level – let me use the word urgency as opposed to the importance and I think we need to proceed expeditiously on it. If we have to make – not that we shouldn't look at other stuff but let's, make sure that that doesn't interfere with the grade separation effort.

Chair DuBois: Just a few quick thoughts. I think we're talking about potentially the largest change to Palo Alto since the Oregon Expressway went in so I think grade separation is a huge deal and I think it is going to be the major focus of this Committee. I think Council has already voted multiple times on CSS. I hear the both for the need of urgency as well as understanding what that means. I think maybe an approach would be for either us to familiarize ourselves with it individually but I think we should bring it to Council as soon as we can, just in that interest of time. Overall, I thought actually, most of the charter remained pretty good. I do think we could agendize and go through it in more detail. I think clearly, we need to go to Council to – for changes. There were a couple of ones that I just wanted to call out. I think Number 8 and Number 15 call for funding by High Speed Rail and I think we probably want to make that more flexible and that we now have Country funding sources. We want to look for multiple funding sources. I am concerned that some of the goals that were suggested might weaken some of the principles that are still valid. One of the goals says we're going to monitor high-speed rail and advocate for grade separation where we have quite a few principles about high-speed rail that I think are still valid and I don't want to necessarily drop those. Then also this other goal here that we undertake Context Sensitive Analysis but then the second point is that we consider results of community engagement. Those seem to be in conflict with each other. CSS is actually about community engagement and then coming up with a structured decision-making process. I'm not sure

# FINAL MINUTES

how we would do one without doing two. It's almost like two separate processes there. I do think from the speaker that we should restore the language about the role and authority of the Committee. I'm not sure where that language is or was and I think we should also include the LPMG role. It might good to also include the ability to continue to write letters if there isn't time but I think the general understanding is that we would go to Council. I don't know if we need to make a Motion or if Staff just wants to take that as an advisement to maybe agendize a more details review.

Ms. Gitelman: Yeah, we can put on a future agenda a closer review of the charter and just keep moving forward. Maybe take your direction on the next steps about a CSS briefing and a hard look at the schedule in the context of the next agenda item. Our expectation was that we would get your direction to come back at the next meeting with some more information on all that. We could maybe just set this conversation aside until we have time.

Mayor Scharff: Tom, I was a little confused on one thing you said.

Chair DuBois: Yeah?

Mayor Scharff: I was unclear about whether or not you're where opposing having someone come and discuss with us what Context Sensitive Solution at the Rail Committee? I think that's really important.

Chair DuBois: I'm just hearing both of you guys and all of us I think we feel some urgency and so if we wait a month to come back to us and then it goes to Council.

Mayor Scharff: You're just suggesting we go straight to Council on that (inaudible).

Chair DuBois: Yeah and then maybe we can outside of a Rail Meeting – Rail Committee meeting, become familiar with CSS either on our own or through other resources.

Mayor Scharff: We have really full agendas. I can start the meetings at 4 and we can do that if you want but in many ways, this is the Committee that is going to have to do it. We're probably not going to come to Council on a lot of these issues before we have some sense of what we're going to recommend to Council. I really think that it would be really helpful – it would

# FINAL MINUTES

be helpful for me to understand what we mean by Context Sensitive Solutions on a practical nitty-gritty basis. I don't know what that means and to do it on my own is not going to be something that's going to be that easy. I really would like to agendize that frankly, as soon as possible so that we can get it done.

Chair DuBois: I guess could we maybe look at agenda as (inaudible) parallel? Bring it here in a month but also see if we can get it to Council in 5 weeks or whatever?

Mayor Scharff: We have to look at our schedule and we can see in the range of all things that go onto the Council's Agenda, where that will fall. I'm not going to commit to where it would go without talking to Ed and talking to Jim and looking at the whole thing holistically of when we can get it. Obviously, all of these things are important and we need to move it forward. I'm not trying to block it saying come to Council. I'm just saying let's not hold it up and not do it on the notion that we to get it to Council as soon as possible. Alright?

Ms. Gitelman: I think we can do -- what we can is see if we can come back to you next meeting which is later this month on the 22<sup>nd</sup>, with a summary or briefing, if we can swing it, from an outside expert and you're -- tee up a schedule for your review and then if the Committee is ok with that, you can advance it to the Council or ask us to make revisions at that time.

## NO ACTION TAKEN

### 2. Grade Separations

- Review and Provide Directions on the Draft Rail Program Schedule, Community Engagement Plan and Circulation Study Scope of Work
- Funding Programs
- Caltrain-UP Agreement
- Other Topics

Chair DuBois: Alright, moving on to Item Number 2 which is a review of and provide direction on the draft rail program schedule, Community Engagement Plan, Circulation Study Scope of Work, funding programs, Caltrain- Union Pacific agreement and other topics. (Inaudible) large thing. I guess Staff, you have a presentation?

# FINAL MINUTES

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Thank you. Josh Mello, Chief Transportation Official. I'm going to introduce Mott MacDonald but I just want to kind of preface this item by saying that we're extremely happy that the Rail Committee has convened this morning. We brought Mott MacDonald on a couple months ago, we've given them very limited notice to proceed on data collection, analysis of existing conditions and we've held off on the bulk of their tasks and are awaiting direction from the Rail Committee. The bulk of what they're going to present this morning is drafts. Just to bounce something off of you and get your feedback. Our ultimate goal is for this to be a very cooperative process where we have defined decision points as we move forward in this process. Mott MacDonald and Staff is able to give you all the materials that you need to make decisions as we move through this process. They are going to touch on a draft schedule that outlines the next 2 years of work that we've foreseen, in order to advance the grade separation projects. They are also going to present a preliminary Community Engagement Plan that is just intended to be a framework and given the feedback that we've heard this morning, it sounds like we need to do additional work to integrate CSS principles more thoroughly into that Plan. Then lastly, they are going to touch on the scope of work for what's called the Circulation Study, which was if you remember, when we went to Council last year, one of the directions we got was to undertake what's called a Circulation Study. Which you'll see from the scope is intended to be a high level, first look at how the grade separation – the grade crossings currently operate. How they would operate if we modified each of the different grade crossings in different formats. With that, I'll introduce Mott MacDonald. It's going to take a moment for me to get their presentation set up.

Chair DuBois: If you guys can come up to the table if you want.

Chris Metzger, Mott MacDonald: Very good, thank you. Chris Metzger, I am the Regional Divisional Manager for Mott MacDonald. I'm excited to be here. Thank you for allowing for us to partake in this process and help you through it. I'm personally excited to be back in Palo Alto. Last time I was here for an extended duration was helping with Homer Avenue under-crossing so hopefully, this will all turn out as well as that project did. I was the Project Manager for that. Josh already walked you through what we want to talk through this morning. You've already heard about what our mission – one of our missions is to help you coordinate with all the different entities that are working on this. I think this should all be very familiar to you. I don't know that we need to spend a lot of time with that. Just wanted to introduce our

# FINAL MINUTES

team a little bit. As I said, I'm the principle but I also will remain directly involved in some of the outreach or all of the outreach given some history here with the City and other experiences. Having recently worked with Mountain View extensively with the Water District to try and get some projects that were very challenging in the middle of a very involved community. That's one of the things I'll be doing is staying involved in that process with you. Richard Davies is the Project Manager with years of experience in transit and other similar traffic and transportation related projects. He is currently working for other local agencies for high-speed rail throughout the State so he has a good perspective of what's going on throughout the State with high-speed rail and how that's impacting multiple communities. Michele DiFrancia, who you have already heard from, is really going to be our day to day contact her at the City and will be attending most of the agencies. With that, Richard is going to walk you through the scope of services that Josh mentioned.

Richard Davies, Mott MacDonald: Good morning, I'm Richard Davies. The overall project is split up into 9 separate tasks. Task 1 clearly is why we're here today and that's to talk to you and Task 2 is we will be waiting for your direction on some of the stuff. Essentially, as Josh said, we've done a lot of groundwork and a lot of preparation so that we are in a position to take this forward. We've also had our environmental people look at the scoping document from the high-speed rail. Perhaps the most work that has probably gone into Task 4, which is the conducting of circulation studies. We've done a lot of preparation work on that. We are very conscious of how important circulation is and the impact that changes in the (inaudible) crossing (inaudible) on the City. As I'm sure you know, we're looking at going up from 6 services in the peak hour to up to 20 and that's a very significant impact so I'll be touching on how we're going to cope with that. The further Task 5 are – has now been discussed and to carry out with CSS process with the alternative analysis that we jointly come up with, which we will be providing all of the information for you to review and make judgments on. Then 6 goes into a rather more process basis which is looking at the Project Study Report and 15 percent design plan on the alternatives. That's followed of course, by the environmental analysis of those alternatives in the full sense of the word and we are also looking at the finance – again funding side as part of the overall evaluation of this project. Task 9 is somewhat something of a bucket because we all know that when you get going on these projects, things happen that may not be forecasted

# FINAL MINUTES

or anticipated and therefore there needs to be some flexibility of perhaps, reviewing some particular issue or whatever. Task 9 is generally that sort of bucket for additional work or if more alternatives need to be viewed; it's that sort of thing. That's our schedule clearly, we're also something of an (inaudible) fortune in terms of what may happen on the high-speed rail but you can see on Task 1, we're fixing for the monthly meetings that we'll be attending. Task 3 is something that we've got going now and task 4 is the one we've already started. Then, there are the other ones below that which I won't go into too much detail but they are yet to be agreed on and taken forward with your direction on that. Summary of what we've done so far. I think Michele covered a little bit of that. We've – well, (inaudible). We've been attending basically, all of the meetings that are relevant to taking this forward so that we know everything that's going on from Caltrain, from high-speed rail, from other Cities. You rightfully said some Cities are in advance here so it's good to learn what they've done so we can hopefully, if they did make a mistake, we don't make the same one and taking that forward. We're working closely with all of them and we're all circled in on the loop of information so we can pick up everything that's going on so we can provide you with the best level of information that's available. We've also been talking to Nadia, very (inaudible) in terms of interested groups to take this forward so we can get the best possible picture. We have responded to some of the documentation and things that are raised – joined in the last few months, which you have in your Packet. Also, we've drafted a Community Engagement Plan, which I think will obviously be open to considerable discussion when listening to what was said this morning. I just want to talk briefly about the circulation studies because that's where we've done most of the work on. I say we are very conscious of the issues which could come up by having different alternatives with grade separations or existing upgrades situations and also, of the impact on the traffic circulation that increased frequencies from Caltrain and high-speed rail will have in the future. We've set up a GIS base map. We always use that as a database because you can load anything into that you like and (inaudible) of that we progress. That setup, you can see this sort of blue area is a half mile sort of around the study boundary of the intersections and that's the one we'll be looking at in much more intensification but clearly, we're looking at strategic effects as well. I'm just moving onto that. This is what we've been doing. We set out having a data review so we picked up everything we think is relevant in terms of recently collected data in previous studies and we've been through that. We then had a look at what data was available and decided

# FINAL MINUTES

where we felt new data needed to be collected so that's actually happened this last two weeks. We've had new traffic count data done on all – most the important intersections that we're looking at. We have the absolute best amount of data available. We're also looking at collision data review. Accident analysis is very important to these sorts of evaluations. As well, we've been looking in complying the pedestrian and bicycle data and that's something that can be laid into our GIS mapping so we can look that up at any time we need. We've done a lot of work now on the travel demand model. That will be one of our basic analysis tools. It will allow us to see what may happen with a different alternative of grade separation and the impact on the highway network. We are very conscious of potential congestion that may cause or may not cause any relief. If you have grade separation that attracts more traffic in as oppose if you don't have one. It allows us to paint the overall picture of the reaction and response of the highway network within the road traffic on it. I just thought that I would show you an example of what we call a congestion map there. I'm not sure how familiar people are with looking at these types of diagrams but it's essentially looking at the road network in 2030 and you – the color coding – as I say, it's a congestion map so unsurprisingly, it's an (inaudible) traffic light approach so red means it's highly congested and green means much less so. It's a very clear way of looking at exactly what is happening in a network and that model has no recognition of the moment of the future increase services or Caltrain and high-speed rail. It allows us to identify all the issues that will be associated. Also, we will use it to forecast the growth in traffic that will be using the intersections. That's the same map but it's just – what I wanted to show you where we can do it any scale from right down to a very detail from right up to a whole peninsula area. That allows us a lot of information to be presenting to you on what the impacts of these various different things will be.

Council Member Filseth: Is that with or without grade separations?

Michele DiFrancia, Mott MacDonald: Without.

Mr. Davies: That's basically based on the Comprehensive Plan and as Michele says, it's a sort of do nothing but forecasted 2030 (inaudible). These are some of the (inaudible) we've achieved already. As I said we did a review of the existing documentation and we did a gap analysis to find out what additional data we need. That was completed this month. We're working at the moment on an Existing Condition Report, which just paints

# FINAL MINUTES

the overall background picture before we start looking at what impact grade separation may have and what not having them may have too. Travel demand valid – well, we've mounted the model on our computer. We've got it running and we've compared it, we've looked at it to look at how it response to the local count data and we're happy it's the right tool to be using for this sort of analysis; it is, though, a strategic type of model. We're approaching it differently for the detailed intersection analysis and that's simply based on intensive traffic counts we've had done over the last couple weeks. We would be doing this standard sort of process of building a future year with no build conditions but with the new frequencies of Caltrain/high-speed rail imposed on the grade crossings. We're developing the model to reflect that and that will be the first run we do. From then on, we start looking at the alternatives and say having two grade separations or one or three and running models to show the impacts of those different combinations and (inaudible). That will lead to an ability to decide on a preferred alternative or a number of alternatives and that leads us onto the various reports that will be coming from that. The final one is the circulation report, which we'll be producing very – later on in the (inaudible), later on from (inaudible). I'd like to hand it over to Michele who is going to talk to you about the Draft Community Engagement Plan that we've had so far.

Ms. DiFrancia: Thank Richard. The goals and objectives of the Draft Community Engagement Plan include implementing a CSS process using detailed community engagement, which we think of course – we agree is extremely important. Provide clear accurate and easily assessable information for the public. Create platforms to evaluate the various grade separation alternatives and also develop performance measures to assess and adjust our engagement efforts. Stakeholders and concerns to be addressed. Our key stakeholders include, of course, Palo Alto residents including senior citizens, residents with special needs, disadvantaged residents, regular transit riders; we want them to be engaged as well. Palo Alto elected officials and Staff, local organizations from the business community, non-profits. Community-based concerns to be addressed include the lack of safety around grade crossings. I think we're all too familiar with that, unfortunately, as well as the traffic congestion around the crossings. Noise pollution and inconvenience of construction activities and inequality of cost and benefits. Engagement tools: We'll be developing a database so we can track and record public commentary. Online survey is we'd like to implement an online survey via email, website and social media. Collateral is we will be



# FINAL MINUTES

developing fact sheets, emails, website content and text messages. Project mailings, flyers notifications and community meetings. We want to cooperatively develop project goals and objectives working with the community. Define and evaluate the alternatives for grade separation. Involve the community and City Council and in the clearly defined decision-making process. Establish CSS process, milestones, and decision points. We've talked a lot about that already this morning and we are proposing to hold 6 community meetings over the next year or so. We're also proposing that we hold the first community engagement meeting in April. Rail technical group, that's our Task 2 and here are a few ideas of potential members including representatives from CARD and Friends of Caltrain. We've been in contact with both groups. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee, Palo Alto residents, elected officials and Staff, technical experts and local organizations. Again, from business, education, environmental, community-based and non-profit and we're open to your suggestions as well. At this time, I'm going to hand it over – back over to Josh.

Mr. Mello: Great, thank you. At this point, we'd like to have a pretty robust discussion with you about what was just presented by Mott MacDonald. Some of the things that we'd like to talk about and I'm sure you'll have more topics that you'd also like to address, but our idea for the Community Engagement Plan is to get your feedback today and then return to you with a final draft. I think, given what we've heard today, it may make sense to consult with People for Public Spaces on CSS and make sure we bring back to you a Public Engagement Plan that meets all of the standards of a typical CSS process. We don't exactly know how detailed the Community Engagement Plan should be at this point. Things are given to change as we start to roll this out to the public and we start to garner feedback from our residents and other stakeholders. We would like to hold the first public meeting in April. We don't want you to feel rushed but we do need to get this project moving forward so the schedule that Mott MacDonald presented tentatively shows a public meeting occurring in April. We'd love your input as to what that public meeting looks like. Is it just a very high-level introduction? Do we focus on refining the CSS process and identifying stakeholders or do we move a little bit further along and bring off the results from the Circulation Study forward? The rail technical group, as Michele has mentioned, is one of the tasks that were identified by Council back when we brought this to you last year. The rail technical group was intended to be a group that supports your work in this process. We've had some additional

# FINAL MINUTES

discussion around what this group would look like and one of the components of a CSS process is the formation of a stakeholder group. It may make sense for this rail technical group to be that CSS stakeholder group. We're hoping for your suggestions on that as well. Also, we need to talk about how we appoint this group. Is it done by the Rail Committee? Is it done by the full Council? Would you like Staff to bring you a list of potential candidates? Do we have a formal application process? Then finally, the Rail Quarter Study -- Circulation Study. What are the goals of the Circulation Study? Today, we've assumed that this would be a Study that looks at a very high level of the circulation of the City's surface transportation network and then identifies what the impacts of that circulation network would be. If hypothetically, if one grade crossing was closed or made by pedestrian only or if an existing narrow grade crossing was widened to accommodate additional traffic at the same time that another may be closed. What does that look like for our service transportation network? That was the original intent of the Circulation Study and that would enable us to have the tools we need to start to identify more firm alternatives for each of our four grade crossings. Then we'd like to know how far we can continue on this Study. We've already done all of the data collections and the existing conditions analysis. Then lastly, if we start to develop these alternatives to model, how does that vetting -- what does that vetting process look like for the alternative? Do we go to Council? Do we use the public at the public meeting in April, to help identify those alternatives or is that something the Rail Committee mainly focuses on? Those some of the items for discussion that we've identified but I fully expect that you also have additional items.

Hillary Gitelman, Director of Planning and Community Environment: Maybe I can just add a couple more thoughts on the background on these issues of the rail technical group and the Circulation Study. The rail technical group was really an idea that came from this Committee, in recognizing they are a group of passionate, very well-informed stakeholders in the community that may be of assistance to the Committee and to Staff. I think the idea was and again, from the Committee, that there would just be a handful of these real experts in the community, that could meet on a regular schedule with Staff and maybe in the same monthly rhythm of the Rail Committee. We, as Staff, would convene this group a few weeks before the Rail Committee and they would help us prepare and vet issues that are coming to the Committee. My impression when this idea came up was that it more informal than a Council appointed stakeholder group. It was more -- something to

# FINAL MINUTES

assist all of us in doing our work. The other – a point on the Circulation Study, again, this was the direction from the full Council. My impression was that the Council wanted us to quickly gather and develop some data that could be an input to the CSS process. It was something that wouldn't be held up waiting for the CSS process to begin but it would generate some data that people could start to chew on at the first discussion of community objectives and how we're going to proceed with the larger development of alternatives for the grade separation themselves.

Chair DuBois: Thank you and thank you, Chris, Richard, and Michele. I'd like to a round of technical questions first and then go to the public before we get into the discussion. Do you guys have any questions? Adrian.

Council Member Fine: Just one, on the Community Engagement Plan, CSS is a big open process but these are actual very technical changes we're considering. I'm wondering if you're considering that when you go through this process of presenting alternatives to the public like whether you are going to guide them on these things or show them different options or it is just coming from a blank slate? I think sometimes when you talk about grade separation, folks aren't even clear that Embarcadero is a grade separation or (inaudible) folks know what that is so, I'm just wondering about that.

Ms. Gitelman: Maybe I can start and then everyone can chime in. I think we understand that we're going to need to start with a little bit of explanation about grade separations and what we're doing. I think really the place you start any process like this is a discussion of community objectives. What are the problems we are trying to solve both as they exist today and as they may exist in the future with increased rail traffic and roadway traffic and demand for people for getting across the rail corridor in a – on a variety of modes. That – I think that would be the first step in a community process and it would probably be a mistake to go to the community right off the bat with a set of alternatives fully developed, without having that first introduction to process, formulation of objectives and kind of start from a level of common ground on those issues. I don't know if Michele has anything to add.

Mr. Metzger: I would agree with what was said although I would throw out there that work has been done, as you know, throughout the City so maybe some historical context as to what has been done would be helpful to explain

# FINAL MINUTES

some of those like you just mentioned. This is what's been done, this is what grade separation is. Some fundamentals to spur the conversation, not to say that anything has been done. Just say work has been done and this is what it is.

Chair DuBois: I have questions. You talked a little bit about your – the traffic forecast. What kind of assumptions were you making for future traffic?

Mr. Davies: The full (inaudible) is built to be compatible with the Comprehensive Plan. All the economic and social economic and a population of the (inaudible) that are in the Comprehensive Plan are in that traffic model.

Chair DuBois: I think we have 5 scenarios we're looking at. What were you using? I mean we're working on our Comp. Plan update right now and you have 5 different growth scenarios.

Mr. Davies: It's just using the alternative one at the moment.

Chair DuBois: Which is as is...

Mr. Davies: (Inaudible) but again, (inaudible) necessary, that can be changed. (Crosstalk).

Chair DuBois: Scenario 1 is a required scenario, it's not one that I don't think Council will pick. Just business as usual, right?

Ms. Gitelman: Yeah, I think it has the benefit of being one of the larger scenarios when you look at job growths so it's probably the worst case.

Chair DuBois: Ok.

Mr. Davies: It's always slightly difficult thing because if you have 9 variables, it's very difficult to manage where your starting point is.

Chair DuBois: There was some – then in terms of simulation train traffic, I saw in some other reports there was discussion that some of these models are treated like a freeway or – I guess you guys are using the [phonetics] Synchro analysis.

Mr. Davies: We will be using a Synchro analysis.

# FINAL MINUTES

Chair DuBois: What the strengths and weaknesses of that approach?

Mr. Davies: You have to set it up correctly for the train side because Synchro doesn't represent the train use that well but we have don't an awful lot of work on street running (inaudible) systems in various counties around the US so we're very used to balancing out the road traffic signals with the train traffic signals. That's an area where we have some very high specialist stuff. We're working on that now so we can develop the right sort of delay situation for the Synchro model to cope with. We're done it before so we're quite familiar with how we need to do that.

Chair DuBois: Ok.

Mr. Davies: Again, that's – Synchro is a much more higher level of precision model than the traffic demand model but the ultimate at the end of the day I suppose, is the micro-simulation model, which is the next one but that tends to come when you have finalized your preferred alternative and that you wanted a more detailed analysis of it.

Chair DuBois: That micro-simulation model is that kind of like a Monte Carlo simulation or is it using averages?

Mr. Davies: It's completely different sort of model (inaudible) demand model. It does actually simulate the movement of individual vehicles as opposed to flow vectors.

Chari DuBois: Cool. That will be good to see. I think also, these traffic reports tend to be very technical. Are you guys going to do any kind of visualization for us and for the community to show what this means?

Mr. Davies: Yeah, I mean one of the key things that (inaudible) interpreting – interrupt those models and present them so they can be understood. That is something that we spend a lot of time on.

Mr. Metzger: One of the exhibits Richard showed was the colored roadways. We would simplify that down and show the impacts on that and take that data and simplify it down to simple graphic that...

Chair DuBois: Yeah, that would be awesome if there was a way to even show renderings of traffic. One thing on those images you showed, I know Oregon and El Camino is a level F intersection but it looked like in your

# FINAL MINUTES

forecast that it was green. I didn't really understand what you were using for green and red. Is it tied to a level of service or...

Mr. Davies: You mean in the environmental – the environmental document (inaudible).

Chari DuBois: The traffic charts that you showed. (Crosstalk).

Mr. Mello: The travel demand model only shows the volume over capacity ratio of a link. It's not as detailed as to look at the intersection operation so Synchro would look at actual intersection operations. The map is more representative of the links that are shown, not the actual – the nodes.

Chair DuBois: Ok that means we have a lot of red nodes that look like they were in green links which I really didn't understand. Then I also saw Circle Point mentioned several times in the proposal. Who are they? What do they do or what is that?

Mr. Metzger: Circle Point is our sub. for public outreach. They will be leading the outreach effort. Working with Michael Baker and our team to help with a lot of the collateral materials and developing and organizing the programs. Setting updates and sending out flyers and a lot of that work that needs to be done.

Chair DuBois: Ok. The last question, there was also an assumption about CBOSS and I'm wondering if you guys are looking at what if CBOSS is late or fails. How do that impact circulation?

Ms. DiFrancia: I don't think we've gotten to that point yet in terms of CBOSS and the impact on the Circulation Study.

Chair DuBois: (Inaudible) how are you modeling the trains?

Mr. Davies: It's not that – the demand model isn't that precise. We will be making overall estimations of the delay that will be caused which really may not be so much sensitive to something like CBOSS but more sensitive to the actual frequency schedule.

Mr. Mello: My understanding of the CBOSS system is one of the potential benefits of it, if it works properly, is that if a train is going to stop and dwell at a station. The gates ahead will know that and not activate. Like today, if there is a station in close proximity to a crossing, the sensors for the

# FINAL MINUTES

crossing don't necessarily know that the train is going to dwell at the station so there may be reduced gate time – gate down time with [SEA BOSS] but I think that – and that would need to be modeled somehow. Other than that, I don't necessarily know that there will be much (crosstalk) (inaudible).

Chair DuBois: That's exactly my question. If it doesn't work and the gates are down longer, are we including that in our simulation?

Mr. Mello: It will be as today. It will be – we'll have to multiply the operations today by the increased number of trains in the corridor.

Chair DuBois: So, it gets to – you're saying basically the model doesn't deal with it at that level, right?

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: Gross approximation really. (Inaudible).

Chair DuBois: A lot of criticisms in the past have been trains leaving simultaneously and not really modeling the train behavior correctly.

Mr. Davies: We will take all of that into account, the grade (inaudible). If it turns out not to be not.

Mr. Mello: Richard can jump into this if he wants but one of the issues with the standard traffic modeling software is it doesn't have that randomness when you model an intersection in Synchro (inaudible), you set all the parameters for the signal but it can never account for emergency presumption. It can't really account for train presumption. If the trains not running on schedule so there's a certain amount of randomness that we're not going to be able to account for when we get down and do this modeling. We'll try our best but at the end the day, it's going to be really difficult to do that.

Chair DuBois: If there are no more questions, I guess we'll take comments from the public. Herb Borock is our first speaker. Thanks.

Herb Borock: Thank you. We're on Item 2 which has 4 bullet points and you've just been discussing the first bullet point but rather than submit a card for each bullet point I thought I'd submit a card for the Agenda Item as a whole. I'll try to fit them all in, in my time. The first on grade separation is the comment I indicated in my letter that Lenny [Seagull] had made at the local policy-making group and that is that you want to look at the entire

# FINAL MINUTES

corridor for the rail. You don't want a situation which (inaudible) the grade – not just the grade separations but always whether the trains are going down and back up again because you're only doing one at the time, rather than doing all of them. You have to do it in concert with what's going on elsewhere along the line and that for the train to get its best performance, you want to have that grade separation everywhere. Secondly, in funding, I think we should still put forward the fact that it is the lead agencies for the trains projects who should be the major source looking and the first source looking for funding. Since we are still doing the high-speed rail EIR, that should be something we should be looking on as mitigation from them. In regard to the agreement between Caltrain and Union Pacific, as far as I know, there isn't anything as a signed agreement yet. They may have deal points and may still be negotiating and they won't release -- if someone else has an update in writing, not just the statement that was made in the minutes of Caltrain or the local policy maker group. It really – in agreement where both sides have signed it, then we should see that. Until then, there is no agreement to talk about. Finally, perhaps you get a report from local policy maker group specifically on the status of the proposal to get money from MTC to do a toolkit which could be something that would be a higher level before individual Cities are doing any grade separation studies. Context Sensitive Solutions means different things to different groups. Originally, we're talking about it as something for Caltrain or high-speed rail for the entire project. From high-speed rails perspective, the only thing they are concerned about with CSS is for intensive development where they are having stations for high-speed rail. Here we're talking about adjust for grade separations rather than looking at the whole line. I think we should still push for high-speed rail to be doing it for their whole process. Finally, rather than setting some objectives and narrowing down what the public is doing. It should come from the other way in having those community meetings lead to what those objectives are. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Our next speaker is Adina Levin, followed by Nadia Naik.

Adina Levin: Adina Levin with Friends of Caltrain. Sorry to miss the top of the meeting but there should be a New York Times article about the Caltrain electrification funding issue coming out this weekend, which hopefully will have accurate information about that topic. I wanted to second what Nadia had talked about in terms of having a Context Sensitive Solution process and support learning more about that. With regard to the grade separations, it was in the list of things to focus on so there where bicycle and pedestrian



# FINAL MINUTES

mentioned in the transportation studies but that should be a first-class goal given the importance of walking and biking in this community for health and safety and quality of life. It really should be a first-class consideration in thinking about the options. Another topic to consider is how the different choices and options relate to Palo Alto's land-use goals as they relate to the work on the Comprehensive Plan and as they relate to potential financing options. There have been ideas discussed in terms of having parks, having trails and potentially having buildings where the value of the building can contribute to the cost of a project. Those are the topics of the land use goals and the financing options would be important to consider in this project and important to assess in terms of the community goals and values. Thanks very much for coming up with a process to take into account the community input from all these different perspectives, including the driving, quality of life, walking, biking and also the quality of the rail service that will be effected by having the grade separations over time. Thank you.

Chair DuBois; Next speaker is Nadia Naik, followed by Roland Lebrun.

Nadia Naik: Hi. I emailed some of my comments today but I just want to add to it based on the conversation we've been having today. I wanted to thank Staff and everybody. The RFP process – the Rail Committee didn't meet since last September and they basically haven't had a meeting since then so you guys have all been doing a great job flying completely blind. The RFP went out, it was kind of a placeholder because we weren't sure if we were going to get an actual person that was going to work at the City or if we were going to get consultants. Obviously, when you go through an RFP process, you've got to specify a lot of stuff so people can bid on it so it's been a great straw man but I feel like in listening to what's going on with this conversation, I'm starting to get a bit of anxiety because we're so far from what the Council had said initially. You guys are talking about gathering data and then figuring out a way to then go and present it to the community and engaged with the community. It's kind of the opposite the way CSS is supposed to work. When we have the CSS process, you're going to figure out who – what the vision – who are the people who are going to be involved, what's going to be our visioning statement. It's a very rigorous process. It's a very timed process. It's not a 4-year thing. When this is done well, you decided ahead of time, before you've gone through all the data, where are there going to be your decision points? Who's going to make those decisions? How long is it going to take and in what time periods? Then you go and deploy the resources. We need a Traffic Study by this date, we

# FINAL MINUTES

need this by this date but the way you guys have kind of worked this now and I understand we need some data but you've got to understand, this is the same problem that we as advocates run into all the time. I get a High-Speed Rail Study that shows me oh, here's the traffic analysis and I can poke 15 holes in it because they didn't look at something that we, as citizens, value. The engineers just looked at the traffic and you've seen Palo Alto's citizens before. You know how this works. That is not going to fly. If you have this Traffic Study and nobody looked at, for example, the possibility of maybe you closed Churchill and you straighten our Embarcadero and that fixes stuff. Instead, we're modeling all these other grade separations -- we're missing stuff. I think it's important that we get some data but I can't stress enough that we really have to get a Project for Public Spaces or somebody who is a CSS expert to come and help us correct that we're getting this in the right order. Otherwise, we're doomed to fail and this is biggy. I think we've all worked too hard and nobody wants this to be 4-years and I agree that we need to move forward but I think we can do this. I'm available, I would love to meet and I loved Hillary's idea about having regular meetings. We're here but I haven't been -- I'm personally happy to see ourselves in the report but we haven't been contacted by anybody. If Friends of Caltrain and CAR is going to be an (inaudible) parts of the process, we need to be talking to people. I just met Mott MacDonald two weeks ago, I think it's been a great start and I'm so excited about the energy on this Committee but I think we really have to bring in some experts. I also wanted to ask, in terms of the Traffic Study, is anybody considering the signally priority that the buses are having on El Camino because that also will affect the traffic stuff. The other stuff is to remember that a lot of times when the citizens go through this stuff, they're not just focused on traffic circulation. They may decide that really improving Caltrain will actually have a great impact on traffic flow as well so again, that would defeat the Data Study. If we're only looking at 10 trains and the citizens eventually say, we want to optimize Caltrain for 20, that will change everything. You have to think about the fact that the citizens are going to look really broadly and they may decide, what -- Traffic Study is great but we need other stuff. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you and the last speaker is Roland Lebrun.

Roland Lebrun: Thank you. First of all, I had a question to the Chair. When you referred to the LPMG, is that a Palo Alto thing or are you talking about the Caltrain LPMG? Ok, thank you. The first thing that I would like to say

# FINAL MINUTES

about all these studies, which I have been reading over the years, is that there is no such thing as a four-track grade crossing. A lot of people don't know that but that basically does not exist. If somebody comes to you says, we're going to put four tracks to your City. Guess what, you get automatic grade separation, right? So, that's the first point. Now the question is – well this is great, this is wonderful, somebody is going to do this and I'd be happy to provide you with the technical references that say that in black and white; three tracks, yes; four tracks, no. Actually, doing simulations of four tracks is basically (inaudible). A question is, if you have two tracks, where do you put them? The initial solution 8-years ago, was well, we're going to put them on a viaduct some 80-feet up in the air. Well, that didn't fly. Now if you start looking at Palo Alto and you're talking about four tracks and you have to grade separate this. Oh boy, you have a problem. I mean you know what (inaudible) looks like. I look at this (inaudible) as you go, that's just not going to work. Another alternative that I think you should be considering is maybe you should underground the other initial two tracks and then what you come up with is a new concept, which is a hybrid, which is actually a Context Sensitive Solution for the Palo Alto (inaudible) context. When your essential grade separate the bikes and the pedestrians -- and every train that doesn't stop in Palo Alto and Menlo Park, basically goes into a tunnel and before anybody tells you it's too expensive and you cannot build it, I'll be happy to provide you with accurate information on that. At that point in time, what you actually do is you have actually reduced the train traffic that currently goes through the tracks. You're actually going to allow more traffic, up to 10 or 12 an hour but the number of trains that cross your level crossing is going to be reduced. Anyway, that's an alternative. I think your rail technical group should be looking at that at some point, I'd be happy to provide input. The last point I have is about the funding and I'm glad that Borock mentioned MTC. This is exactly what San Francisco did for the RAP Study and the Downtown extension. So far, they've raise 1 1/2 million dollars to three different grants to study 1 1/2 miles of tunnels and I'm sure that Palo Alto could be doing the same thing and I'd be happy to advocate on your behalf at MTC. Thank you very much.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. One thing that I would like to say is that it would be great to get presentation like the one you gave today, (inaudible) if possible or have handouts. This is a big item and I'd like to break it up a little bit, I think. I think the first part is really kind of the Mott MacDonald scope of work with the schedule, community engagement, Circulation Plan,

# FINAL MINUTES

and funding. Then maybe we can talk about the Caltrain- UP agreement separately since that seems a bit separate from the others. First of all, we – Council requested a train expert and we put out that RFP and we're glad to have you guys on board. I'm really looking forward to working with you guys on this. Does anybody want to start off with comments? Questions? Good, Adrian.

Council Member Fine: One quick comment. I'm not sold on whether the technical group should be its own independent thing or is the CSS stakeholders group so just floating that to you all. I think it does sound like there are some interested folks who would love to help Staff and Staff seems interested in hearing from them. I worry that if we have a technical group and a CSS stakeholders group if they are not just overlapping anyways and they shouldn't just be the same thing in the end.

Mayor Scharff: A couple things, I think at the end of the day, what we're looking for is to have community Buy-in and have an understanding of what these grade separations will look like. I think that's the goal. I assume everyone on this Committee shares that goal. The question is how do we get there and how do we make those tough choices? How do we not get sidetracked and lost? I was really concerned a little bit about Nadia's statements regarding that she thinks we're doing Context Sensitive Solutions incorrectly. I do think we need to get that group before us and get a sense of how that goes. I'm also sensitive to the fact of getting lost in a stakeholder group frankly, and all the Staff effort and time that goes into dealing with that. I think these all have to be balanced and I'm not sure what the right balance is. I'm sort of looking for Staff to be a little assertive here frankly, and say this is how we would like it to go, while also being sensitive to what the placeholder group says and how Context Sensitive Solution is to work. I mean, at the end of the day, if this is going to work, we're going to need community buy-in and we're going to need – we obviously can't short-change that process and if it takes longer because we have to spend more time on that, I think we're going to have to spend longer and do that. That also means, in my mind, that there may be lots of different choices in how we do the grade separations and that's why I said we needed to go through the original guiding principles. There's a couple of guiding principles in there which for instance says we would not close any grade crossings. Well, we may want to look at closing a grade crossing. We may want to look at doing – in some places rather than doing a bunch of emanate domain, it may make sense to have an aerial track. I mean, that may be the worst – the lesser of two evils. I do think we need to somehow decide and I think the community is going to want to know this. Can we

# FINAL MINUTES

underground the tracks? I mean that's the easiest solution. That's the one that has the less impacts, it's probably the most impractical but it may not be but I think we're going to need to make that decision early because that's what everyone would want to do. I don't see us not wanting to do that. Then I think we need to come up with a time frame about where we get to a solution and I like Nadia's comments about it's a formal process and there are decision points along the way. That's what I'm looking for and I do worry that if we do it the way we normally do it, we may not get there and we may get stuck in the process. That's what I'm looking for us to do is to be really thoughtful on that. It's hard for me to go through this and have comments yet because I don't really feel like I have enough information. I think that's why you're hearing a little bit of silence from the Committee because as we go through this and you look at it, it's hard yet to say yes, we're comfortable. This is where we want to go. I guess that was really my thoughts to start on that.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, this is a big item. We might go around a couple of times, I think. Eric, do you have comments?

Mr. Mello: (Inaudible) first item.

Chair DuBois: Well, this is – ok. Actually, this is kind of broke this down by the tasks so I think your task 1 is supporting the Rail Committee. I think one thing that would be really useful if you can let us know where we can, as elected, can most impact the process. Particularly with all these other Cities considering grade separations. That's something you can assign to us to go talk to other elected in other Cities. I also think that there's a broader issue here that this is a huge project. We want to make sure that we use you guys effectively and so I'm happy that every meeting we're going to get an update on the status and what you guys have been working on. I think we need to be careful that we don't burn too much funds up front before we really get into this process. I hope you guys are sensitive to that. I thought I read that you guys would be representing this City at Caltrain meetings and possibly high-speed rail meetings, is that correct? I have questions of how that's going to work. Hopefully, you're not going just to listen and document but we need advocates at those meetings who are going to speak up and so it's kind of a question for Staff and – I hope that Staff will be there. They will be able to speak up when needed.

Mr. Mello: We review all of the agendas beforehand and if there is anything that we need to offer input into or feel that we need to give direction, we provide those comments to Mott MacDonald and then if it's a major issue, I

# FINAL MINUTES

would attend or one of the other Staff members would attend in (inaudible) of Mott MacDonald.

Chair DuBois: I just want to caution us not to (crosstalk) (inaudible).

Mayor Scharff: Can I follow up on that?

Chair DuBois: Yes.

Mayor Scharff: You raised a really good point. I think we should have a little bit of an oversight and a little bit of understanding about how you're spending the money. What meetings you're going to? I mean I'm not sure I see a huge value in sitting through a lot of meetings frankly, but there may be. The questions are that I think we'd just like to have a sense on the burn rate, at least I would, on what we're doing so that we don't end up saying – you don't come to us halfway through and say we're going to need to expand the amount of money coming through.

Chair DuBois: Task 2, the rail technical team. I agree with Adrian that I think we need to look at that within the CSS process and see how that makes sense. There's great input from a whole bunch of people. We definitely want to leverage it in the right way. I didn't really have any comments on the environmental analysis yet. On the Circulation Study, task 4, I already mentioned the concern about CBOSS and where that fits into our simulations. It would be great if you could clearly show all the assumptions that go into the traffic model, particularly when we're presenting it to the public. I appreciated seeing the area you were considering and that it extended to El Camino, I believe. I do think that maybe it should extent to Middlefield Road on the other side. It looked like it stopped just short of those intersections. On Meadow, in particular, I think we already have traffic backed up between the train and El Camino Way. I was a little bit concerned about the schedule and maybe I just don't understand the circulation report but it looked like you were going to show alternatives by March this year, which is now. I wasn't really sure how that was possible or if that schedule was correct at this point. Could you guys talk to that?

Mr. Mello: That's a draft schedule and one of the items that we would like feedback on today is how do we develop those alternatives for the Circulation Study?

# FINAL MINUTES

Chair DuBois: Just (inaudible) it was way front loaded like we needed all the alternatives now.

Ms. Gitelman: Then again, I think we're looking for the Committee's direction. The full Council directed us to undertake this Circulation Study really in advance of the CSS alternatives analysis for the whole project. If you want to revisit that instruction and kind of hold that, we need to hear that otherwise, we're going to have to tell Mott MacDonald what to analysis.

Chair DuBois: Are there a list of alternatives?

Ms. Gitelman: I think we are thinking right now we're going to have to develop that and we want to know whether that's something you support. Some of them have been mentioned here like close Churchill, widen existing grade cross – retrofitting grade crossings or grade separations. It would be a series of this, then, that kind of options.

Mr. Shikada: If I could jump in and make a couple of comments that might be helpful that would try to put some context on this. First, we knew this is going to be a media agenda and so I think we're really illustrating that because this is an opportunity – maybe a little more messy than we would like to acknowledge and that there are a number of different dimensions here. I actually didn't think I would be putting my (inaudible) Junior License to use quite yet but believe it or not, it's a little bit more familiar than I'd like. The Circulation Study, I do think we're going to need to come back and perhaps be a little clearer both in terms of the specific methodology but also the limitations and how some things – everything from CBOSS to the UP agreement will have an impact ultimately on the level of analysis that it would take to really drill down on some of these things. I think we can address that in due time. I do want to clarify that on the community engagement, that Staff had envisioned the technical groups really as a way, quite frankly, of addressing some of those technical questions before it comes to Council – to the Committee and flush out those more specific detailed questions that we know some of our community members are interested in about getting into the specifics. Then for the Committee and ultimately the Council, we wouldn't have to have a real detailed technical discussion here. There was not really a specific stakeholder group suggested. I will say I appreciated Nadia's sharing – she sent it to us and she might have sent it to full Council, a video clip. I actually watched most of it. I think it was the University of Portland or up in Portland, to describe the

# FINAL MINUTES

CSS process and I'm by no means an expert or even necessarily familiar with the process but it does really start with, as Hillary described, the problem definition in really focusing in on a very highly engaged method in how that problem is defined and ideally agreed upon from a variety of perspectives. I think the circulation work that has been done is to set some baseline data so we can be quantitative in assessing that as well as taking our appropriate next steps into the community engagement that really focuses on that problem definition and that is really where we are at. I think based upon this discussion, we've got a number of to do's and not to cut it off at all but to just be clear that I think that we get it related to the role of the Committee, the priority of the Committee and the mission. Particular in this year how CSS will fit in that context with a sense of urgency which I think we absolutely do feel. How to basically, strike the balance between the CSS process, which could in some ways, stretch this out in terms of time while at the same time recognizing the sense of urgency and an approach that allows that engagement to come together because the last thing we want from a community engagement standpoint as well, would be for the time frame to become an issue of (inaudible). Where it's hard for the community to stay engaged with the kinds of issues and the options and some decision making that ultimately would come back to Council. I think we're headed into a ramp up in pace that we will hopefully be able to strike that balance but it's going to be the pretty intensive year as we look at it.

Chair DuBois: Thanks for that, Ed. Actually, if I could just – do you want to comment on that? I didn't really get to the community engagement piece yet but if you want to go ahead?

Council Member Filseth: (Inaudible). ...

Chair DuBois: On the Circulation Study? Yeah, that'd be great.

Council Member Filseth: I was just going to say that that resonates with me. I think we could do a lot of Study of Circulation, right? I think it's important in the context of sort of how are we going to make sure we're focused on the right stuff and the consultants time and so forth. I think it's important that the circulation studies stay focused and maybe this is naive but stay very focused on helping us support the decision in that we want to make. It seems to me that the top-level decision is, should we do this at all? If we don't do it – because we're going to spend a massive amount of time and money and people's effort and so forth if we do it. The top order question is,



# FINAL MINUTES

is it going to be so bad that we need to do this? Then if the answer to that one is yes. Then the next order of question is how are we going to do it but there aren't really that many options. I'm going to guess and maybe this is wishful thinking but I'm going to guess that the details of the Circulation Study aren't going to be the most important parameters in the decisions of how we do it. It's going to be more like cost, how much of any land we need to expropriate, the impact on the community, what's it going to look like when it's done, what kind of compromise are we going to have to make to pay for it and that kind of stuff. All of which isn't granulated mostly to the Circulation Study unless there are big differences in circulation based on which approach we choose to do it or which combination (inaudible). In which case, I think we need to go there but short of that, yeah, I think we – the Circulation Study ought to focus really on how – on supporting the big decision we've got to make and I think the community will find that easier to digest as well.

Chair DuBois: Maybe limit the Circulation Study to existing conditions for now until we know what the options are. Getting on to the community outreach pieces. I think -- I certainly think we need – want the homeowners and neighborhoods along Alma and the tracks to be involved and just looking at a map, it's like 12 of the neighborhoods so that's probably 50 percent of the City. That really wasn't called out in terms of the potential group. Maybe it said residents but I think it needs to be more specific to – we need people from Monroe Park, Downtown south, and north. All of these neighborhoods that are going to be impacted. Again, we've talked about the Council has voted and approved CSS process multiple times without us fulling understanding what CSS is. I did watch that video as well, this morning. It was very good and that's one of the things that I think maybe all of us should do but it's – I guess one of my concerns is and I'm being frank here, that Mott MacDonald is an engineering company. We may need a CSS facilitator and I think should make sure we get an expert in that process and run it correctly. It really is – that video talks about – it's kind of a difference between advocacy process, which I think is what we've outlined with our typical method of getting special interest groups and stakeholders. All kind of come in with their own point of view versus a more structured decision process and we've – I think we need to do the best we can. This is a huge decision. I have not criticized about our standard approach but it tends to take a long time. It takes a lot of money so I'm up for trying something different.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mayor Scharff: Well said.

Chair DuBois: I also – as I read more – I’ve been personally reading more about CSS. It seems to be a best practice at the federal level, the State level and so rather than have this group of special interest groups, I think we need to really think about the process. Have a group of stakeholders. Have those special interest groups provide input to the process and as you read through this, you really do have these decision points in the structured process. It could take 9-months and if we do it right, it’s going to save a lot of time versus having an artificially short schedule, getting to the end of that, not being done and extending and dragging it out for multiple years. I don’t think we should kid ourselves that just because we put a schedule down, that’s the shortest route. I guess one of the questions I had and I wanted to discuss was if there is agreement, what is a quick way that we could get through this? We’ve already talked about having a Study Session on CSS. If we wanted to find a facilitator. Do we need to go through a full RFP process or is there a way we can shorten that because I do think we all want to get going? Just to finish off my comments on funding. (Inaudible) we have measure B but we were very clear that did not want it to be shovel ready projects; get the money first. I think we need Staff to (inaudible) with the VTA to make sure that they stick to the agreement. In terms of determining the process that the money be allocated. It would be great to find out if we could some of that money for this process; for Mott MacDonald and CSS if we go forward with that. Clearly, we’ve got to be talking about other sources of funding. The schedule itself, I kind of said already but I don’t want to be scheduled driven, I want to be quality driven. I want to have a realistic schedule and not – the schedule that I see here, I already questioned and I know it was put together a couple months ago. I don’t know that we should be driven by, we need final alternatives by November this year. I think we should be driven by, this is the process, this is how long it will take and we’re going to keep it to a reasonable amount of time. Those are my comments.

Mr. Mello: I think Hillary has some ideas around CSS and community engagement but I’m also prepared to give you an update on Measure B today. I don’t when the appropriate – I can do it right now or – This is all I know about the Measure B grade separation program. It’s still in draft format. We’ve had two presentations by VTA Staff and I’ve been very firm with them on, you on know the direction we’ve gotten from Council. It should not be whoever is shovel ready. It should be based on need and analysis. Based on various safety and congestion factors. What they’ve said to date is that it will be a 2-year allocation so they will allocate the funds in a

# FINAL MINUTES

2-year period. They are going to work with us and all of the other – the two other Cities, Mountain View and Sunnyvale, to develop an implementation plan for the grade separations that are to be funded by Measure B. This will include a fairly detailed cash flow projection for that program. I think when our grade separations will be funded will more likely depend on the cash flow for the entire program as a whole, then it will on when we are ready to go to construction. They did say something a little bit concerning to me that I want to put on the table today which is typically along the peninsula, the preferred alternative has generally been the hybrid option, which is where the rail corridor is raised slightly and the roadway is depressed slightly. Those are running about \$125-\$150 million per grade separation and VTA Staff sight that as their baseline for what they might be willing to fund per grade separation. I think if we're going to be doing something above and beyond that, we're going to have to have pretty convincing argument and/or additional funding beyond Measure B. They are willing to fund planning and environmental for those three Cities so a portion of the work under this and/or additional work beyond this, could be funded by Measure B. They're going to require Cities to apply to the Section 190 Grade Separation Program. That's the State level program that creates a top 10 list of grade separations and there's a tiny bit of State funding that goes towards those and those are prioritized strictly based on safety issues. Safety is related to the amount of traffic passing through so I think ours would score fairly high in that but I could foresee a scenario where VTA also uses similar criteria from the Section 190 Program to prioritize the grade separations. They are going to require all grade separations to adhere to their complete streets policies. There will be a 10 percent non-Measure B, non-VTA match required. That could be other State funding like Section 190 or cap and trade or High Speed Rail. It just can't come from VTA or Measure B. Then, as I said, they are planning to have discussions with us so they will probably visit this Committee, talk to Staff outside of the structured tact format and they will talk to Palo Alto, Mountain View and Sunnyvale about the details of this program. That's all they presented to date on the program.

Chair DuBois: Just on quick question, I saw somewhere where it said \$100 million dollars per grade from the Measure B money and if Mountain View is closing a street and things. I don't think we should necessarily assume that it takes the money and divide by the number of grades but I don't know if that's been part of the discussion.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Mello: If you were to do every grade crossing within those three Cities, it would be about \$100 million per grade crossing but some may be closed, some may be just converted to a quad gate – quite zone type. I don't know that they're just going to take the money and divide it evenly. I think the implementation plan is going to be a little bit more nuanced than that.

Mayor Scharff: I think what you've just raised is a huge issue. I don't want to go through a Context Sensitive Solution processes, have buy-in on – here's what we'd like to do. Everyone wants to do that and it would be a huge struggle and then VTA says, sorry, this is the way we do it. We do it only this way. I do think we have to be realistic and understand where we are with VTA and push that in. We may need to put a lot of pressure on VTA and that's going to be something that we need to focus on as well because obviously, we're not going to be in a vacuum on this. I don't know the best way to do it but this is really not only community engagement but I guess VTA engagement the entire way through this process. I don't know if that affects how we do this or effects the schedule or whatever but I'd like Staff to really think about this in terms of how we integrate all these components. They are moving components which make it even harder.

Ms. Gitelman: I love this part of a process. When you're just starting out and you're figuring out what could go wrong and you're trying to set it up so you have all of the eventualities covered. I think your point is a good one. We're going to have to stay on top of these issues but in terms of designing a process and coming back to you next time with some more information. Clearly, one of the steps along this road is identifying constraints, costs, fiscal concerns, all of those things go into an informed decision-making process. We're going to have to -- we'll have to reflect that in the process that we outline for you next time.

Mayor Scharff: I'd actually like to really second what Eric said. I do think that the way this works best is we focus on the big picture items, which is what he said. There are constraints of cost and what the community wants and all of that. That's -- those are going to be the big issues.

Ms. Gitelman: Getting back to Tom's question about how to move this forward. We have a lot of resources in the Mott MacDonald contract with Circle Point included. Our hope was that we could get together with them and reach out to a real recognized expert in the CSS process to determine what resources we have available in the contract and what resources we

# FINAL MINUTES

need to add to the contract. Maybe there are some things we can substitute out. Then come back to this Committee with a game plan to present to you at your next meeting and see if we can't get on the same page and get moving on something.

Mayor Scharff: That sounds great to me.

Chair DuBois: Any other comments?

Ms. Gitelman: I do have one other thing which is I feel like we got direction from the full Council to move forward with this Circulation Study. I think we will want to bring that back to you next time as suggested. Just a summary of the methodology and some limitations but also what we might think of alternatives that would get us more information for future discussion making. Then you can decide at that point whether you think it's worth proceeding or whether we should go back to Council and say, look, you directed us to do this but we're going to hold off and do it a little later.

Chair DuBois: Do we need any motions on this item today? Basically, the Motion is to come back to the Rail Committee with a proposal for community outreach for...

Mayor Scharff: I like the word game plan.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, game plan. Basically, an updated schedule and scope. I guess could we just make a Motion on that I guess?

Mayor Scharff: Sure, I'll make that Motion.

Chair DuBois: I'll second that. All in favor?

Chair DuBois, Mayor Scharff, Council Member Filseth, Council Member Fine: Aye.

**MOTION:** Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Chair DuBois to recommend Staff return to the Committee with a revised proposal for community outreach and an updated schedule and scope of work.

**MOTION PASSED:** 4-0

Chair DuBois: The second part of this was the Union Pacific and I don't know if anybody has any additional questions or comments?

# FINAL MINUTES

Mayor Scharff: My comment on that is that it comes back to are we going to look at this tunneling and how do we get that decision point one way or the other because otherwise, that's going to haunt these discussions the entire time with people saying, I want to do a tunnel. I'm just thinking we need to really focus on that early to decide if that's a route we're – it's a different kind of route. It talks about – we'd have to get VTA on board that that's a possibility. We'd have to do all sorts of things. I think we need to either say we're going to move in that direction or try or we're going to say that's off the table. I think we need to have that discussion.

Chair DuBois: I don't think anybody – I know everybody wants to know but I don't know if anybody knows what was agreed to. I think the question is what is the constraints it imposed on us in terms of the ability to change the grade of the rail so they've enabled third party freight operators and also the electrification. There's been talk about electrified freight. I don't know if that's prohibited now or enabled. I think we need to figure that out pretty quickly and I know I've been talking to Molly if there is any kind of clock running where we would want to send a letter from the City of Palo Alto to the Caltrain Board, asking these questions just to make sure we understand what options we have or if options have been closed down.

Molly Stump, City Attorney: Thank you. City attorney, Molly Stump. We do have copies of some initial documents from Caltrain and Union Pacific, which we obtained by our citizen advocates and forwarded to the City. We thank them for their involvement in that. The arrangements are complex. There's an interlocking set of agreements where some of which have been drafted and executed. There – based on our initial look at this and given the fact that we are not experts in their existing arrangements and the technologies etc. We don't have a way to definitively understand exactly, at this point, the engineering implications but we don't see that there's any provision in here that speaks directly to the grade angle, the 1 percent, 2 percent or that's there any term in here that expressly limits adjustments to that, that are reasonable. There is a requirement that the Joint Powers Board operate the line in a way that allows Union Pacific to safely operate its operations. What we understand from the advocates speaking to Caltrain is they don't believe that the type of distinction that we would be looking at to have that 2 percent as opposed to 1 percent would be inconsistent with that obligation. This is definitely something for us to watch and ask more questions about and we're happy to work with the – I think our advocate – citizen advocate experts would be a great resource and the Staff to draft a letter from Palo

# FINAL MINUTES

Alto expressing – noting the issue and expressing our concern that nothing be agreed to that for closes those types of options in this community.

Ms. Gitelman: Can I add one thing? I may be speaking out of turn here. I think – we're – this is going to be a long process and at the end of it, we're going to need to have Caltrain look favorability on deviations from standards if we're pursuing a trench. I think our relationship with them, therefore, is very important and I also think in cases like this, it's important to ask a question – ask the question when you know you're going to get the answer you want so the timing of when we ask particular questions may be important to us strategically and politically. While we could fire off a letter to Caltrain right now, I just think about whether it might be better to keep our powder dry. Do some more behind the scenes analysis and when we're ready, to ask them in a forum where they can say, yes to us about this issue, do it then. Maybe just put it off a little bit.

Chair DuBois: Is there a way we can get more clarity? I think again, the message is not to fire something off but to ask that they really consider the needs of the Cities looking at grade separations when they are doing these kinds of agreements.

Ms. Gitelman: I think we can try and get some more information using the expertise we have on contract and Staff, just Staff to Staff. Maybe there's a little rubbing of shoulders we can do and figure out informally behind the scenes what's going on and just start to build more understanding as a technical matter about what we're going to need in terms of exceptions and what the process is and who's going to be the real decision maker before we get deeper into it.

Chair DuBois: This is really about Union Pacific and how hard they are to negotiate with. We want Caltrain to make sure they're an advocate for us and then if we now have to negotiate with Union Pacific and a third party, it just got a lot harder.

Ms. Gitelman: I understand. Maybe it made a lot harder but maybe it made it a lot easier. We don't know yet.

Chair DuBois: Right. Ok. I guess do we have any other comments about Union Pacific or we'll just – I think we'll take your advice.

# FINAL MINUTES

Mayor Scharff: I guess I would just say that I would agree with Director Gitelman that if – we're not used to as a community being the supplicant position. We like to fire off letters and tell them what our positions are and all that. I would encourage all of you to make contacts with the Caltrain Board Members you know and talk to them privately about it and work the processes.

Chair DuBois: I think the issue is this didn't go to the Board. They weren't aware of it even. Ok.

Mayor Scharff: They are aware of it now.

Chair DuBois: Yes, they are. Alright, so moving on. I guess we'll go ahead and allow it this time but this was all part of this item. We'll have two more speakers on Union Pacific specifically. Roland and then followed by Nadia.

Roland LeBrun: The discussion you just had is exactly what is (inaudible) technical working group should be. At this point, you had quite an extensive technical discussion and that needs to be referred to that group. Basically, to tell them we want to look at this and come to us with a recommendation. I know you haven't formed that group but my advice to you is that you want some representatives from neighboring Cities. You definitely want someone from Atherton. I can't think of somebody there. Maybe some Menlo Park -- I guess that would be Friends of Caltrain but you want some really highly technical people who have seen this, how it's done. I'll tell you right of the day, from where I come from is that the trench is not feasible.

Nadia Naik: Thank you and thank you for allowing extra comment. I think procedurally in the future when the – there's sub-bullets to the super media discussion, it kind of help to break it up because otherwise for us speakers, two minutes is a lot to say about certainly one part and then others. I know, well thank you. I would just echo what Hillary said. I don't think we necessarily need to be firing off letters to Greg's point that we kind of like to do that a lot. I think if you read the Board Packet for tomorrow's Caltrain Board meeting, you'll see my public comments from the previously things where I pointed out all the things that Roland just said, which was that the Board didn't really know and the Staff kind of did this stuff. They are on notice but I think certainly through the local policy maker working group and just Staff to Staff connections can be a great way to ask these questions. I think – again, to reiterate the importance of having actual Staff be attending



# FINAL MINUTES

those meetings because otherwise, for example, putting Mott MacDonald in that position is sort of awkward. I think the personal relationships that we as City people and City Staff actually have, can really be most helpful. I don't – think it's not a surprise that Palo Alto as a particular reputation when it comes to the train and so I think we have to be really sensitive to make sure that we continue to stress to them that we love trains, we love Caltrain. Yah us! Right? Thank you.

Chair DuBois: I guess I'll go ahead and allow (inaudible). This is the last speaker. Adina Levin.

Adina Levin: A few things quickly on the grade separation. Thank you very much for paying close attention to that grade – one of the things I've heard is that in that process with UP, Caltrain does have the ability to say, yah or nay and would have to ability to assert the will of the community to enable that 2 percent grade and pushing Caltrain to use that ability that it has is important. In terms of the earlier rough cost guesstimates on during a trench. As you know, those price tags varied. If you could do the slightly less grade tolerance, the difference is between a billion dollars for – was that \$2 – was that \$3 or was that \$2? – or versus a half a billion dollars. That is a huge amount of money so being able to push that could make a big difference in terms of something that could be within stretching distance of feasible and not at all. With regard to electric, that's an interesting question. There some look at a State level in terms of legislation that would facilitate electrification of freight. The freight on the peninsula is really a very small business considering so it wouldn't necessarily cost justify on its own but there might be ways to do it. It's worth paying some attention and lastly, thanks for the attention to fire off a letter. Palo Alto is in a great position in terms of being able to have the attention and technical expertise and combining that with some diplomacy about how to use it, I think will be very helpful in getting those goals achieved. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: I think we – we're at the end of the meeting. Here we talked about future agendas. Do we need anything ...

Mayor Scharff: We have some other topics.

Chair DuBois: Oh, ok. What are the other topics?

Mayor Scharff: I have some other topics.

# FINAL MINUTES

Chair DuBois: Is that under 2 here?

Mayor Scharff: Yep, that is under 2. That's where you up to other topics. I think other topics should have been 3 but I will go with 2. Under other topics, I think Adrian made a really good point. I don't think it should be a focus necessarily of the Committee but Dumbarton Rail is getting much more press these days and I know Facebook did a million-dollar type study of it. This is the Rail Committee. (Crosstalk) I think the Committee should have some sense of what's happening with Dumbarton Rail and should monitor it a little bit. I don't want it to take a lot of Staff time or anything like that but we should have some sense because Dumbarton Rail would actually be as big as boom to Palo Alto as electrification on Caltrain. If there is an opportunity to actually make it happen, I would support that. We should be doing that. The other thing I think we should do is I would like to put a discussion to understand quite zones. I think we should do quite zones. I think there's an issue of timing and money and it depends on how quickly we go with grade separations versus how long that's going to take and how much money it costs to implement quite zones. I would be all in favor of moving on quite zones as quickly as we could. Assuming the costs make sense and we're not making financial mistakes. I'd like to understand that process and those would be the two other topics I would like to include in this Committee.

Chair DuBois: Alright, so with that, I'd say meeting adjourned. See you guys in a couple weeks.

Interagency Communications

Next Steps and Future Agendas

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 A.M.