



CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE TRANSCRIPT

Special Meeting
August 16, 2017

Chairperson DuBois called the meeting to order at 8:00 A.M. in the Community Meeting Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: DuBois (Chair), Filseth, Fine, Scharff arrived at 8:02. A.M.

Absent:

Oral Communications

Chair DuBois: (Inaudible)

Nadia Naik: Good morning everyone. Nadia Naik from CAARD and Friend of Caltrain at the moment. I'm here to reiterate what Adina has been talking about, which is that they are doing the presentations for the Dumbarton Rail Corridor. There's a couple of meetings coming up but notably, there's nothing in Palo Alto and so I really would urge you guys to see if there's a way that they could come present to the full Council. They are presenting everywhere in San Mateo County but not for us and as you guys know, Dumb Barton Rail Corridor actually has a huge effect on traffic in Palo Alto. I think it's a big deal and so I would urge you guys to think about maybe putting that on and trying to get them into City Council. I know it tight but they are trying to move very, very quickly with this. They want decisions within the next month or two. We're hoping to be able to dive into some more of the details. Some of the things that are – so it's good that they started the report but there are some things that need to be tweaked. For example, they're looking at being able to have bus and rail but they would them illuminate the bikes, which kind of doesn't make sense because bikes don't take up a lot of space. So, I think there needs to be some tweaking but overall, it's excellent that there's a study but I think you guys are going to want to dive into those details. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: (Inaudible)

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: I'll provide more information on the Dumbarton study under the next agenda item.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Our next speaker is Roland Lebrun.

Roland Lebrun: Thank you and good morning and I absolutely second everything Nadia said one hundred percent. The reason I am addressing you today is to give you a heads up about a letter that you are going to be receiving from me hopefully next week, which essentially is going to echo what I say to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the PAC. That is, we look at what's happening in (inaudible) – at what Caltrain's plans are and there is absolutely no way they are going to be able to handle the demands that we are going to have on the system. Especially, as you know, what Google is doing in the Sunnyvale area and actually, it is going to hit Mountain View because slap bang in the middle between Mountain View and various above. So, the proposal is that we are going to double the length of every single baby bullet platform to 1,400-feet and of the City's one in Palo Alto. Now Diridon, we tackled this over six months ago so we're coming – we have nine platforms at grade and hopefully, we are going to have two underground platforms, also the same length, which will have the same capacity as the nine at grade platforms. We're done with Mountain View and so far, the reception has been good. Sunnyvale, I think knows what's coming and then now, I want to talk about Palo Alto and talk about some of the opportunities here. Essentially, it's a 1,400-foot platform, it's four tracks so that you can pass and traffic can go through. We don't block the line like they do in some San Mateo County cities and it starts off by branching off the line for about 800-feet so that you branch off pretty close to maximum speed. You now have your 1,400-foot platforms and another 800-feet at the end so that the total thing is 3,000-feet but since you are looking at grade separations, it gives you an opportunity here with Alma. If you start forking between the bridge and Alma, you will have four tracks at Alma and then the situation is that there is no such thing as a grade crossing with four tracks; you get automatic grade separation. In terms of funding, the opportunity that you have is not just the \$700 million that the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) has for grade separation but you can also use some of the \$300 million because you are increase line capacity; which is what those \$300 million (inaudible). So, there will be a letter over to you with more details and what the opportunities are in Palo Alto. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Our last speaker is Richard Brand.

Richard Brand: Good morning, Richard Brand, 281 Addison and it's good to see everybody again. I – since the last meeting there was an announcement that was made by High Speed Rail that they have to tunnel 14-miles to get

TRANSCRIPT

through Pacheco Pass which this didn't come up before. I just want to make the Committee, if you are not aware of it, that that's the case and it's – I don't know Nadia, it's about \$1.3 billion for – anyway, it's a very expensive tunneling project. I think that if they are going to go ahead and do that just to get into San Jose directly, rather than over the Altamont Pass as you've heard me talk about. I think they ought to have money for us to actually pay for grade separations and I don't know how – I'll have to think about how we might address that but San Mateo County got funded for some of their grade separation requests from High Speed Rail and that's something that – I know we're going to get into that in the other agenda item but I am just putting it out there as something new. Maybe we go back and request High Speed Rail representatives to come back in again. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Alright thank you.

Agenda Review and Staff Update

1. Receive and Review Rail Program Briefing Paper From June-July 2017.

Chair DuBois: We'll proceed to Item Number 1, a review of the rail program.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Sure, good morning Chair and members of the Committee. I'm Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official with the City of Palo Alto. Included in your packet is a Rail Program briefing paper which covers the period from June 15th to August 2nd and provided you with an update on all the activities that transpired over that period. Item 1 was the planning for Community Workshop Number 2 and I'll talk a little bit more about those in our presentation on the next steps for the program. However, it is important to note that this workshop will be held on September 16th at the Palo Alto Art Center auditorium. It will have a similar time frame as the previous workshop on May 20th, which was 10 AM to 2 PM with a lunch provided during a break period. I'll talk more about the programming of that workshop later in my presentation. Item Number 2, we've also tentatively penciled in a Community Workshop Number 2 or Number 3, excuse me, for October 21st; also at the Community Art Center auditorium. Number 3 in the briefing packet is an update on the community questionnaire. You remember the meeting that the Rail Committee held prior to summer break, we discussed doing a community questionnaire in order to solicit input on the problem statement, the objectives, and the evaluation criteria. The questionnaire was extremely successful. We had almost 800 unique responses to the questionnaire and got some incredible feedback on the problem statement, the objectives, and the evaluation criteria. That

TRANSCRIPT

feedback has been incorporated into the presentation that you'll see later on, on those components of the program. Item 4 in the briefing paper is an update on a Measure B Caltrain Grade Separation Program meeting that City Staff had with VTA Staff on August 2nd. This was a very productive meeting, we learned a lot about their approach to the Measure B Caltrain Grade Separation Program. Some key take away from that meeting is that VTA is working on a Request for Proposals (RFP) currently to complete an implementation study to determine how to best allocate that funding and construct all eighth-grade separation over the 30-year tax time frame. We will be involved in the preparation of that RFP and I will assume that we will be able to provide comment. Their goal is to kick that off in early 2018 and they were excited to see that we were making progress on our planning efforts. They also seemed open to discussing some creative ways to utilize the grade separation funding. They seem open to closing grade crossings, redirecting some funding to maybe some more expensive grade separations and they also seemed open to changing the language that we are concerned about. We are still in discussions with them and they haven't made that change yet. The final program guidelines are going to the VTA Board on September 7th so that's our last chance to get this language changed. The language that I am referring to is, funds will be allocated to the most cost-effective grade separation alternatives. We feel like this may preclude communities from adding local funding and other funding sources that do something that may be more expensive but in the community interest. We've recommended some changes to that language. They would more specifically call out the cost-effective use of Measure B funds and that would leave open other alternatives that may bring some additional funding to the table. We have talked to Staff from Sunnyvale and Mountain View and Sunnyvale concurs with that change. I have not heard back from Mountain View yet but we have asked VTA Staff to make that change before this September 7th meeting to the program guidelines. Item number five in your briefing packet is an update on the Dumbarton Transportation Corridor Study. I've also attached a presentation that was delivered when they announced that the draft plan was released. I'll be attending a stakeholder meeting at Menlo Park City Hall this afternoon, which is all of the agency representatives that are involved in the Dumbarton Transportation Corridor Study. I'll be able to provide further information after I attend that meeting. Our speaker, Nadia Naik, did mention that there are some public meetings that are also scheduled. We've also reached out, at the request of the Chairman, to invite SamTrans here to present on the study and they have agreed tentatively to attend the September Rail Committee meeting; if you are all interested in having them present. The public comment period is open until the end of September so we fully expect that we'll be drafting a letter

TRANSCRIPT

after we receive some input from you. I think we can wait until after the presentation from Staff before we start drafting that letter, we do have until the end of September to submit comments. Item Number 6, recently San Gabriel – in the San Gabriel Valley and southern California a trench – a railroad trench was opened and this Committee asked for some information on that so I've included a budget. It was a little hard tracking down any kind of project fact sheet or any information for the specific project but I was able to determine that it was a 1.4-mile long trench. The total budget was \$312.7 million and they separated several roadways using the trench. They did an interesting thing which creates a Joint Powers Board (JPB) just to construct these grade separations and what's included in your packet is actually the 2018 budget for that JPB. It has some pretty detailed information on the funding sources and the total budget and some photos of the project. This was really the only information that I could track down without actually calling somebody from the JPB. If you would like additional information, I can do that and see if they have any kind of project fact sheet or update specifically on the trench project. Then finally in the briefing paper, we have the latest expenditures from our consultant team attached and I will say that we had a little bit of a reset over the summer with our approach to the Rail Program. Starting this summer Staff has taken more of a leading role in the management of this program and we're using our consulting team strategically for technical support and community engagement support when needed but going forward, you'll see Staff play a larger role in this process. That's why the briefing paper was actually prepared by Staff this month. So, with that, any questions on the briefing paper, I'll be glad to answer.

Chair DuBois: Any questions? So, we do have some members of the public so maybe we should have them speak quickly and then go back to questions. So, on Item 1 we have Richard Brand, followed by Elizabeth Alexis.

Richard Brand: Richard Brand, I applaud that Joshua – you've done a good job here in this report and I especially like it – it was brief to the point and covered a lot of the things that needed to be covered. Once again, I thank you for that good work. One of the things about the Dumbarton thing is included in here in the meeting and I'll be at that meeting tonight and I invited Joe Simitian to come too. Is that we – it's true, we have no representation from VTA going to this at all. I'm glad that our City is taking that option to go. I wondered if we can get our old colleague Mark Berman involved in this too. It might be something that the Committee would do, to send a letter to Mark and say hey Mark, I need a little help here, because it's a regional issue. It's not just San Mateo County issue so I just offer that as a

TRANSCRIPT

thought. I think the Committee ought to consider sending a note to Mark. Thanks

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Elizabeth Alexis to be followed by Roland Lebrun.

Elizabeth Alexis: Good morning. I want to talk about the VTA piece also. I think while we are making progress, I think we really need to push for reset of the VTA entire approach, I mean on two different levels. I think they have now sort of said that this isn't just like a bike project grant program where a couple of good projects will rise to the top. That yes, you need to do everything but they are still talking about a 30-year time horizon and that's just not the time horizon that Caltrain is going to be on. Transbay Terminal is going to open sometime between 2025 and 2030, Caltrain demand, just from that alone, will double. The number of people who live in Palo Alto who take the train will probably triple just based upon an analysis that we've done with sort of similar towns. The same kind of things will happen in Sunnyvale though and will happen in Mountain View and even before then. I mean we see eight trains for Caltrain in not that distant future and we would see ten trains for Caltrain by 2025. No major – during the peak hours, no grade crossing will effectively be open after that time period or one of the Cities will stand in the way of the expansion of Caltrain and the option is gridlock on 101; more people going there. I mean whatever we do, it's a bad situation and the entire County needs to mobilize behind this idea that this needs to get done. I've heard well, it's a 30-year tax measure, well I mean you borrow against the sales tax. I mean the \$700 million that they have is in 2017 dollars are ready. They've already assumed that it's sort of borrowed and right now interest rates are low and they might not be low in the future. I mean we need to reset this as something where everybody's major – I mean we need Sunnyvale stuff to get done, we need Mountain View stuff to get done. This idea of pitting everybody against each other, they should simply allocate it out, divided up by the number of grade crossings per City and then let the Cities allocate across their own – make their plans. No one is going to be wasting money, I mean everybody's projects are going to cost more than their prorated share of the money, everybody. So, everybody will have to come up with the difference. So, there's the incentive to do that and we need to make this where we all understand that we are all in this together, instead of some kind of competition. We do not benefit – I mean, we will have a time pressure of this – of Caltrain's expansion; the Cities will have that but quite frankly, the other Cities also – they need to have some planning time. We have heard this competition and that we're falling behind. I know the situations in all

TRANSCRIPT

those Cities, they are not going to benefit either by rushing their programs through.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Next speaker is Roland and then our last speaker is Adina Levin.

Roland Lebrun: So, that was a perfect segue into my public comment, right? We know there is this massive problem, it was right there, we're not seeing any answers in governing and business plans. That's why we decided to take the matter into our own hands and we also know that we are specifically speaking the entire (inaudible) will not get grade separated. So regardless of what we do in Santa Clara County, you're going to get stuck but we do have an opportunity that if they don't get their act together (inaudible) the road, is to actually start taking trains up the mountain rail and address the congestion that way. So, half of the traffic will be going across the bay and the rest will be going to San Francisco. Anyway, I want to talk about what's going on with Dumbarton Rail and I think Nadia already brought up one of the problems. The figures they gave us last night, that they need 65-feet for the trains, are totally incorrect. That's four tracks and we're only going to have two tracks and they only need 35-feet, which means there is plenty of room left for peds and bikes trail. I put a post on Adina's blog last night that actually gives the references directly from the Caltrain Standards and how the calculations were arrived at so that's point Number 1. We also – I don't know if you know what (inaudible) is or what the deal with Union City is? Union City is what blew up the entire Dumbarton Rail last time because they want \$400 million to reroute Ace and Capital Corridor to Union City but we're safe from the beginning; we don't need this; I mean this is just a boondoggle. All we need is (inaudible) which is where BART and the tracks intersect so you can transfer from Capital Corridor and Ace right there at (inaudible). It's not going to be an infestation, it's just going to be a pure transfer station. There is \$130 million right there in (inaudible) that (inaudible) approved for this. So, last night we are hearing from Caltrain oh, the \$130 million is not all for (inaudible). We are saying this over and over again over there at SamTrans, this has to stop, we've got to get rid of these people because they keep ripping us off. The \$12.5 million (inaudible) Metro Lane cost, well look at what's there, ok? They are not red, they are still gray just like they were in Metro Lane days; the money is gone. The \$125 million bridge loan, while we are waiting for the FGA to come through, that money is also gone and it just goes on and on; it's got to stop. Now going back to Dumbarton Rail, one thing they are not even considering is a tunnel; it's not even on the map. If we tunnel, we will be able to grade separate both Willow and University. Just think about that – for that – what that would do for us;

TRANSCRIPT

(inaudible). I think that's it for now but we're going to go out there tonight and I strongly encourage you to go to East Palo Alto and listen to what's going on. My take on this is we're going to have to ask Facebook to basically take over the entire thing and just get the job done. We're never going to get anything done with SamTrans. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Ok, and our last speaker is Adina Levin.

Adina Levin: Morning Council Members. Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain and here to piggy back on what Mr. Lebrun said about the Dumbarton Corridor. While we're not done pouring through their several hundred-page reports, the fact that this is ambitious and it's talking about ridership on the level of the mid-twenty thousand to thirty thousand is good. That's really different from what came out a decade ago, which wouldn't have been worth investment and this is worth investment but there's also a lot of specifics in there that are worth a lot of attention. There are near term bus improvements that make eminent sense and could be done tomorrow, which is great but some of the issues in there in terms of how do you use bus and rail together seem really perplexing in terms of how you would actually run a transit system. The fact that it's multi-modal, great, but how they work together is kind of odd. The – having buses and rail use the right of way and crowding out the bikes, the data that came to Palo Alto from Stanford on the general use permit showing twenty to thirty percent bike mode share within five miles when you have good connections. That could suck up twenty to thirty percent of the drivers between Redwood City and Facebook if that was done and it's basically ignored because the Metropolitan Transportation Commission model doesn't forecast bikes and therefore you can't forecast bikes; that needs attention. The proposed improvements not only for – there's a – it looks like there's about \$800 million in freewayizing 84 in there, with the hope that it will improve the traffic but if you have drivers coming up, they still need to get off of 101 and how much extra room is there on Willow hill towards 101 or University hill towards 101? None, so will that actually just move the bottleneck? That's needs a lot of attention for the amount money towards the amount of value. Lastly, even though there are all kinds of details in there that need to be hashed out, it's good to see the funding in the expenditure plan for RM-3 and if somebody made a call, it's time to make a call again because that expenditure plan is in flux. There are political issues in Sacramento causing people to be fighting over what's in there and so talking to Marc Berman and Mullen and Hill and anybody else you have relationships with, let's keep the money in, figure out what to do with it and pay a lot of attention towards making it good. Thank you.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Alright so back to the Committee, does anybody have questions?

Mayor Scharff: Yeah, I do.

Chair DuBois: I do too but go ahead.

Mayor Scharff: I think that the change – oh yeah sure. So, the change in the language if we get it and I guess Mountain View hasn't weighed in, is that it? The practical differences of the language are the language we're suggesting allows us to do a trench if the trench is cost effective. Is that roughly the difference?

Mr. Mello: The language that we're requesting would give communities more flexibility to add additional funding on top of Measure B for something that maybe more expensive like a trench.

Mayor Scharff: So, it's basically adding the – is that we – it basically allows us to take whatever the low-cost alternative is, add any money to it and do, as opposed to not getting the money because it's not cost effective.

Mr. Mello: The current language makes it sound as though VTA will judge the projects based on the total cost when they measure the cost effectiveness. Not the most – not the cost effectiveness of the Measure B funding and you know, using Measure B funding to leverage local funding and other funding is actually more cost effective than just picking a lower cost alternative.

Mayor Scharff: So, Mountain View people tell me that they are pretty much done. That they're ready to go, they are looking for the funding and they are hoping to get the funding to fund the whole thing and move forward with their grade separations. Sunnyvale tells me they are going to have – do you know their (inaudible) because I think they said something to me like they are basically planning on two meetings and then just moving forward.

Mr. Mello: I have a table and I'll talk more about that later but their ready – they are going to have preferred alternatives identified by early 2018 and then they are going to move into design.

Mayor Scharff: I mean it seems like both Sunnyvale and Mountain View are going to get their grade separations and that they are moving really quickly and that seems to be the facts on the ground. Have we had any discussions with VTA? I mean do we have any commitment at all about – the whole 30-

TRANSCRIPT

year thing really concerns me as well and I think it concerns the speakers. I was – do we have any sense at all of what they are thinking on that stuff?

Mr. Mello: We know that they want to build all eight grade separations. We know that the horizon for the sales tax is 30-years.

Mayor Scharff: Are they talking about bonding or are they not...

Mr. Mello: They have not talked about bonding recently. That was a question we continue to ask through the holding Measure B development process. I would assume that they are still talking about that; their financial folks but we haven't heard an update on that recently.

Mayor Scharff: Then in terms of the trench over at San Gabriel, the relevance to us is that it shows what a trench might cost or does it not really have any relevance? I mean we don't – we did some preliminary estimates of what a trench would cost. I remember us having our consultants look at that but do we think – what do we think the relevance to that is frankly, to our own trench numbers and what would it take for us to actually get – to get some context around what a trench would cost; those kinds of information. What are the constraints on building a trench and what's that going to take for the City?

Mr. Mello: So, we provided the information on the San Gabriel trench at the request of Committee Members. I do not know enough about the project to know how relevant it is to our trench discussions. We can look into that and get some more information on that project if that's something you're interested in.

Mayor Scharff: No, no, I...

Mr. Mello: As far...

Mayor Scharff: ... if it has no relevance, I have no interest. What I am interested in knowing what it would cost to build a trench in Palo Alto. So, my question is – I mean if it does have relevance, I want you to look into it but if it's really not that helpful then I want to know what it would take to get good numbers or at least starting to get some handle on a range of numbers or where we are on that.

Mr. Mello: We're planning to start the development of alternative at the September 16th community workshop number two. You know very—in quick

TRANSCRIPT

order, upon starting the alternatives development we'll start putting together some planning level cost estimates to get that kind of a magnitude of cost for things like a trench, a standard overcrossing, and an under crossing. I think September or October we'll start to get a hand on what the order of magnitude is.

Mayor Scharff: So, there's the over crossing but as – do we have any issues – does VTA have any issues with an over cross? That's an elevated track, right? I know (inaudible), it's an overpass and then we have the underpass and then we have the trench. I mean is there any other options?

Mr. Mello: I think there could be a whole host of different options.

Mayor Scharff: Like what? I can't think of any.

Mr. Mello: Closure, a hybrid which is raising the rail a little bit and lowering the road a little bit. It's also going to depend on the location of the overcrossing and under crossings. How do we interface with Alma Street? Do we sever the connection with Alma Street or do we raise or lower the intersection? I think there's going to be a pretty significant number of – you know in our universe of alternatives before we start to narrow down. We'll start to have this discussion pretty intensively in September and October and I think we can narrow them down relatively quickly when you start looking at costs and constraints.

Chair DuBois: I had a couple quick questions. The Art Center Auditorium, is that the space in the back?

Mr. Mello: Yes.

Chair DuBois: So, are we concerned that it's not large enough? I mean the first meeting there was – probably wouldn't have fit in there.

Mr. Mello: Yeah, there are 180 seats available and we're going to use the courtyard as well for activities; the weather should be good.

Chair DuBois: Ok, I guess we don't have a choice for this next meeting but the third meeting – again, I'm just concerned that it's not a big enough space.

Mr. Mello: Yeah, we're very limited on the space that's available. We tried and tried to get the Mitchell Park room again.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: So, even in October?

Mr. Mello: Yeah, there was very little availability for Saturdays.

Chair DuBois: Is there any other spaces larger than the Art Center? Cubberley?

Mr. Mello: Claudia helped secure the space. I don't know if you have any more information, Claudia? I don't think there's a space large enough at any other location.

Claudia Keith, Chief Communications Officer: We do have the Art Center which holds 180 and the October dates, we had originally had a late October date for Mitchell Park and then when we changed dates, it was tough to find a place. We've looked at other venues that are not public facilities like the Elks Club and things like that but it does have a cost. I think the Art Center, we've had some large gatherings there and we do have the court yard which it should be nice weather so at least in terms of activities –we can search for the October date and see...

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I am just – again, if we can get to September and if it's standing room only, we may not have enough time to adjust.

Ms. Keith: I mean the El Palo Alto room definitely holds more, for sure.

Chair DuBois: Yeah and I know we did the Sustainability Summit in the multi-purpose room in the schools so there might be some other options like that. So, I'm glad to hear about the conversation with VTA and funding. Is there's recognition that Measure B funds aren't going to cover all these grade seps?

Mr. Mello: Yes, and I think the enrollment plan is going to look at what other potential funding sources there are. I think they'll look at a high level at what a package could be for the whole eight. You know VTA does have the ability to program other federal funding through their TIP.

Chair DuBois: So, they can help us with that or we could do that ourselves as well, right? Look for other sources of funding?

Mr. Mello: Yes.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Ok. I'm glad to hear that we've got SamTrans committed and I guess we'll talk about that at the end of this meeting. The San Gabriel trench, I guess I found it very interesting. The part that I found relevant was again, the funding plan and looking at how they put together a bunch of funding sources. I guess we'll talk about it at the next item but one of my concerns is that this isn't a linear process and we should really probably start to talk about a funding strategy sooner rather than later. They – just looking at it pretty quickly, they – it looks like they had 35 percent funds from State grants, forty percent came from the MTA and 25 percent were federal and local together but the idea that JPB—to assemble all these funding sources, looks like a pretty big effort. That is something that we haven't even started to talk about. Then the last one, again I appreciated this report and the Staff taking more of leading role. I noticed that seventy-two percent of the funds on the circulation study has been spent. When are we expecting to get that study?

Mr. Mello: They are working on a modeling of the scenarios right now and soon as they're in a legible format – the output is in a legible format, we're going to have a meeting with them and put together a draft report on the findings.

Chair DuBois: Is that going to be used at the next public meeting, to...

Mr. Mello: That's the goal, yes.

Chair DuBois: Ok. I mean if it's not ready, it seems like that's pretty important information to start to look at alternative impacts and...

Mr. Mello: Yeah, they started modeling immediately after the last Rail – after the time period for comments on the scenarios expired, we directed them to begin modeling those scenarios.

Chair DuBois: Cool, I guess that was it so thank you. Yep, Adrian?

Council Member Fine: Thank you and thanks for this report. A few things, so I actually agree with Council Member DuBois about the JPB. I thought it was interesting so one was the organization they used. The other things were kind of that they were looking at multiple trenches in multiple areas and they had a pretty nice project plan for (inaudible) showing where they were in the works. I think Sunnyvale does a good job of that too. With regard to VTA, so do I understand that you correctly that there are multiple agencies helping VTA write an RPF to study how disperse the funds?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: VTA is authoring the RFP and we will have input into the scope and we already gave them some opinion on the time line but the project will be managed by VTA in consultation with Palo Alto, Mountain View, Sunnyvale, and Caltrain.

Council Member Fine: So, do they not have established ways of dispersing funds likes this?

Mr. Mello: They – you know a lot of their funding projects have different criteria and different grant – they use completeive grants for a lot of the programs like Go Bag and TFCA and some other funding streams. This is a little bit different and I think they recognize – well, it's a little bit different because they're – they've to date committed to delivering all eight grade separations. So, to do a completeive process would not work because you wouldn't be able to strategize about how – what the funding package looks like for all eight so I think this is a different animal when it comes to all the different funding programs.

Council Member Fine: Yeah, I mean I guess I would just echo what some of the public speakers said, like this seemed like a public County Wide Measure and as you mentioned, there's an opportunity here for each local municipality to leverage their own matching funds and VTA should be looking at that bottom line. What can we do to help? I mean should we contact the VTA Board?

Mr. Mello: I think we need that language changed before it goes to the Board on September 7th and we have the example – the recommended language in the briefing report.

James Keene, City Manager: Can I jump in? (Inaudible) my questions were going to be (inaudible). I'm sorry guys, I didn't wear the Staff uniform today the blue shirt, the dark jacket, and the jeans and I really apologize for being out of uniform. I agree with what Elizabeth was saying, I mean first of all it seems absurd that we would be thinking about trying to do this without funding for it at all. I mean over a 30-year period if we have \$27 and the elasticity of sales tax over that period of time. Even there's an equity issue about really who is paying and who is benefiting. I mean is this completely open and up for debate or is it – are we able to get that commitment in some way because without, I really think we're at risk. I think it's very difficult for us to be doing any near-term planning on gap funding if we don't know what and when (inaudible) is going to be available.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: I think a lot of this discussion will occur in the development of the implementation plan because they are going to look at what the bigger funding package is, can they deliver all eight with their existing funding sources, do they need to bond? I think we need to stay on top of – you know we need to make sure that the scope includes things like – that would need – be needed to do an analysis of whether bonding will work and those types of tools.

Mr. Keene: I just think we need to die on this hill honestly. I mean the – or else the ...

Council Member Fine: I think that's my question, for now, thank you.

Chair DuBois: Alright, let's move on to Item Number 2.

NO ACTION TAKEN.

Action Items

2. Recommendations Regarding a Suggested Problem Statement, Objectives, and Evaluation Criteria to Support Development and Evaluation of Railroad Grade Separation Alternatives.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: So, in the interest of allowing all of the Committee Members to participate in the maximum amount of discussion, we've broken this into two separate discussions – two separate presentations. The first on the process, the Context Sensitive Solutions Process and then the second part of the presentation and discussion will be on the problem statement, objectives and evaluation criteria.

Council Member Filseth: (Inaudible)

Mr. Mello: Council Member Filseth is going to participate in the first part of the discussion which is the process and then he'll recuse himself for the second part of the discussion, which is the problem statement, objectives and evaluation criteria. Do you want to...

Council Member Filseth: In advice of the City Attorney it's because I live within 500-feet of one of the grade separations and that I'm conflicted.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Are we going to be talking about specific grade seps or are we talking about overall objectives?

Molly Stump, City Attorney: Is it helpful if I chime in? Good morning, City Attorney, Molly Stump. So, the conflict rules include a set of rules on real property proximity to significant projects or events. The problem statement talks about the four grade crossings in a way that takes them on as a group and talks about beginning and decisions making process on potential projects and the grade separations. Council Member Filseth does own real property quite proximate to one of the crossings. Council Member Fine asked whether the public generally exception would apply here? It does not because that exception means that it – to qualify for that, the decision at issue needs to effect twenty-five percent or more of property in substantially the same way. While the grade separations solutions at the four crossings will affect all Palo Altans and in fact, people throughout the region who travel to Palo Alto, it does not affect them all in the same way. Both in terms of short term construction and long-term solutions of the properties that are very proximate to the crossing will be affected in a more intense and quite distinct way from others who may live further away who will also have some effects but not similar effects.

Mayor Scharff: So, Molly it did strike me that the Alma crossing where Council Member Filseth lives close to is actually very different and distinct from the other three crossings and the issues facing it. I actually was wondering if we could segregate out the other three? Do a problem statement for them and then have a discussion to see if we want the same problem statement for Alma because Alma actually is a completely different animal in the way the whole thing looks and so that would work for me.

Ms. Stump: We certainly looked at that segregation role and again, for those who aren't familiar, that allows a decision to be broken into pieces and taken separately to narrow the recusal but there are some specific requirements to use that rule. We don't think that we have access to it under the currently defined process at this time, although hopefully at some point we will. What it requires is that the piece that – where the conflict lies, which in this case is the Alma Street crossing that's close to Council Member Filseth's real property, it has to be able to be addressed in a way that is not linked in any way to the remaining items that the Council Member would participate in. It can't be linked in terms of money, timing, engineering, policy; it has to be completely separable. It very well may be that at some point in this process one or all four of the crossings are separated out to be considered in a distinct way but right now, at this early stage as we read the report, we

TRANSCRIPT

really are talking about them as a group and there are potentially some trade-offs and exchanges to be made in terms of priority and approach. Where a decision on one will impact the decision on another and given that situation, it can't be separate at this time.

Chair DuBois: Can you just clarify, is Council Member Filseth going to participate in any overall objectives and criteria that are at a high level?

Ms. Stump: So, certainly Council Member Filseth has participated thus far on the rail policy statement. That is at such a high level that we think that works. There are some procedural items in terms of how the City is going to tackle this conversation that we've been able to say, those really don't have to do with a specific potential option at the crossings and then that – the problem statement then actually does.

Mr. Mello: Yeah, we have broken the presentation into the first part will cover the process, including a discussion of how decisions will be made and then the second part we'll delve into the problem statement, objectives and evaluation criteria.

Chair DuBois: It just seems like the criteria and objectives were totally general, there were nothing specific grade crossings. I guess we could take this up from any future meetings.

Ms. Stump: I think we all are sensitive to wanting to maximize participation while making sure that we follow the ethic rules. I think as the process works its way forward, the Staff and Council can be mindful of what ways to frame these items that come before the Committee and the Council to allow that.

Council Member Filseth: Council Member Scharff's point or Mayor Scharff's point, you know the Alma Street crossing is such a different beast than all the rest of these and essentially all the discussion that we've had dating back to 2010 has been how do we deal with rail between San Antonio Road and at the very, very north part of University? Everybody assumes that basically there's not that much to be done with the Alma Street crossing, it's not the most critical one anyway. All the issues related to cross town traffic and so forth associated with the entire rationale for doing grade separations don't apply at the Alma Street crossing. So, it seems ridiculous that the Alma Street crossing should be dragging around policy on how Palo Alto deals with grade separations.

TRANSCRIPT

Ms. Stump: So, I may be then that in this process as it moves forward in the near term, there can be some priority on defining that approach to that crossing in some way that's distinct but remember it needs to be distinct in terms of budget and funding availability. In other words, there – for FPPC purposes it can't be the case that the funding and the timing of one say approaches on the mid and south Palo Alto crossings are in substance linked or traded off against. If that's the case, then they are not separate for conflict purposes but if the conversation is framed in a way that focuses earlier on, on separating out that, then I think we would get sooner to this place where we really did have this separation and then there would be the ability to participate in the other crossing discussions.

Mayor Scharff: I think that's a good question that you frame it that way is that I agree completely with Council Member Filseth and that all of the tough issues here relate to the other three crossings and I almost think we could segregate that crossing out. I mean we're probably not going to be grade separating that one on the same time frame. That may be the 30-year grade separation, is the one down there. The other three are hopefully much sooner so I'm wondering what that segregation would look like and obviously we're not going to solve that today but the question is, what would you need from the Committee and the Council to segregate this in a way that would allow Council Member Filseth to participate? Obviously, that's not necessarily the goal but my gut sense is that the Alma Street crossing is so different than the others and in terms of funding, timing and all that, that I think that that's the way it would go. We need to obviously have that discussion and decided and obviously, we wouldn't just be doing it for you, I think it just falls that way. So, the question is if we have those votes and we have the discussion at Council, how do we segregate it out and we should do that earlier. If we're not going to segregate that out, I think Council Member Filseth should know that as well. So, how do we do that, that's really the questions?

Ms. Stump: Well, we certainly know what the conflict rules are, their settled and what they require. What we don't know is how this conversation is going to progress so if that's the Committee and the Council and the community's intention to address that issue and separate it completely in terms of – so that it's not linked or related to the other set of decisions in timing, budget, engineering, policy. Then we can support that as a Staff, we can get there and then we'll be in a situation where we can use that rule.

Council Member Filseth: Let me ask a – maybe this is the same thing but slightly different (inaudible) so it's slightly different but how we define the

TRANSCRIPT

problem, does that make a difference because if we define the problem as by 2025 Caltrain is going to be running ten trains an hour in both directions and it's going to be impossible to get my car from one side of Palo Alto to the other. If we define that as the problem, the Alma crossing is irrelevant to that issue so if we define that as the problem, then can I un-recuse?

Ms. Stump: We'll need to look at the rest of the decisions and see if we've achieved – if we've met that legal standard of having the – any approach at Alma not be linked to the rest of the crossings. So, for example, if there's a substantial question that the community and the Council needs to grapple with about other types of improvements at Alma, are those prioritized for budget and timing purposes first or behind other crossings. Then I think for FPBC purposes, they are going to say that those decisions are not fully separate. That one, in fact, depends on the other and so then they would say that that's standard for separation is not met. If..

Council Member Filseth: Even that can't be totally a black and white thing because I mean you could make an argument that if we decide to declare Alma Street a quiet zone, then that's going to take a certain amount of money and digging a trench in South Palo Alto, that's going to take a certain amount of money so it's all money so it must be connected, well that's ridiculous too. So, how do we differentiate that?

Chair DuBois: I'd like to suggest that we just have this conversation after this meeting. I think – I don't see us changing the decision for this particular meeting and then we should work this out before the next meeting.

Mayor Scharff: I agree completely with that. I think the only difference is if we have to give direction to Staff to ask what that would look like and what decisions we need to make. I mean right now I don't know how we make that decision without us making decisions about how we break it up. I mean I think I need a Staff report or something that says, you'd have to take it this way, you'd have to make these decisions, you'd have to – the community would have to look at it this way. I mean I don't see how we could have – I don't see how you can get to what you need and Council Member Filseth can get what he needs without Staff telling us what we need the decisions to look like from this Committee and this Council because it's how we phrase it whether or not he's recused. I mean we could just say we're not dealing with the Alma Street crossing. We're not going to grade sep or we're not looking at it. It's a separate path and separate track, I'm not sure – I'm not say – advocating that or thinking about it but that would

TRANSCRIPT

be a decision that would seem to allow him to participate or we can say we're going to look at Alma but it's a different and then you would have to tell us what that looks like. Am I wrong on that?

Ms. Stump: I think we do need to work our way forward but I hope that I've been clear about the standard. For example, if there's a common pot of money that is available for all of these projects, simply declaring that the Alma Street project is separate is not going to meet the standard.

Mr. Keene: It seems to be that if you were going to have any more of this particular conversation, at a minimum it should take place at the end of this process discussion because I think that there are some implications for the process discussion even based upon these kinds of conflict issues.

Chair DuBois: Ok, so why don't we go ahead with the Staff presentation.

Mr. Mello: Great, so as I mentioned earlier we've broken this presentation into two parts. The first will cover the Context Sensitive Solutions Process. As you know there's been a lot of discussion about whether or not to have a Stakeholder Committee as part of this Context Sensitive Solution Process. Back in the spring prior to our May 20th community workshop, we presented you with this table that shows kind of the five steps – you know five decisions that need to be made moving along this process at the top; process milestones. In order to move this forward, we decided to come to you and recommend that we just move forward with stage one of this, which was to create a community engagement plan and host the first community workshop with a goal of getting to a problem definition, objectives and evaluation criteria decision point. We're currently at that point today. We went to Planning and Transportation Commission August 9th and we are bringing this forward to you today on August 16th. Then we are planning to go to City Council but there is a little bit of a change on this. We were originally going to City Council on August 28th, it's not September 5th. That has been moved forward a week and then finally we're hoping to go back to the community for community workshop two on September 16th. We do believe that the process that we're following adheres to the Context Sensitive Solution principles. This is from a report documenting a successful Context Sensitive Solution processes. Just take a step back, Context Sensitive Solutions came out – and it's a solution so highway departments were really struggling with how to integrate transportation facilities into existing communities. Particularly after the adoption of NEBA back in the 1960's and historically they had just used cookie cutter for highway designs

TRANSCRIPT

and plowed through existing communities and neighborhoods. Some pretty cutting-edge Department of Transportation (DOT) started to deliver project that were context sensitive so sensitive to the context that they are located in. Those became known as Context Sensitive Solutions and then a whole group of academics and others started to look at how those projects were delivered and found some commonalities in how those projects were delivered. That became the so-called Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Process but ultimately, you know CSS is judged on the context – how well a project fits into its context. Does it enhance the community? Does it create barriers? Is it in harmony with the surround community? Does it solve community problem or is it just addressing something that somebody – a bureaucrat in a DOT decided that was the problem? So, that the origin of CSS so out of all those studies and kind of forensic audits of how these projects were delivered, some principles were developed. The principles are really around continuous engagement of the community. Thinking about the context of where the project is located. Every single neighborhood is different, every single context is different so a cookie cutter highway design or a grade separation design is not going to work in harmony with every community; every community is different. One of the key components of Context Sensitive Solutions is transparency, so continuing communication and collaboration with the community. You don't come to the community after a decision has been made in a back room and say this is the alternatives that we've developed, what do you think? That's the design and the defend model where you – engineers and others sit in a room and they think they know what's best for the community, develop a solution and come out and present it. Have a faux public hearing where they take comments from the community and then go back and come back with something that is very similar. This is a totally different process under CSS, it's much more transparent. We've brought those principles into our Rail Program. Our goals – kind of our principles that we're operating under here and these are not formal principles but this has what's come out of the discussion of the Rail Committee and Council and other in the past is that we're going to build on the work that was done from the prior two Rail Corridor Studies. We're going to set the context at the beginning, which is what the point where at today, define the problem and then define the measures of success. We fully expect this process to evolve. We've said this over and over again throughout the spring and this year that we're not locking ourselves into a process early on because as we have discussion and as we continually involve the community in this decision-making process, I think we may end up somewhere that we're all not expecting and we need to be ready to adapt. Then our current process is to use broad based community workshop, establish Commissions and Committees and elected bodies for decision making. We don't currently

TRANSCRIPT

have a stakeholder group created just for this program. On the top is a flow chart that shows our current decision-making process, which takes somewhere – for each decision it would take somewhere around two months and that’s being somewhat ambitious. It takes about four weeks for us to prepare for a community meeting. The shortest time that we can prepare for the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) and Rail Committee is about two weeks and that’s agenda preparation and preparing materials. For more complex decisions, you know there could be a two-week period of meeting preparation in advance of that so it could be up to four weeks for each of those Committees. Fortunately, we’re able to use a lot of the same materials for PTC and Rail Committee. City Council agendas are you know, we start work on those five weeks in advance of the City Council meetings so it shouldn’t be taken lightly when we add other steps and we – these decisions are going to take a long time to make. If we were to add a stakeholder group, at the bottom we’re estimating that that would add another two weeks to potentially four weeks to the process every time we want to make a decision. So, that doesn’t sound like a lot but cumulatively when we make multiple decisions throughout this process, we could be adding months to the decision-making process and the entire alternatives development process. This does not include – we’re anticipating that if a stakeholder group was convened, it could take three to six months to get that group up and running, which would put us in a holding patterning pattern for three to six months. Then you add any additional weeks that it would take to prepare for the stake holder group meetings and we’re looking at a several months push back of the schedule ultimately. To put that in context, this is a chart that we developed that shows where are peer Cities along the peninsula are as far as grade separation; as well as the schedule of Caltrain electrification and High Speed Rail. Since the report was prepared we got more information on Sunnyvale so I super imposed a green bar there and the red line represents when Sunnyvale will be complete with their alternatives analysis and they’ll have preferred alternatives selected. Mountain View already has preferred alternatives and they have final design actually for Rengstorf Avenue. So, they are ready to go to construction on that project and they have a preferred alternative identified for the Castro Street grade crossing. So, if we were to push back—and we’re currently on schedule if we continue along a path that we’re on, it will – it is ambitious and we will need to maintain schedule but we are hoping to have alternatives identified at the same time Sunnyvale has alternatives developed. This gives very well with VTA’s plans to begin work on their implementation study because then all three communities will have a pretty clear picture as to where they are in the process when VTA begins the implementation study. We’ll be on equal footing with Sunnyvale and

TRANSCRIPT

somewhat equal footing with Mountain View, which is farther along in both Sunnyvale and Palo Alto. We did go to PTC last week and we made a very similar presentation to them. At the end of the discussion they passed a motion that read Palo Alto will follow a CSS process for evaluation of rail grade separation including the creation of a dedicated expert stakeholder group in parallel with neighborhood stakeholders. So, they did recommend to Council that a stakeholder group be convened in order to execute those Context Sensitive Solutions Process. With that, our Staff recommendation in regard to this section of the presentation is to review the attached community engagement plan, which is Attachment A. Then provide a recommendation to the City Council on the CSS decision making process.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I guess let me know if you want to speak about both and I'll keep your card for the second discussion. Alright, so the first two speakers that I have are Nadia Naik and Elizabeth Alexis. Do you want to speak on CSS?

Nadia Naik: Good morning everyone. I appreciate Josh's presentation, thank you, Josh. This slide, which wasn't actually included in our packet but it was sort of an add on which is super helpful, I think is missing a lot of decision points. So, I think we're getting to what in my public comment described that we need to flush out the process more but I don't see the kinds of stuff that you've got to tackle ready that's looking at having Caltrain, High Speed Rail, Water District, all these people being involved. Where are all those decision points in terms of where their feedback is? I think what's important to lay here for people to understand the process and not feel blindsided is that it doesn't matter what you do, stake holders or not, expanding attack or not, you need to the layout that these are all the things that we're going to discuss. This is how we're going to input those people and these are the ones making decisions. When does the City Council make a decision? When is PTC making a decision? You guys asked last time that PTC review stuff, what exactly is their role? What exactly is going to be the TAC's role and how is the community input - is there going to be an actual decision from the community at these large community meetings? In the end, are you going to do thumbs up or thumbs down on do we even look at taking people's homes or not? Do we look at a trench or not? I mean those things - those important decision points, those are kind of the tree diagram of alternatives that you guys are looking for that need to be flushed out in order for this to make sense. Otherwise, you're really not spelling out the process. You're going through some of the motions, you've got some great terminology going but we're not quite there yet. So, I would just say that

TRANSCRIPT

that's something that you guys need to look at and I'd like to speak again on the other topic as well. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: I am going to start using a timer because we have so many speakers.

Elizabeth Alexis: Ok. Oh, I see, I won't take that personally. First, I want to just – Nadia sent a letter yesterday that was kind of – if you're going to go ahead and have a Technical Advisory Committee, one way to kind of split the baby is just added some people – members of the community there and do the matrix to see that we have different expertise covered, different neighborhoods covered. I mean especially if you're going to have all Council Members or PTC Members who live near a crossing not there. I mean it's absolutely essential that you have people who actually understand those places as part of that process. The second thing is CSS is this sort of complete transparency thing so any Technical Advisory Committee meeting should be open to the public. I mean they should be – people should be able to go to whatever they want. I mean this is in addition to the big public meetings. I mean you'd rather have people be bored than feel left out, even if there's nothing actually exciting happening in the room. Just going back to this idea on the decision making, so we keep talking about this idea that you have to start with this giant list, which you amend and keep sort of a life; assumptions, presumptions, and requirements. There's an additional feature to that which is really the decisions to be made and the decision to be made is not just community ones, like are we comfortable with eminent domain or do we want to do all of them or whatever else. There are other ones that are—like one of the things that drove the high cost of the trench was this thought that you had to have a 24 ½-foot clearance for Caltrain, which you may or may not really need to have. That you need to have additional 8-foot clearance under a creek for VTA, which or the Valley Water, which I'm not sure if you actually need that much. There are other agencies which actually would meet the deciders on some critical assumptions that drive cost. So, you really have to have this list of all the different decisions and you just – this is a list that lives and who makes those decisions. So, even a Technical Advisory Committee, I mean we were talking about who does it really report too? Is it Staff or Council and we're like no, it's not anyone person. For each decision that's being made, it reports to that decision maker. So that is – that's part of this and that just needs to be explicit. I mean we should be having at the back of these 333-page reports, I mean we could really go for 600 pages but there should be an ongoing list of assumptions, presumptions, requirements where we keep moving things up and down. As well as the decision to be made and who's going to make them and when do

TRANSCRIPT

they need to be made? Are these decision that needs to be made sooner or later? Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Next speaker is Roland Lebrun. Did you want to speak to the process?

Roland Lebrun: No, I don't want to speak on the CSS, I want to speak on what Josh talked about just now about what's going on and how it relates to you and how to address the issues with the FPPC.

Chair DuBois: Oh, the recusal issue? Ok

Roland Lebrun: Roland: The FPPC is serious business. I don't know if you know [Roseanne Fowl], she's been there twice. The second time around she got a \$5,000 fine. The Chairman of the Caltrain Board right now is a Council Member in Redwood City and he's currently under investigation. He's about to get another investigation because of his interest in the building on Townsend Street, which is less than 400-feet from 4th and Kings station and directly in the path of the Caltrain downtown extension. So now I want to talk about Mountain View and Sunnyvale and how that relates to you and come up with some solutions. In Mountain View, essentially what they are doing is they are closing Castro and Moffett. That's essentially like if you here where to close University at the station, it's serious business but this grade separation is really part of the building of the station – I mean a massive station (inaudible). My (inaudible) over there is to have the VTA on one side of Castro and Moffett and then Bay Corridor platforms will be on the other side. One of the Council Members has to recuse himself because he's got a nice property which is less than 500-feet away from that so I'll come back to that in Palo Alto in a minute. In Sunnyvale, they are grade separating Mary, which is like you're three separations and they are also going to grade separate Sunnyvale. That again is going to be part of this big – you know let's do a station and let's have this massive concourse for bikes and peds and whatever. So, moving onto Palo Alto, Alma, as you say, is a completely different animal and as I mentioned during public comment, if you are going to go ahead and have this massive bullet station at that point in time, Alma now becomes part of basically the redesign of Palo Alto. Potentially what you are doing with the pedestrian underpass and everything else and the other three are going to be a lot more like Mary. Now the key in Sunnyvale is that you've got to go to the website and see what they are doing; it really is first class. They have – they had the first presentation on Mary and they are showing eight different alternatives which are totally

TRANSCRIPT

focused on adjacent property impacts. You can tell right at the end which one they are going to go for, it's called a jug handle, it's really creative and then they are going to have a complete separate discussion about Sunnyvale next week. So, my advice to you is watch what they are doing because I think they are on the right track. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Next speaker is Richard Brand; do you want to speak to this topic?

Richard Brand: Yes.

Chair DuBois: Do you want to speak to the other topic as well?

Mr. Brand: I'll defer because I haven't seen the presentation yet because it had to be broken up this way and that's unfortunate. Yes, I'll hold that open but I will try to be brief. A couple things, I did consult with at least one PTC Committee Member who asked me some questions about this. That Member had known that I was attending the Rail Committee meetings and involved in this process and so I supported the idea. Having been a stakeholder and still am I guess in the Committee meetings, what I find and I'm looking at this time line here, is that a stakeholder group will actually truncate or shorten the work of the Staff. In fact, that's one of the values – I know this is a push pull kind of question but with the Residential Preferential Parking Program (RPP) we found that we were able to come up with a lot of ideas that could then be put in and Staff didn't have to come up and review that. So, I think this two and a half months versus two months can be shortened because this is a continuum here that will truncate that six weeks into less time. So, I would argue that this may not be the case in terms of the time and time is of the essences here, no doubt. The other thing is that I support Nadia's letter that if – we should just have one group and a TAC should include local residents as stakeholders as well. So, I think that one group could work out together, although looking at the TAC list, it's a long list already. I think the list needs to be culled and reviewed in order to make this an efficient process so that this can be cut down from six weeks to less than six weeks. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Our next speaker is Herb Borock.

Herb Borock: Thank you, Chair DuBois and good morning Committee Members. I want to speak on both parts of this and as – since Context Sensitive Solutions is a process type question, I want to just add reminders

TRANSCRIPT

which I'm sure you all know but it doesn't hurt to put it on the record. On the conflict of interest, that whatever portion someone is not participating in, it means that you can't be at the table that the Committee Members and Staff are sitting on during that conflicted matter. Also, that definitive decisions about participation can only be in a written response from the Fair Political Practices Commission to request—and elected officials and Staff frequently get their own independent Council to help them frame the question. On Context Sensitive Solutions, Josh Mello gave a very useful distinction between the old way of doing things and Context Sensitive Solution, which is a new way. One way to continue doing it the old way is just to label it Context Sensitive Solutions and when you have that situation. Very often proponents of Context Sensitive Solutions fall into the trap and feeling that they have to bargain with the other position. If they get something—some part of it, that looks like Context Sensitive Solutions and they are willing to call it that. My advice to the public who know more about Context Sensitive Solutions than I do, if something is not Context Sensitive Solutions but is rather something resulting in a bargain with the old way, it's still not Context Sensitive Solutions and people should still be advocating for that and labeling the process for what it is. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. The last speaker is Adina Levin.

Ms. Adina Levin: (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: Great, thank you. Alright so come back to the Committee. Anybody have any questions or comments? Eric.

Council Member Filseth: Yes. Did Mountain View have a separate Stakeholder Committee and a separate Technical Committee?

Mr. Mello: I'm not sure. I can check on that for you. I would like to address if I could, a couple of the comments – the public comments. The TAC is not shown on this because the TAC will not be making decisions. The TAC will be advising the community and PTC and Rail Committee and Council as decisions are made. We're not intending to allow other agencies to make decisions on our behalf around different alternatives but their knowledge will be important so that's why they are not shown on this. Just another point of clarification, this is not intended to show the alternatives analysis, -- the Context Sensitive Solutions Alternatives Analysis process. This is only showing how we're intending to make each decision in that process along

TRANSCRIPT

the way so it's not actually showing the decisions that will be made. It's showing the process that will be used to make those decisions.

Chair DuBois: Alright, go ahead.

Mayor Scharff: In terms of the process and making the decisions, when I look back at what we've done in the past and where we are going. The big issue that came to Council was that when we looked at the different options, we obviously had an option for South of Oregon for a trench, which is only south of Oregon that came up. Then you had the crossing at Meadow and at the time people talked about taking 29 homes fully and 8t partially at Meadow and Charleston together. At property acquisition, if you maintained the turns of Alma, thirty-two full homes, and seven partials. Those are a big number of homes and I think that's one of the reasons and there are other reasons as well as to why the trench was such an attractive option. It seems that one of the things is until we know if the trench is a constraint option that we can do or not, it's really hard to figure out how the decisions are going to be made. I mean it seems like are we going to – as we go through this process, how are we going to get to that decision point of do we want to do a trench or not? I mean it seems to me that we don't know yet because we haven't gone through the process but the community would prefer to have a trench. At least that's what was in our – Council voted and that was the preferred alternative, that's the feedback that we've gotten. That the trench is the preferred alternative and that with the trench is was unclear to me if there are no homes taken or if it's just the smallest number but I think there was some hope that there were no homes taken with the trench. So, it seems that the trench is going to be something that everyone wants to know how much is it going to cost, whether or not it's feasible and it's going to be impossible to think any other decisions until we have the information on the trench. When I look at the schedule, what I see happening is unless we understand the trench—and the trench is complicated. I mean I think as both members of the public have mentioned, we have to have decisions about can we do a two percent grade, can you – is – first of all, are they even going to allow us to do a trench? They may simply say we're not allowed to do that and they are not going to let us do that. So, there are all these agencies corporations, there's all these understanding of what permits are going to be required and how we go through that process. I think there's going to be a significant amount of time spent on that so when you look – when you create this Palo Alto process to come out in the middle of – I guess it's up till the last quarter of 2018, for a decision, what are your thoughts on that? How are we planning on dealing with that?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: The process that we're currently planning to follow is beginning September 16th and starting to develop what's called a universal alternative. So, we would consult with the community, let them put their ideas down on paper, what are the ideas that you had around these four grade separations – grade crossings, get some ideas on potential solutions and I fully expect the trench will be one of those solutions that are identified. Then we will go in and generate all the technical data that's required to evaluate each of those alternatives. So, the cost will be one of those components and of course, we're only going to be able to estimate at a very high level what the cost is until we start moving into engineering but we'll get an apple to apple comparison of the different alternatives. Then we will reconvene the community, present the universe of alternatives and start to use our evaluation criteria to narrow those down. The narrowing down will be a decision point that will need to go through our decision-making process to pick the ones that we'll study a little deeper and then eventually we'll get down to one preferred the alternative. We may end up prioritizing the grade separations, we may end up deciding that we only want to identify preferred alternatives for three out of the four and the red line that's shown on that chart is when we adopt a preferred alternative. So, that's – after we adopt a preferred alternative, that's the point where we start moving into design and we get a much better handle on cost but we're hoping to have a pretty good understanding of the costs of the different alternatives by the end of this year.

Mayor Scharff: I don't think anyone was happy with the way our bridge went over 101, so this reminds me a little bit of the bridge. So, how did we get out of the bridge trap? It goes something like this, we say we're going to build a bridge over Highway 101 – a bicycle and pedestrian bridge. We decided, let's build a beautiful bridge, let's have community engagement, let's have a design composition. We get all these people involved, we have a design composition and we choose a beautiful bridge. We go through that process, we then look at the costs and we're like that doesn't work and now we have an unattractive bridge. I mean it's not terrible but I mean – and it's – but – and the process for choosing the other bridge was really just chosen on cost and we went through all this community engagement, built up all these expectations and then didn't deliver. I don't think we're paying enough attention to the fact – we're pretending that the trench is not the preferred alternative and that the community may choose something else. I think that's a very low probability and without constraining it and saying – without having the information in a good way, how are you going to tell the community that the trench works or it doesn't work? Once we go down the path that yes, we think the trench is going to work but there are all these

TRANSCRIPT

issues. I mean, how are you going to make that decision? How are we going to get there? That's my concern is that I don't want to spend all the time and get to the end of it and say, oh, actually the trench doesn't work. Then we've spent 18 months designing, going through it and not having the feedback. I mean how do we get that and then it could be complicated. I mean it seems like the issue on the two percent versus the one percent in itself is a negotiation that's not resolved in a month, that's not resolved in two months. Then I – I mean I guess the other question is the cost, I mean – so if I am wrong, just stop me but my recollection on the California Avenue garage was we were at like \$10 million to start with, something like that and now we're \$30 million and so a high – when you say a high-level cost estimate, I panic. High-level cost estimate, what does that – what value does that have in making a choice if we're not going to have numbers that actually we can then go ahead and find?

Chair DuBois: So, Greg I agree with this conversation and I totally agree with what you are saying. I'm just wondering if you're not getting into the next section versus the CSS process discussion.

Mayor Scharff: I was actually talking about the schedule because that's what was in front but is that – and that's the process on CSS. When I am really deciding or asking is my concern that I have here is that we act as if CSS says everything is on the table and there are no constraints. Where there are clearly constraints and you want to start with a rational – instead of constraints that the community can work within. If you say that that's not true, I think we could very much end up like the bridge and so that's why I'm trying to figure out how we do the process and the schedule and if we are actually being realistic; that's my concern.

Mr. Keene: I don't think you're – you've actually bled over into this other area. I think the Mayor's, as I hear it, is a little more theoretical or conceptual which is saying how we're thinking about how we design this process really has some life impacts on schedule and what we do and we need to be thinking about that. If I could just add something to this, could you put – oh, you've got it back up there, good, you've got the schedule back up. I think that's – this is really important because if you look at this right now, this is saying that vertical dotted red line looks like the end of the first quarter of 2018, which is basically saying we've got to, at a minimum, kind of catch up and be ready in whatever that is; 8 or 9-months. I agree with Nadia's comment that we need to flush out the steps and the process more but I think it's really important to think about setting what we think is when we've got to be ready and then reverse engineering back from that, as

TRANSCRIPT

opposed to looping it. What I heard the Mayor potentially saying is we could vaguely also design a process that anticipates some things but then unfolds or balloons way out of our control and we lose our opportunity. I think we really need to think about that. If I could add one other frame work for thinking about this and I mentioned this to Tom when we were having breakfast. I think we need to get clear about what it's going to take to ultimately get to making a decision and I think the language that we need, needs to be accurate. I mean unless I'm really missing something, the real decision makers in this are ultimately, the City Council. Now that doesn't mean there are some exterior decision makers who are going to make determinations on one percent versus two percent or those kinds of questions but the real question ultimately is that we're going to engage, we're going to inform, we're going to get recommendations from – through different approaches but there's no confusion that at the end of the day, the City Council informed by the Rail Committee is going to have to make the choices and the decisions of the official positions on behalf of the City. Now ultimately if that means we've got to pursue gap funding that requires saying a vote of the people, then in that sense our public is ultimately going to be a decision maker explicitly. I don't think we can -- you can forget the fact that at the end of the day, this is all going to come back to the City Council who've got to make some decisions and that seems to me that by the end of the first quarter at a minimum, 2018, that we've got to get to that point. I would like us to think about this frame work that is – includes some things that has to unfold in parallel in some ways, even if some components occur later. Number one, there is a technical issue here which is what are the – what is the design, what are the impacts of—actually what we do at these locations? The second one is what is politically feasible? In other words, what is ultimately acceptable to our community? The third one is what is financially possible? What are the financial capacity that we have to have and I think we need to be clear about what we're – in the process discussions, what we are designing to because in the end, what is politically feasible or has community acceptance? The City Council is ultimately going to have to listen enough and have weighed all that and say this is where we see this. This can't be delegated to anybody else. You want to be informed by it but I think that means that you – we need to be thinking about multiple engagement opportunities. We don't have for example focus groups on here that very well may be – for example, that you would say in this eight or nine-month period has some recommendation advance. You would really want to test our community and public in some very specific practice ways to be able then again, inform reactions to folks. So, I think those three things, technical, political, community and financial need to be kept in mind and clearly, we can't do those in an expressly linear – let's do the technical, then

TRANSCRIPT

let's see what happens at the decision-making process and then let's figure out how much it's going to cost because it's not going to work. So, please keep that in mind, thanks.

Chair DuBois: Adrian, do you have any comments?

Council Member Fine: A few, so thank you, Josh, for mentioning that one-time line was not the ultimate public facing timeline. Although I think it's a point well made that we do need to better map of this process. Even this one is a little hard to see but – the one behind. This one certainly, yeah. I just wonder if there's something that could be a little more public facing for folk so they do understand this. Then to Nadia's point about where the TAC fits in as well. I mean this does document it so just to be absolutely clear that the TAC is public, right?

Mr. Mello: Yeah, those meetings would be open to the public.

Council Member Fine: Ok, great. I mean I have some questions around the time line but I think our question here is more about what process we want, how many groups we want to involve, what value they add, how they funnel into each other, and then as the City Manager just mentioning of what is kind of the contours of the decisions that they are making? I guess I'm looking to you three what kind of solutions are we going to propose here? I'm not sold on anything.

Mayor Scharff: I mean, I'm supporting the Staff proposal and I think we should have focus groups too. (Inaudible) good approach but I think we have to be flexible on and I'm open to different...

Council Member Fine: I just want to hear from you all.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I still have some questions to if you are finished?

Council Member Fine: Yeah, I think I'm finished for now.

Chair DuBois: So, on that time line it says that Sunnyvale still has to go through design. How long does design typically take?

Mr. Mello: If you look at this chart, you can see Burlingame took a year and a half to complete the design for Broadway; well, we'll take a year and a

TRANSCRIPT

half. San Mateo took, it looks like a year and a half as well for the design at 25th and Hillsdale.

Chair DuBois: So, I mean it does feel like we're definitely on track in terms of timing and if it takes a year and a half for Sunnyvale to complete their design, we're kind of right along there. It does make me feel better and I guess so does the conversations with VTA about funding this corporately instead of compactivity. That slide you had on time for decision or recommendation if Council is going to be the decider, I think then what's missing here is the assessment of the quality of the decisions. I've said it multi times in this meeting that my fear is that in the rush for timeliness, we have a decision the community doesn't expect and ended up either restart and taking a much longer time. Which again, that's the way the Comp. Plan started was with workshops and then we had to reset so I just want to make that point.

Mr. Mello: If I could address that? What's not shown here is there would be a fifth piece which is going back to the community after the Council. That's what we're doing with – so with the problem statement, the objectives and the evaluation criteria, that's going to Council August 28th. Then the first part of September 16th public meeting we will be reviewing the Council decision and getting opinions on that and then we move into the next decision.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I think we just want a process that surfaces quality decisions. I'll see this PTC input that we should have some kind of deeper engagement. I appreciate the City Manager's comments on kind of these three areas because that's what I've been struggling with. I feel that we've been somewhat linear so far and to Council Member Scharff's – Mayor Scharff's comments about is the trench feasible? What's the cost? Part of that is what is the funding capability and I think we need to start to work on some of these in parallel and really having a more clearly defined process focusing on these areas of the engineering aspects, the community acceptance aspects. I mean we're going to get into that in the next section but projects that are realistic with the amount of funding we expect but right now, I don't really have a good view of how much funding we could expect with Measure B. Then Nadia's point about we're kind of at a high level defining roles but we need to I think, get a lot more specific. I did appreciate the CAARD letter, I thought it was very well written and the detail in here, the example of this highway project where they had the criteria for membership, a kind of detailed outline of roles and responsibilities and criteria. We're getting there but I think some of that real focus on some of

TRANSCRIPT

that work right now is going to get us on a much stronger footing kind of going forward. I am kind of intrigued about the idea of just adding some additional stakeholders to the TAC. I think that's kind of the biggest gap is we are doing these community meetings, focus groups are pretty qualitative but really having some ongoing engagement at a deeper level with a few more stakeholder parties and residents. I don't think we have PAUSD on the TAC right now. It just seems like we are missing a few groups and having this additional viewpoint feed into the recommendations. Hopefully, it's not going to add any more time and we're going to get a much richer set of what the community is willing to accept built into the recommendation. I think the other thing that I wanted to say was I actually appreciated making it explicit about building on the prior work. I thought that was a pretty good letter from former Mayor Nancy Shephard, about feeling like we were ignoring the previous work. I think – I heard some of that at the first community meeting as well and a lot of the people that were involved in those early works were attending these meetings. So, I think it's critical that we acknowledge that work and how we're building on it. Part of that is the community has said multiple times that a trench is preferred and so again, I think as we frame this process – when we start a meeting talking about four separate separations, it doesn't really allow for that other approach to be discussed. I think we need to think about how that is made more explicit. Then again, my notes are a little bit out of order but I keep coming back to the funding investigation and the example at the Saint Gabrielle thing. It almost feels like a parallel track of people focused on the funding. The last thing that I would like to say is that I do think constraints are a key part to CSS and they need to be defined up front. Again, it gets back to this documentation of process and rules and I think constraints is a key part of that, funding is part of it and where is CSS strong? I think you bring in these community-based constraints and just an example—but I'm sure there are tons of others that we aren't even aware of but yesterday, the Alma/Oregon Expressway intersection was completely backed up on Alma; it was very dangerous. You know we're talking about grade separations but we haven't – it hasn't been explicitly talking about the Alma/Oregon intersection. Those kinds of things would have surfaced I think with more community involvement in the process and hopefully, it will be surfaced in the circulation study too. Again, I would support the recommendation from CARD and that we consider adding a few more people to the TAC as recommenders into the process. I think it's a good way to get deeper community engagement without setting up a totally separate Committee and a separate group.

Mayor Scharff: Can we look at that Committee? I actually – I'm fine with adding some people to the Committee. I think that actually makes some

TRANSCRIPT

sense though I think you want to workable Committee and you don't want it to be too big. I definitely agree but I don't think we should be adding ten community people and I think we want people with technical expertise from the community. I'm open to what we do but I remember there just being a long list.

Chair DuBois: I think – so it's in your hand out here.

Mayor Scharff: It is – right. It was somewhere.

Chair DuBois: Well, it's Page 3 of the...

Mayor Scharff: Of the CAARD letter?

Chair DuBois: ...of the CAARD letter. Again, I think some people could fill multiple roles.

Mayor Scharff: No, that's what I was thinking, right?

Mr. Mello: So, a better list to look at would be in the community engagement plan which is Attachment A. It's on Page 9 of that.

Chair DuBois: Do you also list potential public members?

Mr. Mello: No, no, no, for the current makeup it is identified on page 9 of the...

Chair DuBois: This just has all of that plus some suggestions.

Mr. Mello: I have not seen that list so I can't verify whether that matches the list on Page 9 of the Attachment A.

Mayor Scharff: So where – Page 9 on Attachment A of the community engagement, got it.

Mr. Keene: The one that says the Caltrain list at the top and then the community engagement identifies...

Mr. Mello: That's from the current letter.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Filseth: Packet Page 74.

Mr. Mello: The list that Staff provided is Attachment A, Page 9.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, so again I...

Mayor Scharff: Packet Page 74?

Chair DuBois: Again, I think the CAARD letter actually copies all of those and then it has kind of a working list of potential others.

Mr. Keene: Could I make...

Chair DuBois: Yes.

Mr. Keene: ...comment here, like a real-world comment? No, I mean I think the tendency to get into the beautiful minds solution that just ties everything together is a little risky. I mean I actually like the idea of thinking about adding some folks to the TAC. I do think we need to get clear about even the TAC's role because there are lots of important conversations that have to take place with other peer agencies that some may benefit from being really open and public. I'm sorry but some may be debilitated by that. I know we think that everybody wants to listen to us in Palo Alto but other folks don't necessarily see that. I can guarantee you that if we did every conversation we did on the San Francisquito Creek and the JPA project on getting that project built, we would still not have some things done because we've got to be able to get together with some other jurisdictions at times and have some big arguments without it all being out there. Now, that's not no decisions are being made, those are agreements trying to be reached. I think we need to think about how we're nimble enough to have these different technical folks – maybe there's a plan recession at times but then there's some break out opportunities for us to mix and match in some way in order to be able to be most effective, so just a caution.

Mayor Scharff: Yeah, so...

Council Member Filseth: The City Manager is very eloquent about this and I'm going to be less eloquent. Which is usually when you do these things you've got sort of two broad level objectives. One is how do we get the right answer and the other is how do we make sure there's buy in from all the

TRANSCRIPT

stakeholders? The challenge here is going to be in a perfect world you have everybody represented on all of the Committees and you would get to the right answer too. There's going to be a trade off in here but is that we're not going to be able to get a lot of stuff done with thirty people on the Committee or forty people on the Committee and every group. I think we're going to have to be judicious about who are represented for the – sort of getting buy in versus get the right answer part. I think as the City Manager point out earlier is absolutely correct but ultimately, the responsibility is with City Council to make the right decision. I think we should weigh very, very heavily on what it's going to take to get us to the right decisions and perimeters of what's technically possible. Are we going to be able to afford it and what's acceptable to the community? I mean that's sort of the right kind of stuff and so I don't think we're going to be able to represent everybody who's interested on the Committee. In fact, we're going to have to make a tradeoff for how do we focus on getting the right answer. The best thing that we can possibly do to get everybody to accept this is to get the right answer in the first place and then it's going to be a lot easier to – I mean I think defend is the wrong word. I think it's – I think people will buy in and I think we're in a situation where I don't think this is going to be the most decisive issue in our community that has ever faced. I mean we have issues in our community – there are really people that really feel one way and people feel vastly different that we try to reach. This one, I think – I mean the general high-level problem I think you're going to get most of the community to buy into which is increase in congestion on the rail and impacts on – we want to – without – I don't want to veer into the second part of this discussion but I think we're going to find that most people sort of have similar values on this kind of stuff. Who do we need on the Committee to get the right answer and let's try to not grow it too much longer than that? I'll say for example and I'm just going to make this up so don't (inaudible) me but the Water District. Yes, is the Water District relevant, yes. Is the Water District – may be where they fall in the trade off of if we make the Committee to big, we're not going to get to the right answer versus everybody gets represented. I think we've got to be very judicious on that.

Chair DuBois: If I could just chime in. The TAC is currently intended to be on an as needed basis so as we move through the decision-making process, the (inaudible) will reach points where we need to cross the creek and we'll need to consult with the Water District and say you know is this something you guys can work with? Do you see any red flags? It's not currently intended to be a regularly scheduled meeting. It would be convened at key decision points where we need technical question addressed from the different stakeholders.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Filseth: (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: Just some thoughts again, I think having the TAC does not stop you guys from having stuff with Caltrain Staff and these kinds of meetings that the City Manager was talking about. I think those are going to have to happen; High Speed Rail Authority is on here, right? I mean we only have I guess seven groups confirmed and we have several invited. The TAC is not that large right now and I don't think we're – (inaudible) representing everyone, I mean that's kind of an extreme. I don't think that just adding a few would make it a much richer group and I do think that it maybe needs to be on regular schedule; again, for public participation, transparency, and also just scheduling some of these groups. Looking at these lists, I can see adding maybe a neighborhood rep near each crossing. Again, I think Palo Alto Unified School District (PAUSD), we should invite them. Maybe the Research Park or I mean we have business representation to the Transportation Management Association (TMA) but maybe another like I said the Stanford Research Park or another business representative. Then the other one that I thought was interesting on here is the hydrologist just because the water issues keep coming up and you do have the Water District but that's like four or five plus the seven. I don't expect—even the people currently listed on TAC, I don't know if we expect them to show up for every meeting so that's just my kind of thought.

Mayor Scharff: I think that we need to – I'm fine with adding some people to the TAC but I think we can't lose sight of the purpose of the TAC. It's a Technical Advisory Committee and you may also need the ability to create subcommittees if you want too. You also – I'm not necessarily comfortable with the notion that we should have to have meetings if they don't need to have the meetings. They've already committed to making the (inaudible) to the public, which I think is a good thing but I'm not – I don't want to basically turn the TAC into the stakeholder group. What I want to do is add some additional representation so that if the – if there are technical issues that people think why didn't you consider this? That's really what I view the neighborhood people saying. You know what about this technical issue over here, how would that work out so that that comes forth?

Council Member Filseth: Right, how do you get to the right answer? (Inaudible) make sure the stakeholders are equally represented.

Mayor Scharff: Correct. People who have technical expertise and they are also in the neighborhoods. I mean – I will just be honest, someone like

TRANSCRIPT

Nadia for instance, I think has that combination of being in the neighborhood and having technical expertise. I'm interested in adding like three people, that's what I was thinking. Maybe four but I mean not more than that.

Chair DuBois: Well I think maybe Staff has heard our input and rather than be that explicit we could have a more general motion to have Staff come back with a suggestion for adding deeper community input to the TAC and what the roles and responsibilities would be; even when they would meet and not meet. I mean I would be...

Mr. Keene: Well, just a second on that Josh. Going back to Nadia's comments earlier about flushing out the process and I just think we need to be doing that here just a little bit so that we have enough direction. I mean I really appreciate the attempt to sort of morph some of these streams together but what is the reason for adding say our local citizen voice to the TAC? Is it technical or is it political community or is it both? I mean I think we need to get clear about that because again, to the Mayor's point, I think clearly, we'd have to have some freedom to spin off subcommittees because I mean I guarantee a lot of other agencies outside us are not going to always want to go to a meeting with us with our citizens. Nothing against them and then they are going to say, wait I guess we better bring our citizens in to and then all of a sudden it a whole different meeting. We just need to remember that other agencies in jurisdictions see the world differently than we do. What are we trying to accomplish? Is it mostly technical? Would we – or is it representational of the community? It sounds like at minimum, if anyone that we want to provide representational piece, also has to be somehow technically proficient. That is what we are saying, ok?

Chair DuBois: For me, it's not really technical or community, it's a deeper expert engagement through the process versus just a workshop. So, it is community members who (inaudible) more technical but I think the TAC should also be more CSS. In that it's not purely engineering type decisions, it is engineering married with some community context.

Mr. Keene: Could I provide an alternative? It's one that I brought up months ago and you probably hate it but isn't the Rail Committee really important? I mean...(crosstalk)

Mayor Scharff: We're the community engagement.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Keene: ... is it – ultimately you are the nexus between the Council and the decision they make. You are going to ultimately try to formulate whatever it is to recommendations the Council makes because the Rail Committee can't even make decisive decisions on its own. Isn't there some way to think about is there some more direct connection to the Rail Committee, rather than the Technical Advisory Committee? You're going to have to get this, I mean do you – I'm not saying this is the right but do you have ex-officio members of the Rail Committee from the community somehow involved? Not the same (inaudible) but advice – I don't know or some...

Mayor Scharff: We do and they are sitting in the audience. (crosstalk)

Mr. Keene: I know, well now we deputize them.

Mayor Scharff: You know, I don't want to expand the Rail Committee. I think that's too complicated.

Chair DuBois: Again, I don't think that gives us necessarily the expertise in the different areas that are potentially missing right now.

Mr. Keene: So, could -- I think we need to define those expertise a little bit if we're going to come back with some recommendations. Then again, I think the TAC needs to be thought of as a kind of not static. It kind of expands, morphs, moves, grows, has a subcommittee as needed. Do you know what I mean because – there you go, ok.

Mayor Scharff: I mean I don't view the TAC as the stakeholder group. How I viewed the TAC is it provides the ability for the City to get technical questions answered. I actually thought if we added some community members, what it allows is there are some community people who can say why didn't you think of this? That's all and then they can then get those questions answers but you know, the community people come here and ask us to make sure to ask the technical question and that process. I think it's a tough call and I think you – Staff needs to be really clear with us that we're not going to mess the TAC up. Yes, there's no way for instance that – if you're going to make progress with VTA on stuff, a lot of those discussions about what we want in negotiations are not going to be made in a public forum. VTA is not going to be open to being, shall we say, have a bunch of our citizens yell at them and say this is what we want. That's not the way it's practically going to occur and I think we have to keep that in mind.

TRANSCRIPT

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: If I could perhaps chime on – in on to that from the perspective – I think maybe in the dynamic here from Staff, I'll play the engineer here and someone who's spent a career dealing with other agencies on projects like this. I think in terms of motivation, one of the things to remember in terms of the other agencies participation with us as we go forward is that they are here by choice or they will be here and engage by choice. The typically bureaucratic response to a situation that they are not entirely comfortable with will one be either to not show up, which is really possible in terms of the TAC Committees or more likely will delegate it to junior Staff that will not really be able to contribute at the level that we need in order to have effective input into the decision making. That group dynamic is one to keep in mind, especially if you take as perhaps a given that to a certain extent, VTA, a Caltrain, a High Speed Rail institutional interest is not necessarily to help Palo Alto define the grade separations. In fact, it could be to just go along for the process, rather than necessarily see an immediate solution come out of that. I think that dynamic is important and perhaps to Council Member Filseth's point, the right decision – the term I might use in terms of going from the technical to ultimately the political decision is a sustainable one – sustainable decisions. One that the technicians and the engineers will say that's the right answer but then it comes to the Rail Committee, much less to the Council, and the Committee and the Council says the wrong answer, go back and figure it out. Ultimately, I think Staff is looking for a decision that can be made at a Staff level that will be sustained through a policy process and that it involves a more deliberation of discussion that obviously goes way beyond the engineering considerations so one that can be carried forward. I think quite frankly, weighing down the technical discussions too much will ensure that – as I said, you're not going to get the really honest feedback from the other agencies that will help make a decision that will both be sustainable, as well as actionable at the Council. So, I think there are some conflicting goals there. To a certain extent I suspect that with identifying the right people in the technical, it gives Staff the flexibility for how that interaction actually happens. It would be able to help bring that forward with the recognition of the issues that are important to the Council along with the way.

Mayor Scharff: So what decision do you need us to make today under this item? I mean do you want us to just endorse the Staff plan plus anything else. Is that what you're looking for? I mean or are you looking for just the discussion or what – I mean how do we bring this item to a conclusion?

Mr. Keene: So, Number 1, we need some direction from you so we can start to move ahead. Two we've – for the most part, what we're really talking

TRANSCRIPT

about is what sort of local citizen involvement we're going to have and into inject formally into our process right now? What I am hearing is that you want us to look at some way to use the TAC as a forum that can allow us to bring some of those perspectives or voices into the process. The Chair suggested that you give us that direction and we go to work and come back on that. Now I don't think this is just – and Josh is freaking out thinking about how does he stay on schedule and all the twenty other things and what does he do on the shuttle; he's going to come back on that and all those things. I think there's a lot of work that we just need to do at our level too, even talking with the City Attorney about how we could bring a recommendation forward pretty quickly on how to make this thing work. I think we would have to diagram and map it out that there will be some situations where the TAC is some subset of it and is just some Staff at some level. Then there are others that were engaged and it may be that we use our own citizen advisories to sit down and even on our Staff levels, to give us feedback or tell us what to do and then sometimes participate. I mean I think we could design that if that's what you are interested in. What I am also hearing is we would formally all be agreeing that we can let go of this concept of this independent stakeholder group. I think we need to be clear about that.

Mayor Scharff: That's correct.

Council Member Filseth: The way I say this is actually a way to avoid the scenario that Ed talked about. Just enough to avoid that scenario, right?

Mr. Keene: I (inaudible) we're not in any sort of chamber business team bureaucrat thing like gosh, let's keep our citizens out of here. As a matter of fact, to the extent that we can ever be more effective, we will always do that. At the same time, his thing with the – we're inviting people to a dinner party here from other places and if they really don't like what we're eating or what wine we're serving, they are going to not come. We just need to be sensitive to that, that to some extent we really need their input. In other situations, we really need our own communities input to the technical recommendations that we're going to make.

Mr. Mello: I just want to say that this whole exercise today and PTC last week is CSS in process. We're talking at length about decision making and how we're going to do it and that is one of the core tenants of CSS; is establishing the decision-making process early on. So, I just want to

TRANSCRIPT

commend everyone for – we are – this is the CSS process in action and we're experiencing it right now.

Mr. Keene: With that, let me just put a schedule thing on. Right now, we are scheduled to come back from the Rail Committee to the Council on September 5th on a tentative agenda. I mean it would be open to thinking whether or not the Rail Committee directions would be enough that we could put this together for an item – for the item that would go to the Council.

Chair DuBois: I don't think this is what Ed meant and I appreciate the comments about engineers and having a dinner party that people want to come too but I also think that we don't want to go back to this old method of the technical decision driving the solution. If we get into this mode of deciding and defending and if the TAC makes a decision and you come to the Rail Committee and we don't like it, that's basically the old method. They are going to defend it and we would have to object to it versus a more collaborative approach. I just don't – I think some public speakers said this too, I don't want to call it CSS if it's not CSS. I would like to figure out a way that we add like I said deeper community engagement at even what the TAC – being on the TAC doesn't mean if there are subcommittees that again, there's an engineering discussion and maybe it's open to the public but doesn't mean that all participants are at the table as part of that particular discussion. I don't know how we would work that out but again, the pieces that I see missing right now are the neighborhood, the schools, we have some business and the environmental expertise.

Mr. Keene: I think that's really important but I just again think that – I mean the TAC itself isn't necessarily how we solve that or – I mean I don't think we have ever felt that stakeholder engagement is not central and representative. Stakeholder engagement that allows for the political community by in on technical decisions; that's what we're after. I don't know that we can specify all of those right now but we could give more definition to that even when we come back to the Council. Even the idea of just some static representatives rather than free flowing, I mean we could have hundreds – forget the group meeting, we would have 200 people involved in a much more hands on way over the next eight months than we would with even just say one single Committee with ten people on it. You would get more representative voices so let's just take PAUSD, I can't imagine that we could get them to hang in there with us at the level that we would but episodically or appropriately engaging them, we could be sure that we do that.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: I also wanted to say that I don't view the TAC as making decisions on anything. I view them as purely advisory – frankly advisory to Staff and then Staff makes the recommendation to PTC and the Rail Committees and then eventually to Council. That's – I think that's an important point that we've got to keep in mind and then I think Staff needs to be able to use the TAC to get good information and I think that's what Staff is pushing back on. I think that's – we've got to make sure that happens. I also think that it's more than TAC, I think if we're going to give this direction, I also wanted to give direction to go back and I like the City Manager's idea of focus groups. I think some focus groups actually can really get good citizen engagement by going through that process. Then I also, on a third thing, wanted to give direction to Staff that we really focus on starting now starting to work out what a trench would look like and the cost associated and the constraints and how that would work because the sooner that we start around that process, the better the information everyone will have. I view that as the stumbling block in all of this, I think because those technical issues regarding the trench are going -- what delays this process. I don't want to wait for people to say it's – I don't want to go through a whole process where we say let's get to this point where we then decide that the trench is the preferred alternative. I want to do it in parallel and we may choose the trench as not being the preferred alternative but I want to take the risk that we spent all that time understanding the trench because I don't think anyone can make the choice without having the information.

Mr. Mello: I might suggest that similar to how we're working on the circulation study in parallel to the Context Sensitive Solution Alternatives Analysis, maybe we start work on a white paper that looks at the trench...

Mayor Scharff: That's all I'm suggesting.

Mr. Mello: ... and starts to take the work that Mott McDonald did a little bit further and we could provide that as information as part of the decision-making process through the CSS.

Mr. Keene: This is another aside, I mean I haven't even talked with Josh about this but not everything just directly has to be in Transportation's wheel house. So, I mean I think we're going to do some financial scenario planning what ifs on – under different possibilities. Whether it's how we could look at what the appropriate numbers are, what does it mean on bond financing versus other things, so we start – again, these are high level but we start to put some meat on the bone about these things.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Filseth: He's really only talking about accelerating the existing process, not sort of getting into the decision of Alma crossing versus...

Ms. Stump: Chair DuBois, can I make one comment?

Chair DuBois: Yes.

Ms. Stump: So perhaps one tool that would be a component of enriching citizen involvement which we could talk about off line, this would be legal and permissible for this Committee to enhance and loosen and supplement the public participation practices that we usually use. I know sometimes people feel that public comment is kind of narrow and constraining and if this Committee was interested in enhancing the public dialog process in this Committee, we can talk about ways to do that.

Mayor Scharff: I actually think that would be a great idea. You know we've done that on some of the airplane noise stuff and I was actually thinking about engaged people are on the airplane noise stuff. I mean if I – if we scheduled a meeting on airplane noise right now, there would be one hundred people in this room. Two hundred people in this room and I got to say that we don't have a formal stakeholder group but the airplane noise people understand that stuff than the FAA half the time I think. I mean it's really amazing the expertise they bring to it. I'm open to us doing some of that stuff.

Council Member Fine: So just a few things, I think it would be helpful to potentially expand this group but I also want to remind us all we do have comment periods at PTC and this meeting every single time, right? So, there's that level of community engagement. I'm a little worried about just putting community engagement within the TAC because it seems like something we're going to turn off and turn off when we don't want it and if we're having other agencies come, we're just going to turn off the public engagement piece there so that seems a little shallow to me. Then also I do think Tom, your comments on finance are well taken. I don't think we have that piece exactly. It could be the trench study that you're looking at but maybe that's separate and done more at the Staff level. Then just a last thing, Eric, I think you said it pretty well; we're trying to make the right decision, we're trying to get agreement on it and I think we, as Council, pushed more on getting the right decision, we're taking on more of a political risk on the back side. I also kind of agree with you that the values

TRANSCRIPT

around this aren't as fraught as some other issues that we've faced in the City. So, I guess we should just be clear with ourselves about that, right?

Chair DuBois: I'll attempt a Motion, so my Motion would be to have Staff propose adding some additional members to the TAC, to add additional expertise in areas that aren't represented, to define those roles and responsibilities, and potentially sub-committees. To consider adding focus groups and to start to develop a trench scenario.

Mayor Scharff: Ok, I second.

MOTION: Chair DuBois moved, seconded by Mayor Scharff to recommend Staff propose adding members to the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to provide additional expertise in areas not currently represented, to define those roles and responsibilities, suggest potential subcommittees and to consider adding focus groups.

Council Member Fine: Is the trench scenario – it's just the trench itself. Do we want anything on financial scenarios and directing Staff there?

Chair DuBois: I don't know if that needs to be a part of this Motion.

Ms. Stump: Can we move – can we actually move that second part, the trench and the finances, to the second item and just deal with the process issues here?

Mr. Keene: Just to be clear, I may leave during that part of it in some way but I'm assuming that the – whatever motion comes out of the Committee is not prescriptive. I mean it's trying to clarify some particular directions but when we write the report to the Council, we may touch on some areas that are unspoken and the Council (inaudible).

Mayor Scharff: It's not prescriptive.

Chair DuBois: So, do you want to read that Motion again? Did you guys get it?

Council Member Filseth: (Inaudible)

Mr. Mello: I mean I – well so

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Keene: That was good, that was classic. Let the record know (inaudible)

Mr. Mello: Well I think without any kind of Motion, we're going to put together a white paper on the trench.

Chair DuBois: We'll talk about that in the next section. Alright so, all those in favor of the Motion? Great, alright.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Council Member Filseth left the meeting at 10:08 AM

Mayor Scharff: Ok, so I have a hard stop at 11:00 so hopefully we can wrap this up.

Council Member Filseth: (Inaudible)

Mayor Scharff: So now we are on Item Number 2, right?

Mr. Mello: It's still the same item, it's 2B.

Mayor Scharff: Oh, it's 2B, right.

Mr. Mello: So, it's still the same item but we've broken it into two parts and this is the second part which will cover the problem, the objectives, and the evaluation criteria. Just to give you a background on how we arrived at the problem statement, the objectives and the evaluation criteria. This process started with fifteen community stakeholder interviews, which my Staff and I conducted across the street at the Downtown Library. These interviews included neighborhood leaders, advocates, former elected officials and local rail experts. The key takes away from those interviews were that the prior Rail Corridor Studies are important. There's a confusion around the trench study, a lot of folks misinterpret the trenching study to be some type of alternative selection, when in fact it was just a feasibility analysis of what it would take to do a trench. There were also differing opinions on the CSS process, which we are pretty familiar with. Concerns about a pre-supposing solution so we – one particular interview we talked about how the trench could be more expensive than a traditional grade crossing and there was a disagreement. So, folks want us to be very deliberate about how we talk about the cost of each of the different alternatives and pre-suppose that one

TRANSCRIPT

of them maybe more expensive or less impactful than others. Then we reaffirmed – there was reaffirmed that safety and visual impacts are very important. So, visual impacts around the potential to raise the rail road and there was a lot of concern around the impacts that would happen in surrounding neighborhoods. Following the stakeholder interviews, we hosted our community workshop. You are very familiar with what occurred then, that was May 20th; we had 130 attendees, 39 written comments. The afternoon of that Saturday we talked about the problem definition, objections and evaluation criteria and that were the – that session is where we got the most valuable input on these three topics. Over the summer we did a survey monkey community questionnaire. We emailed it out to 444 recipients, that's the number of people we have on Gov. Delivery email list for the Connecting Palo Alto Rail Program. They sent it out via email trees to their neighborhoods and other groups. We also promoted it on social media and as a result, we had 791 unique responses within the two-week period. Nine-eight percent of those who started the questionnaire completed it, which is a pretty good completion rate given the complexity of the questions and the amount of information we were asking people for. The purposes of the questionnaire were to maintain community involvement, so you remember one of the key tenants of CSS is continuing engagement. We didn't have the May 20th workshop and then disappear for three months and leave community member feeling as though we had forgotten them. We also wanted – didn't want to bring anything forward to PTC, Rail Committee or Council without first going back and check with the community as part of the continuing engagement process. The questionnaire shared the draft problem statement, objectives and evaluation criteria and then solicited input from the respondents on those three topics. After the questionnaire, we made some edits to the draft problem statement and I can read this if you want but it's included in your packet. This is our suggested problem statement today and it's – this is how we will frame this process going forward in this program. Instead of Staff or someone else deciding what we think the problem is, this is a community driven problem statement that attempts to clarify how the community sees the current issues out there and where we should – what we should use to developed solutions to the problem. We also developed a list of suggested objectives, it's a pretty long and lengthy list and I'll talk a little bit about PTC recommendation in a little bit but we may want to think about shortening this and being more pointed about where we want to focus our efforts on this. Then the evaluation criteria, we have three tiers and the tiers are based on the questionnaire and the input that we got during the community workshop. The ones in Tier 1 are what the community thought were the more important so facilitate movement across the corridor for all modes, reduce delay and congestion for automobile traffic at rail

TRANSCRIPT

crossings, provide clear and safe routes for pedestrians and bicyclist, and support continued rail operations and Caltrain service improvements. That was something that a couple of our interviewees touched on as whatever we develop, we should – it should support Caltrain service not detract from Caltrain service or planned Caltrain service expansions. Then the tier two criteria and the tier three criteria are still important but they were judged to be less important than the tier one criteria. The PTC last week reviewed these materials and their two recommendations in regard to this portion of the presentation is to reconsider the inclusion of noise and vibration and other common issues near railroads in the problem statement. They felt that safety and circulation are really a primary issue and that noise and vibration are something that's fairly common when you live near a rail corridor and to expect us to solve those problems a little bit of a stretch with our Rail Program. Then their second recommendation was to reduce the number of objectives to the top four. So, this is the current list of objectives and they felt that a lot of the ones at the end are just best practices and we would be doing those anyway; like maximizing Palo Alto's fair share of available funding sources. They didn't necessarily feel like they were worth while putting in the objectives for this program because it dilutes the other – the top four objectives, which are to improve safety along the rail corridor, reduce traffic congestion, improve circulation and access for all modes and then deliver grade separations in a timely manner. So, with that, I conclude the presentation.

Mayor Scharff: The evaluation criteria and the suggested objectives, why wouldn't you just have one?

Mr. Mello: The objectives are a refinement of the problem statement – I'm sorry, I just got a...

Mayor Scharff: But isn't – what's the relationship between the suggested objectives and the evaluation criteria?

Mr. Mello: The objectives are a refinement of the problem statement and the evaluation criteria, when we start to develop our alternatives, we'll create an evaluation matrix which will rate each of the alternatives on how they meet the evaluation criteria.

Chair DuBois: Like have specific metrics?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: Yes, we'll develop specific metrics on how do we measure the reduction of delay and we'll have a matrix that basically compares all of our alternatives using the evaluation criteria. So, the objectives are more policy, the evaluation criteria are technical in nature. Then just next steps, we're going to City Council on September 5th; it's no longer August 28th. We are hoping to convene the Technical Advisory Committee sometime in September, just to give them an update on where we are and not string them along too much; you know bring them into the fold and know that we will be consulting them throughout this process. Then we are hosting a community workshop on September 16th and then did pencil in a tentative community workshop on August – October 21st but we've been thinking more about that lately and we think there could be a potential to use polling and/or focus groups in lieu of having community workshop three because that work shop is going to be where we start to talk about what alternatives are acceptable and applying to the community. So, a focus group might be a better way to get more intensive involvement from the community and allow for more prolonged discussion about the pros and cons of different alternatives than a community workshop. With that, our Staff recommendation today in regards to this section of the presentation is to review the attached summary of community workshop one and the summary of the questionnaire responses and then provide a recommendation to the City Council on the draft problem statement, project objectives and an evaluation criterion for discussion of community workshop two and to inform the development in screening of grade separation alternatives.

Chair DuBois: Alright, we do have some members of the public. Where did I stick these? Alright for Item 2B we have Nadia Naik, followed by Elizabeth Alexis.

Nadia Naik: Hello again, so I'm kind of actually still mentally on the last section but when you're looking for better ways to maybe have some of these meetings be a little bit more engaging with the public. Some of the things that we did in the last Rail Committee meetings in the past was that when there were lengthy discussions like what you guys just had, they would actually go around for a second round of comments because often times folks like us are like oh, but there is a mistake. So, for example, the two percent grade is absolutely a technical thing that Caltrain can do; it's on their tech specs but it leaves the rest of us biting our finger tips because we've got lots of more things we could say so that's an easy way to kind of get more engagement. The other thing that was done in previous Rail Committee iteration was there were a lot more working group sessions. So often times the Chair would have different sets of groups who might come

TRANSCRIPT

up. So, you might have CAARD come and present what we know, you might have Clem Tillier come and talk, you might have Adina come talk but it allows you, Council Members, in an open forum to ask specific questions and get data. It also presents a way publicly for all of us to also help Staff get some of the things that they need. So those would be some suggestions on maybe how to – while you guys still figuring out where your stakeholders belong in this process, how to actually start to have a wider conversation. I think what I hear you struggling with at your – at its core is that you don't want to make anything to official but you agree that the citizens have something to add and in the end, we all just want to have a really good conversation and make sure that we're having it openly. So, I think there's a way to figure this stuff out. I will say that I sent my comments and I warned you not to print because I was thinking of you guys that might be printing it at home and reading them last minute last night. It – the packet does not include the rest of my attachment which is – which would be page 10-36 which include excerpts from the Pennsylvania project. They have very specific examples in there of community criteria that they used to kind of measure their alternatives. Obviously, that's a finished report so it's much more advanced than what we have but some of the specific things are for example if you were looking at the Churchill crossing, including criteria that would say you know really maximizing how to get bikes across or whatever. They just had very geographically specific criteria so I would highly recommend that we continue to look at models of other projects to see how we can build on those and look at those things. I think that's all I have for the criteria right now. I just – again, it's going to be hard to continue to widdle that down unless there's a kind of spelled out the process of where we're going with all this stuff. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you.

Elizabeth Alexis: Yes, it would be nice to talk more about the – I think there are some interesting things that were brought up about what is the role, why do you want normal people in a room with the technical experts? That's sort of the magic of CSS is you're asking technical people to think a little differently than they did before because on the technical side you get sort of stuck on standards and the book and what it says. What you are asking people to do is can you think of another way to achieve your objectives? Like if you're trying – like for the Water District; I mean it really is a big project. We all the creeks that we're crossing, we have a lot of water flow issues, and we have a lot of stuff there. So, I just – ten people going really deep is not the same as two hundred people going shallow. I mean it's different, you want both actually because there are certain things that the two hundred

TRANSCRIPT

people will give you feedback on but ten people thinking really deeply about the problem and that lead into the problem statement. I think -- and this is one thing to think about with Eric and some other people, I think you've got a problem statement on sort of a global level. That we have the Caltrain expanded in 2025 and that we have -- we've always had limited capacity on an east/west and that's already taxed in. That will just be -- it will be a non -- I mean nonviable but then we start to look -- and this is where we can use the experience that we've learned from the previous studies and why we're a little different than the problems that we're looking at in Sunnyvale or Mountain View. I mean I think you can divide it up, I think there is a South Palo Alto project that starts at San Antonio Road and includes the station area because one of the things -- the 2025 Caltrain thing is not just about the crossings but it's going to be about as people who do not work in San Francisco because it's a pain in the butt to get there, they will work in San Francisco. People who live in Palo Alto, who live in Los Altos, who live in -- all of these things are going to create a demand to get to the stations and we need to be thinking about that when we're solving these other problems. We have more issues with bicyclist than other Cities do because of our reliance and that for the high schools where you get in a half an hour period you get, I don't know, five hundred people moving across the crossing; they have to be a different kind of width. I would look at -- and as I think Staff said, you said oh, there are just two alternatives. No, there's actually -- I mean the permutations and combinations you get because we know -- this is things that we already know. It's expensive to maintain all the current turning movements so the question is, can you find a way because we do have a couple of crossings and the San Antonio Road is -- we haven't even talked about sort of looking at that area and what that can use or not use or the limits on what's going to happen there. Looking across those South Palo Alto as a general problem, I think is one issue. Then looking at North of Oregon Expressway, including the California Avenue area because there are issues which are people getting into the station there and people getting onto Alma. Up to, let's call it Town and Country, that's one area because some of the solutions may include looking at the Embarcadero Crossing as part -- taking up some capacity and then the -- as the Alma Street one is really -- it is a Palo Alto station area plan which we will need to do and thinking of those as three different distinct things.

Chair DuBois: Great, thank you. Richard Brand.

Richard Brand: Richard Brand, resident and I guess acting as an ex-officio advisor here, thank you, Mayor Scharff. A couple things on the problem statement, I think -- and this comes back to what I outlined at the beginning

TRANSCRIPT

of the meeting is that suggestion – let's see, sorry, suggested problem statement. Cal – the a – High Speed Rail is going to be probably, I wouldn't say possible. I mean as it is right now, High Speed Rail is a probable solution and we've heard them say that as they presented here so right now the wording is possible. Yes, funding is still up in the air but I think you need to consider changing that and that brings me to the other issue of the trench, which I think is a great discussion that's going on. I think Staff though cannot come back with a cost issue until we have High Speed Rail tell us what they are going to do about four tracks versus two. Four tracks will change us and in fact, what are we going to do? Close down Alma and build a shoe fly along Alma to get the trains to continue to – shoe fly is an alternative rail solution. A four-track trench is going – where are you going to put the tracks? So once again, this all depends, I'm defending Staff here, on what the High Speed Rail people do. We need a solution – we need an answer from them on that proposal. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Next speaker is Herb Borock.

Herb Borock: Yeah, I just want to talk a little bit about the problem statement. The – how you frame the problem statement gets into what Council Member Filseth said on the previous part of this agenda item, which is making a decision and having by in on the decision. In previous meetings and I guess at this one, it seems that the no project alternative, that is not doing any kind of grade separation; whether it's a trench or clover leaf or anything else. That's already been made, even though not in a formal way so, in some sense, that's part of the problem statement in that you have already decided not to do that. Another part of the problem statement is the relationship to feature development. I mean if Caltrain is the only rail line and is not High Speed Rail, just to simplify it and their ridership is going to double, does that mean that half the people who drive – an equal number of the people who are driving now ride on the train now. Well, it's just going to come from those people so we're going to decrease the number of people who are driving cars in Palo Alto by an amount equal to the commuters who come into Palo Alto and the commuters who leave Palo Alto. If the real situation is related to the Comprehensive Plan, that land developers and large corporations, who among themselves could pay for all of this and not have a sales tax and bonds (inaudible) the public, it they want that relieving that traffic congestion to be able to develop more and have more employees come in by vehicles so that you are back to the same congestion. What's missing from the problem statement is the land use decision that is being made in the future when you make a Comprehensive Plan decision and those have to be weaved into that. Otherwise it just becomes an issue that you've already made a decision, for example, to do a trench or maybe the problem

TRANSCRIPT

statement is (inaudible) by the City Manager, which is there's this pot of money available within a short period of time and our problem statement really at the top is how do we do this so quickly and come to a decision that people buy in to get that money. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Ok and our last speaker is Adina Levin.

Adina Levin: A few different points in terms of the problem statement and objectives and criteria is – as well as the process is that I think funding strategies really need to be a first-class consideration here because if a trench is a preferred alternative, the order of magnitude cost here is a billion dollars. Think about the heartache about the Adobe Creek Bridge in the ten to the \$20 million range and that was difficult. We're talking two orders of magnitude greater than that; a billion dollars is a little bit of money and the strategies whether they are bonding, whether they are taxing, whether they be land value capture, those will make a really big difference in terms of the burden on community members. The change in the community being envisioned in order to make some of this possible and building in the time to get the expert advice on the financial options and then the community input on what seems like desirable strategies and undesirable strategies. I think that needs to be pretty heavily weighted in the analysis and in the decision making, so that's one point. Another point with regards to taking things into the account but not pre-judging. You may be familiar with a process that Burlingame went through where they had earlier phase and they said we want a trench. The Council Members were persuaded they wanted a trench, the community members were perused they wanted a trench, then they looked at the details and what – where they came to was they saw visualizations of the amount of fencing you need to protect electric poles and wire from people fallings on top of them. They concluded for themselves that the aesthetic impact, they thought that was uglier than the other alternatives that they were looking at. That was the decision that they made and the other thing is that they looked at the water issues where they were located and realized that it would be extremely difficult at that location to keep it dry. They came up with, at the end, a split alternative that was different from where they thought they started. I do not have a personal opinion, Friends of Caltrain has no position on this topic so this is not to say Palo Alto should do one or the other. It's to say that when those options are considered and people look at the visual impacts and the data, they may come to a different place than when they started. Then two more things more quickly if I might. One is about how separable Alma is and one of the things that I've heard from community members is around on the permeability topic, it might be possible to make additional through

TRANSCRIPT

connections in that area but that would have timing and funding interrelationships. Even in the current value capture legislation where things don't need to be in the exact same location, they could intertwingle. I know that has like some consequences that people don't want in terms of process but that might be on the – be considered sooner rather than later. Oh, and just the long middle three only goes through Cal. Ave.

Chair DuBois: Ok, so back to us for discussion. So, I think there are two parts, here right? There's the problem statement criteria, objectives and then I think we're also being asked to – well, just (inaudible) (crosstalk)...

Mayor Scharff: The problem statement.

Chair DuBois: ... the results, yeah, so that's it.

Mayor Scharff: Adrian, do you...

Council Member Fine: Sure. I think the problem statement is pretty close, there are a few things that I want to change and I'll start with the small ones. So, one is I actually do appreciate Richard's comment about High Speed Rail probable versus possible. Another one that kind of stuck to me is saying the rail corridor also creates issues in surrounding neighborhoods. It also creates issues for Stanford and for our commercial areas and I think that's worth noting and then the last thing is the biggest comment. I think it's important for us to frame this problem as something else we're committed to because I mean we could say like gosh, Caltrain is going to increase service and we should just fight them tooth and nail and not do grade separations. I think it's important for us to acknowledge that Caltrain is really the backbone of heavy transit on the peninsula. You know many of our residents use it to get to work, many folks come down here for work, and so I think it's worth acknowledging that Caltrain is expanding and it's going to provide more service to our region and to our City but there are these connectivity and physical barrier issues. So, I would just recommend that we bring that opportunity in benefit of Caltrain to the front and then kind of do the butt. That's my comment on the problem statement. I do have comments on the other things but you want to just stick with...

Chair DuBois: Yeah, why don't we just talk about the problem statement?

Mayor Scharff: Yeah, I agree.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Fine: Just stick to that for now, ok.

Mayor Scharff: Do you want us to wordsmith this right now? Would that be the easiest thing for you to do or do you want general comments like Adrian just made?

Mr. Mello: I mean so after this meeting we'll refine it and bring it to Council on September 5th so I mean just input into the refinements that you'd like to see would be sufficient I think, as long as there's general agreement among the Committee.

Mayor Scharff: I agree with what Adrian said and I'm perfectly good with that. I actually think you did a good job on the problem statement. I think the unspoken part of the problem statement and I know you want to just do the problem statement but I think it bleeds into this, is when you put down objectives all the way – bottom is cost minimized right of way acquisition. I'm afraid that we not talking about that when we look at these grade separations that it's up to 50 homes that are taken. I think that if we don't make that explicit as we go through this process – you know one of the things may be minimizing eminent domain, which where's when you talk about just right of way acquisition, people think it's a cost. It feels like we're hiding the ball so I do think it's appropriate just to use the term right of way acquisition. I want us to be explicative so that people talk about it, that people – that the community has this discussion. I don't want to get through this all and then 50 people's homes might be taken, plus their neighbors and that they come out on mass and say we had no idea this was going on so I think that's really important. I'm not sure that needs to go into the problem statement but that is my biggest concern with sort of where we are on this.

Mr. Mello: If I could, we could certainly change right of way acquisition to property acquisition or acquiring property or something that is more explicative under the objectives. In the evaluation criteria, I know you want to talk about that later but currently minimized right of way acquisition is shown as a tier three criterion so a recommendation the Committee could make is to move that to tier one.

Chair DuBois: Or two but I guess a question is do we want to explicatively say emanate domain?

Mayor Scharff: I don't know, I just don't want to be ever accused that we hide the ball so I wanted them said publicly and I mean I don't know how we

TRANSCRIPT

do it, I just want it to be out there in the public and people start talking about it.

Mr. Mello: Yeah, so there's generally two types of property acquisition; there could be a vulnerary sale to the City and then there could be eminent domain. I think the eminent domain one is the primary concern if I'm reading you correctly.

Mayor Scharff: Correct.

Chair DuBois: Yes.

Mayor Scharff: So, I'm good with the problem statement with the comments that Adrian made, go ahead.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I think I generally support the comments that both of you guys made. Maybe a few tweaks to something that Adrian had said but for me, I feel like we're burying the headline on the problem statement. I think it – we're really talking about future impacts and that's really understated. It doesn't come out that no project is not really feasible because of these future impacts. So, I think that needs to be kind of the headline and so the very last sentence is some of these issues will continue to get worse in the future' I think that's just very weak.

Mayor Scharff: I agree with you Tom, you're right.

Chair DuBois: I would split the support of Caltrain sentence with the but and I would actually lead with that the planned increase and frequency and length of trains by Caltrain and High Speed Rail will worsen all impacts. Then maybe follow that up with the City of Palo Alto benefits from Caltrain service and we support Caltrain. Again, being really clear that why are we spending all this money that doesn't even sound like there's a big problem here.

Hillary Gitelman, Planning and Community Development Director: If I could just respond to that last comment. Hillary Gitelman the Planning Director, I just wanted to let the Committee – make the Committee aware that some of the very strong responses we got to the citizen questionnaire were on this subject and they challenged us to acknowledge that some of the impacts, for example, noise, and vibration, may get better with electrification. So, they didn't want us to lump like all the impacts are going to get worse. They wanted us to be more explicitly about our support for Caltrain service and

TRANSCRIPT

acknowledge that while congestion may get worse, other impacts may be improved in the future.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I don't know we quantify that they get better if others – maybe a little less noise but it's much more frequently right? So again, we're talking about I think more trains and potentially longer trains.

Mayor Scharff: Well it's east/west connectivity that gets worse, congestion may actually get a lot better because people will hopefully be taking Caltrain and not driving.

Ms. Gitelman: But the number of times that the gates come down and traffic gets congestion...

Mayor Scharff: That's east/west connectivity.

Ms. Gitelman: Yeah, the congestion associated with that is what (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Chair DuBois: Something else is you need to be realistic about the volumes. I mean you're talking ten times the volume in vehicles and 30,000 people on the train.

Council Member Fine: I mean this is why I do think that we actually want to lead with the opportunity a little bit saying the City of Palo Alto is supporting the modernization of Caltrain, which will result in better service but that will impact our east/west connectivity, noise, vibrations...

Chair DuBois: So, that's the one thing that I disagreed with that in terms of a problem statement...

Mayor Scharff: You think you want to lead with...

Chair DuBois: ... we should lead with the problem, right?

Council Member Fine: I just think people don't see it get and I think you articulated well like there is something coming towards us and not doing anything is not an option.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Yeah, the other thing that I would say is that I consider Stanford and businesses to be parts of the neighborhoods so I wasn't really clear what you were suggesting. (Inaudible) Again, that's my main comment, that we should really be very explicit that these changes are coming and they are going to have significant impacts. Do you need anything more explicitly than that feedback?

Mr. Mello: No, I mean I think we can look at ways to emphasize that more clearly and also, emphasize that Caltrain is a good thing for the community in general; the Caltrain service that is provided to Palo Alto and will be provided with electrification.

Chair DuBois: Great, ok, so let's move on to the objectives. Want to mix it up or go in the same order?

Council Member Fine: I'll lead off, I don't mind. So, I think these are pretty good. A few of them, (inaudible) the PTC comments and what you said Josh, we maybe could knock off; like the bottom on maximizing Palo Alto fair share of available funding sources, I think we're always going to do that. Minimize disruption during construction, I hope we do that every time and I think that's kind of goes without saying. The one that I didn't see here is kind of – I don't know the exact phrase but leverage these changes that are happening and kind of coordinate it with our land use planning and other opportunities that may arise, maybe even doing a new station plan, particularly for downtown. I think that there may be an objective there in terms of saying there are big changes coming, we're doing a lot of physical work, lots of upgrades and what are the surrounding land use station impacts. I think that's all I've got on the objectives for now.

Mayor Scharff: Let me tell you what I've got. I've got – I actually think we should change it to minimize emanate domain and local road closures; I think that would be helpful. I think we should strike to ensure fairness in terms of the investments, improvements in North and South Palo Alto and let me tell you why. We as a community may decide we're going to change – close Churchill, which would mean a much less investment in North Palo Alto. We may decide that we're going to do a trench which is much higher investment in South Palo Alto and I don't think it makes any sense to say the funding needs to be equal for both and so I think we should strike that.

Chair DuBois: Is that it?

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: Yeah, I also agree with Adrian about getting rid of the last two. So, I would get rid of the last three to make that one change. Let me see, (inaudible) something else. Yeah, I think the rest of its fine.

Chair DuBois: So, a lot of agreement on this, that's great. I agree with both of those comments. My main comment was the third bullet, I think improving circulation access for Alma is a transportation period is an objective and that's separating bicyclist is a separate objective. I think in your report you said that this was somewhat in priority orders, kind of clustered, so I think it might be good to make that explicit in the workshops and things because it is a long list. I don't necessarily agree that we need to get it down to four items but I think there is some implied priority in this list. The other thing in the Staff report, you know there's a sensitivity about talking about the trench because we're potentially proposing a scenario but I think that's an opposition to this and kind of recognizing the work of the past. So, I think it would be great if you could find a way in the objectives to reference the past Community desire – stated desire and Council's stated direction has been a trench. We're starting to look at this new approach just to acknowledge that past work so we don't continue to get feedback that is why are you ignoring this one from a few years ago? I just wanted to completely drop it in and work it in somehow.

Mayor Scharff: Yeah, I'm fine with that as long as – if it seems that the trench is not going to be feasible, I don't want us to be locking in that as an objective.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I'm not saying that it's an objective, I'm just acknowledging (crosstalk) (inaudible)...

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible)

Chari DuBois: ...preference, right?

Ms. Mello: I think we could certainly reference the past work and the community preference for the trench and then clarify that we'll be going through a formal alternatives analysis process and we may end up there, we may not end up there but we'll think about how to word that.

Mayor Scharff: But at least that gets us starting on the trench work and I'm good with that.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Fine: Just one last piece I'm missing from here, I don't know again, if this one that goes without saying but to support the City and Region sustainability goals. There's nothing in here about that but it's not priority one.

Mayor Scharff: Why would we add that? I mean I understand but I mean we're trying to...

Council Member Fine: I'm just wondering as we've heard about things like – as we've heard about things of – in terms of one -- like there's the mass transit aspect of this too. There's also like the bike and ped stuff, right? I agree with you Tom that separating bike and ped is not a first order thing.

Chair DuBois: Well, it's up there but I'm just saying that it's not the same (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Council Member Fine: As improving circulation for all modes. There are the electrification pieces, there's kind of our construction management in some of these sensitive areas, there's all the creek work. I don't know, I'm not totally sold on it but it just seems like as I look through this list, that seems to be one key term we're missing but we may not need it here.

Mr. Mello: We could potentially expand the one that says to support Caltrain Service enhancements...

Council Member Fine: (Inaudible)

Mr. Mello: ...to encourage sustainable transportation or something to that effect, ok.

Chair DuBois: Alright, let's get moving here. Criteria?

Mayor Scharff: The draft evaluation criteria, right?

Chair DuBois: Yeah. Why don't we switch up the order? I'll jump in and then we'll go down the line. I didn't know if we need to call out rail operations at a tier one. I don't think anyone is talking about trying to stop Caltrain or anything. It just seemed not needed, I mean it was just an impression. On number two, I do think minimizing right of way acquisition should at least be a tier two, I'm not sure it should be a tier one but a tier two. On – then tier

TRANSCRIPT

three, I think we should separate the – well the other part of that; finance with available funding sources. I think we should have something like determine funding sources and take steps to start to get them in place. I think one of the public speakers said making the funding strategy more explicit and that's a class one problem.

Mayor Scharff: Yeah so, I...

Mr. Mello: See if I could just jump in so just to be clear. These are criteria that will be used to evaluate the different alternatives. So, it would have...

Chair DuBois: Sure, ok so (inaudible) (crosstalk) I guess – well, I guess the other – yeah, maybe it doesn't belong here. The other part on the cost that I forgot to mention is the last time in the workshop we threw in a bunch of potentially new crossings, which may have different sources of funding and I said it at the last rail meeting that I think we should be really clear about separation of costs on current grade seps from funding, potentially new crossings. I think that adds confusion to the process.

Mayor Scharff: I think what Tom – maybe you were trying to get at it a little bit and I'm struggling with this too on the cost thing. It's really not cost, it's feasibility; it's cost feasibility. I mean something may be more expensive and we may choose to do it but it's feasible where as something may be totally unfeasible because of the cost.

Chari DuBois: And know what's feasible requires some analysis of funding sources but I'm not sure how we capture that.

Mr. Mello: So maybe finance with feasible funding sources instead of available because it may very well be that...

Mayor Scharff: That's what I would say.

Mr. Mello: ...they are not available today.

Mayor Scharff: I would just say cost feasibility quite frankly and leave it at that and knowing just like you're going to do the work on the trench stuff in parallel. Jim said we'd start with finance and doing the financing part for availability. I actually disagree with Tom on the rail operations, I think support continued rail options on Caltrain service improvements. I think

TRANSCRIPT

making that explicit is really important and I do think that we should move up to minimize – I actually think it's minimized, do away with the word cost and just say minimize emanate domain and make that a tier two criterion. Then I'm not so sure we need a tier three criterion. We may just have tier one criteria and tier two criteria unless you want to break some of these out. I mean...

Chair Dubois: Well, I mean disruption of (crosstalk)

Mayor Scharff: Right, so we could make – minimize disruption and duration of construction activities Tier 3.

Chair DuBois: Well, we still have cost feasibility under Tier 3.

Mayor Scharff: But I mean cost feasibility has to be under Tier 1. I think. I mean if it's not feasible – in fact, it should be the number one criteria. I mean if it's not feasible to do it, we should drop it. I mean that's – so, I'd actually make that Tier 1. You disagree?

Chair DuBois: I just think it's a fund-raising effort so it happens over time and knowing up front something that is absolutely feasible – it depends – well, kind of like the order of magnitude of feasibility versus more accurate.

Mayor Scharff: I realize that the term feasible is squishy, right? I mean what may be feasible for – but I think at the end of the day, that's sort of a...

Chair DuBois: But until we've done the work, it's hard to know.

Mayor Scharff: Yeah but you can't engage on the fund raising and decide that you're going to see if it works and then end up not having any grade separations. You've got to have a plan that's feasible, right? I mean I don't think the plan could be hopefully someone will donate the money for instance. It's got to be like what we did with the infrastructure.

Chair DuBois: But the plan could involve private money, business impact money, and a bunch of other things that we haven't been talking about.

Mr. Mello: If I could just jump in here. So, the evaluation matrix that will be created using these evaluation criteria will be used to inform the decision-making process. The matrix itself is not going to make the decision so the

TRANSCRIPT

way this could play out is under rail operations, for example, let's say we get into a one percent versus a one and a half percent debate with Caltrain and they say well, we could accept 1.25 percent but not 1.5 percent. The alternative that has that 1.5 percent would have a lower score under rail operations because...

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible) support passenger rail operations.

Mr. Mello: We could certainly... so it's – basically this is just going to help facilitate the decision-making process. So, the feasibility of the funding would be something that would be if we're building something that only uses Measure B funding because it only cost \$90 million. Let's say that would have a high score under funding feasibility but if we pick something that's going to require a local referendum that's – we haven't done any polling on and have no idea, that would have a lower score under funding feasibility but it's not going to be automatically dismissed because the decision will ultimately up to Council.

Mayor Scharff: Getting back to what Tom said, what you just said – I don't think we should be scoring that until we did the polling. Do you know what I mean? I mean I – what I don't want to have happened in this process is we make decisions with very limited information when we could get better information. I would actually give you a hard time if you came here and said we scored this low because we haven't done polling yet and I'd say well, let's go do the polling.

Mr. Mello: That's exactly probably how it would – I mean we can leave it blank until we do polling and not score it but I mean I just wanted to be clear about how this will be used.

Mayor Scharff: Ok, I just don't want to get into a situation with the bridge where we had the entire community go through this, we choose something, and then we are really rushed for time and we just basically do what the opposite of CSS; which is we say ok, we're just doing this grade separation just like this because we no more time and we need to do it. We had a 5-year process and we went down the wrong path.

Council Member Fine: I mostly agree with the Mayor. I do think the rail operations bullet is important, as is something about the financial feasibility and I think for Tom's point, that could be a broad feasibility catch at that point. If we're going to move the minimize -- I mean the use of emanate

TRANSCRIPT

domain for this project into tier two, I agree. I think we can get rid of tier three and that the construction criteria, minimizing disruption during the duration of construction activities at a single location; it's nice to have. I think we're going to do that anyway and it shouldn't just be the one hanging out in tier three.

Chair DuBois: So, you're saying to move it to Tier 2?

Council Member Fine: I think that we could strike it and just move the right of way acquisition of the emanate domain bullet point into Tier 2 and then...

Chair DuBois: So, I guess the one thing that we would be missing and again I'm ok leaving rail operations in there. It just struck me as we're going to do it anyway; that was my only point. The issue of construction disruptions not only to vehicle traffic but also rail operations are we – do we suddenly...

Council Member Fine: Impact on current (inaudible)

Chair DuBois: (Inaudible) there. I mean are we going to like not consider an alternative because it has some construction impacts on operations.

Council Member Fine: I mean that's fair.

Mayor Scharff: That's fair but I actually liked keeping minimize disruption of the durations but I was just going to move it to Tier 2.

Chair DuBois: But yeah, I'm ok with that and just have two tiers.

Mayor Scharff: But if Staff for some reason wants Tier 3, I mean three tiers, we could break up Tier 2 into Tier 3 and then we'll have (inaudible)

Council Member Fine: I guess that's a little persuasive. Maybe that at any single location is a little funny then. I guess that was making think...

Mayor Scharff: Why don't we just say duration of construction (inaudible)

Council Member Fine: Yeah, that was making me think we're not going to impact a single household so badly for this but I think Tom, your point about it could like it could be existing service or another right of ways.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: Well, if we take that house it won't...

Council Member Fine: We'll we're not going to take that house that's why we're going to try to minimize that.

Mayor Scharff: Exactly.

Chair DuBois: Ok, so I think this is mainly kind of feedback and I don't know if we need a Motion. I did have a couple other comments on – so on the Council meeting on September 5th, what are we taking to Council?

Mr. Mello: I think a Motion from you directing us to incorporate your feedback into the problem statement, objectives and evaluation criteria that we present to City Council on September 5th would be helpful.

Mayor Scharff: So, moved.

Chair DuBois: Second. All in favor? Ok, but is that the only thing we're taking to Council?

MOTION: Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member DuBois to direct Staff to incorporate the Committee's feedback regarding the problem statement objectives and evaluation criteria and to present the new versions to the City Council in September; and

Mr. Mello: Yeah, well we'll also probably most likely has a discussion about the process again and we'll provide the direction that we were given by PTC and Rail Committee to Council.

Chair DuBois: The other thing I would just say is that I am pretty concerned that on the engagement plan around the alternatives, you were saying that it may not even have the second workshop. I mean the amount of people that can participate in a focus group on probably one of the most key steps is making a little nervous.

Mayor Scharff: So, I thought – I'm with Tom. I think we should have – we should do – I thought the focus group was an additive to be honest, not a...

Chair DuBois: Well, I heard him say that maybe we (inaudible)(crosstalk)

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: No, no, that's why I'm supporting you on that.

Chair DuBois: I think we need to think about that.

Mr. Mello: We can do both, we can do a community workshop and focus groups. I think focus groups will enable us to get a little deeper in the discussion and spend more time...

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I'm a little bit concerned about even just two meetings on alternatives and if that's going to be sufficient.

Mr. Mello: This whole process is designed to be flexible so I think if after October 21st, we don't feel like we have closure on the development of the alternatives, we could have another discussion with the community.

Chair DuBois: So, do we need to add to the Motion the idea about the trench white paper?

Mayor Scharff: Yes, just add that in.

Chair Dubois: Is that ok?

Council Member Fine: Yep.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion, "Develop a white paper on trench scenarios, which will address constraints to a longer trench while providing a more extensive look at the Charleston/Meadow trench."

Mr. Mello: I just need a clarity; would you like the white paper to focus on just the trench under Charleston and Meadow or a trench along the entire corridor?

Mayor Scharff: No, it doesn't work on the entire corridor. Why would we spend the time on that? (Inaudible)...

Mr. Mello: So, the white paper...

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: ... can't go past Oregon, right? I mean that's what we've been told.

Chair DuBois: I don't know. I'd be interested in understanding that.

Council Member Fine: Yeah, I would be interested in seeing the entire corridor and if there is that issue, spelling it out on the white paper.

Mr. Mello: So, Hillary I think wants to jump in but the complexity of a paper focused on the entire corridor would have – I think it would lead to a longer turnaround time for the paper. I think we could deliver something on the Charleston/Meadow one a little bit quicker and go a little deeper than we could if we were to look at the entire corridor.

Ms. Gitelman: What I wanted to add is maybe tearing off of the Chair's comments earlier about constraints. Instead of a white paper that focuses solely on the trench, I was wondering if we couldn't broaden it to just be more about the constraints that we're going to face along the corridor with all of these things; particularly with below grade solutions. I mean we've done some work on that in the past but that needs to be re-looked at and refreshed and it might be a way to make it a little broader than just the trench at these two crossings.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, that sounds good. I think constraints and maybe if there are any mitigations for constraints but I think the other part of it was getting a ballpark of pricing too at some point and costing...

Ms. Gitelman: Yeah, I mean we have that ballpark pricing in the first Mott McDonald study. We'll dust that off, take a look at it, and refine it as we can at this point.

Mayor Scharff: I think it's more than that. I'm not actually ok with that direction. I think I don't want to have the \$10 parking garage because that's the best you can dust off. I mean I'm fine with an iteration on this but I really do think that we need to start honing in on whether or not that trench is feasible. When we talked about this previously – and look, if you want to do a light touch across the entire trench and if it is possibly feasible, I'm interested in it but all the work that came back to us last time indicated that trench over the entire corridor was not feasible. Now, if that's changed, great but let us know but I...

TRANSCRIPT

Ms. Gitelman: If I can clarify, I mean that last study which we linked to in the report you got today concluded that the longer trench was like a billion-dollar project and the Charleston/Meadow trench or no it was, I'm sorry. The one percent trench was a billion-dollar project and part of it is, is it went farther than just Charleston/Meadow. It had to go and impact at the Caltrain station and the Caltrain under crossing and all that, as well as the Oregon Express Way under crossing. So, there were all kinds of costs associated with the fact that it lengthened the footprint of...

Mayor Scharff: So yeah, put all that in the white paper, I agree but let's not just stop with the white paper. I mean I think we need to hone in on what's feasible in terms of a trench and what's not.

Mr. Mello: I think a good format for the white paper would be a look at constraints to a longer trench but then go a little deeper into the Charleston/Meadow trench and look at sharpening our pencil on the cost estimate.

Mayor Scharff: Right, that sounds good.

Chair DuBois: So, I know you have a time constraint...

Mayor Scharff: I do.

Chair DuBois: ...but if we could quickly get through Item 3 which is the Union Pacific letter, was that a re-sent?

Mayor Scharff: Was there a re-sent, what do we do?

Mr. Mello: This is just an informational item for the Committee to show you that the letter was sent.

Jessica Brettle, Assistant City Clerk: I'm sorry to interrupt. We had a Motion on the floor and no vote yet on Item 2.

MOTION AS AMENDED RESTATED: Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member DuBois to direct Staff to:

TRANSCRIPT

- A. Incorporate the Committee's feedback regarding the problem statement objectives and evaluation criteria and to present the new versions to the City Council in September; and
- B. Develop a white paper on trench scenarios, which will address constraints to a longer trench while providing a more extensive look at the Charleston Meadow trench

Chair DuBois: All in favor?

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 3-0 Filseth absent

Interagency Communications

3. Cities' Letter to Union Pacific to Inform Short-Haul Freight Operator Request for Proposals (RFP) Regarding Peninsula Grade Separations

NO ACTION TAKEN

Next Steps and Future Agendas

Chair DuBois: Quickly on upcoming schedules and agendas. So, we have SamTrans hopefully in the next meeting. What else is on the future agenda?

Mr. Mello: We'll be bringing you an agenda for the September 16th community workshop. Assuming – I'm sorry, what's the next date of the Rail Committee – do you know?

Chair DuBois: I probably have it.

Mr. Mello: Yeah, so we will be going over the agenda in the planning for the community workshop on September 16th. We'll also be recapping what the outcome was from the Council meeting.

Chair DuBois: So, I have a Rail Committee meeting on September 13th, is that incorrect?

Mr. Mello: Yeah, I have September 13th from 8-10 on my calendar as well.

Mayor Scharff: So, we are doing one on the 6th or not?

TRANSCRIPT

Jessica Brettle, Assistant City Clerk: Currently on the tentative, it's for Wednesday, September 13th at 8 AM.

Chair DuBois: Is there a reason to change it?

Mayor Scharff: Oh, you know what, there is a reason to change it. The issues are that that's where the League meeting is.

Ms. Brettle: In Sacramento?

Chair DuBois: Can everyone make the 6th? (crosstalk)

Mayor Scharff: We do have (inaudible) but that's at 3 in the afternoon.

Chair DuBois: Alright so...

Ms. Brettle: September 6th?

Chair DuBois: Yes.

Ms. Brettle: Ok.

Chair DuBois: Make sure...

Ms. Brettle: No problem.

Chair DuBois: ... Eric Filseth knows.

Ms. Brettle: I will.

Chair DuBois: The other thing that you talked about not starting the Dumbarton Rail letter. I guess since we moved the meeting up, we'll have more time but if it's possible to even outline a draft letter for that meeting, I think that would be worthwhile. Alright, anything else? Alright, thank you guys, long meeting, meeting adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 11:03 A.M.