



CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE TRANSCRIPT

Special Meeting
Wednesday, April 26, 2017

Chairperson DuBois called the meeting to order at 8:02 A.M. in the Community Meeting Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

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

Absent:

Oral Communications

Chair DuBois: Do we have any Oral Communications?

Chair DuBois: We have three speakers. The first speaker is Richard Brand, followed by Herb Borock.

Richard Brand: Yeah, good morning everybody. This – I'm Richard Brand, Palo Alto and I wanted to give you an update on the San Mateo County Transportation Authority Program on the Dunbarton rail corridor study. As I've told some of you, I've been working on this for 20 – over 20-years. I remember when [Dina Mosser] was the Mayor. I actually contacted – there is an active study – activity going on in San Mateo County to study what to do with the existing rail corridor. The County owns the right of way for the old Southern Pacific tracks that go across from here to Fremont. They – in the study they have been funded in part by Facebook to see how this could be reopened and integrate with rail lines on both our side of the Bay and that side of the Bay. The lady who's in charge of this for San Mateo County – I also contacted the Mayor of Menlo Park who – Kirsten Keith, who also has been active in this area for quite a while. The study is supposed to be published in August and she did indicate to me – Tom, I think I copied you in this. She is willing to come and speak to this Committee on the project and when it's ready to do that and so I wanted to offer that as an option. I can get you in touch with her. I just took my niece over to East Bay a couple of days ago in the afternoon and it's a zoo. That road is absolutely at capacity and a rail link is very important so I'm an advocate for that and I'm just here to let you know that there are activity and somebody who's willing to come and give you an update. Thank you.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Thanks. Our next speaker is Herb Borock.

Herb Borock: Good morning. There have been some items in the news about the leadership at both Caltrain and High Speed Rail. The executive director of High Speed Rail has announced that he will be leaving and the Joint Powers Board thinks so highly of their top officer that they voted him a performance bonus. I was thinking that one way to get rid of somebody is to give them a going recommendation for another job and I noticed that the High Speed Rail Authority will be having a close session meeting on Monday, relating the employment of an executive director and a 30-minute Agenda item is compensation and contract deliberation. It sounds like they already have someone in mind. Now I hadn't heard that they were making a public solicitation and noticing everybody that the jobs available and that if anybody wanted to, they could apply. Perhaps, [Mr. Heartnet] will be moving on to High Speed Rail. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thanks. Ok, I guess we will move onto our second item.

Agenda Review and Staff Update

1. Receive and Review Rail Program Briefing Paper From March-April 2017.

Chair DuBois: We're going to move onto Item One which is Agenda Review and Staff Update.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Good morning, Chair, Members of the Committee. Michele DiFrancia an overview of the briefing packet that is enclosed in your Agenda and then I'll give you an update on some VTA activity last week.

Michele DiFrancia, Mott MacDonald: Good Morning. Michele DiFrancia with Mott MacDonald. I'll quickly summarize my briefing packets that was submitted to you as we have a couple big presentations today. One is from High Speed Rail and the other is on all the planning work that we have been doing for the community workshop on May 20th. On that note, for the community workshop planning, we've held several meetings with Staff, with the consultant team, with CirclePoint, with Gary Toth and Nadia Naik. To develop an outline for the workshop and Josh will be giving you a presentation with more details on all the planning efforts including the postCAARD that we're hoping to mail out to 15,000 plus people in the next

TRANSCRIPT

week or so. High Speed Rail, they held a CSCG meeting on April 19th; last week and we were in attendance. I personal was not able to...

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible)

Ms. DiFrancia: The City and County, Staff, coordinating group for High Speed Rail and Caltrain electrification. It's a group that meets monthly and it's the Staff of the Cities along the corridor and they support the LPMG, which also I think is meeting tomorrow night, actually and Tom is our rep. for that. On the agenda – and Caltrain and High Speed Rail rotate each month running the meeting so this month's meeting was led by High Speed Rail; Ben and his team. They did – they provided updates on operators expressing interest for High Speed Rail. I think they have a big community outreach event happening and Ben can provide – probably provide you more information on all of those activities. Preferred alternative is still supposed to be released this summer. We're heard in August with a draft environmental document coming out this fall, I think we've heard October. They did have some breakout sessions with the people in attendance of that meeting. I think they were focused on three key areas including passing tracks, the light maintenance facility in Brisbane, and the approaches to the Diridon Station. I think you received a separate report on the passing track item and the open houses that were held by High Speed Rail Authority in earlier this month so you should have that information on passing tracks. Wayside horns, we provided you additional information on wayside horns per our presentation given on March 22nd on quiet zones. Please let me know if you have any questions related to that. It was provided by our rail engineer, Michael Canepa who gave you the presentation on quiet zones in March. Lastly, there's also some background information on vegetation landscaping requirements for the rail corridor as it relates to electrification and the poles being installed or to be installed in the future. I think that concludes my report. If you have any questions for me.

Chair DuBois: So, at the end of this report here, you talked about the right away with the tree clearance.

Ms. DiFrancia: Yes.

Chair DuBois: Could you explain there's – it says right of the way varies from 80-100-feet and the tree line is well inside that corridor and then it shows a picture of Atherton. I wasn't sure what that was.

TRANSCRIPT

Ms. DiFrancia: Yes, so the question was raised to me as it relates to Atherton. I believe maybe there was some talk about Atherton receiving an exception or something for their landscaping as it overhangs or impacts the right of way. What I've learned from this information provided by Mike Canepa is that we need 21-feet or Caltrain needs 21-feet clearance from the center of the track to where the landscaping hits. There are no exceptions that we know of.

Chair DuBois: How does that relate? (Inaudible) The 80-foot right of way, that seems like that's plenty wide enough. Is it 21-feet from the track?

Ms. DiFrancia: From the track.

Chair DuBois: So, if the right of way is even larger, can they clear it out of the right of way?

Ms. DiFrancia: Sorry, I would need to get back to you on that but I think that was just a general number presented in terms of the – how it varies; the right of way varies.

Chair DuBois: Ok, so my understanding in the EIR, they tested center line in five places and Palo Alto wasn't one of them. Does that preclude us from getting the center of line electrification?

Mr. Mello: If I could jump in. I think we're going to have to come back to you with the final draft of the construction agreement with Caltrain around the electrification. There's a lot of sections in that agreement that addresses these specific issues.

Chair DuBois: I'm concerned that it's final draft and again when I read this, it sounds like it showing potentially wide slots of trees that need to be removed. If that's part of the EIR, we have no say in them and I'm concerned.

Mr. Mello: So, we can go back and look at the specific language in the draft agreement before it comes back to you to make sure that we address this at the greatest extent possible.

Chair DuBois: Ok, I mean I've asked several times and again, there seems to be this option between a center power rail and the two on the outer side.

TRANSCRIPT

Again, it could potentially have a big impact on the (inaudible) of Caltrain through Palo Alto.

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: If I could jump in on that. Chair, you've made that point and in fact, I've to ask the utilities electrical engineering Staff to talk to High Speed Rail about that to see what could be accomplished. It's our understanding that to date, much of the discussion that we've been having with our consultants has been – it's a designed built contract so some of these issues are not fully flushed out but to the extent that you pointed out that Atherton may have received some special, either agreement or commitment to using a center pole as opposed to a frame or a bent type structure for holding the electrical lines. We'll get some follow-up information.

Chair DuBois: Ok, thank you. Yeah, Eric?

Council Member Filseth: The wayside horns, do you if there is an intersection or anywhere that is sort of nearby where there are wayside horns installed?

Ms. DiFrancia: I would need to ask Mike Canepa about that. I personally do not know.

Council Member Filseth: Ok. It would be nice to go listen to them.

Ms. DiFrancia: I can get back to you on that.

Council Member Filseth: Thanks.

Mr. Mello: Then, finally an update on the VTA Board workshop on Friday. Last Monday, the VTA Staff released a draft – the agenda for the Board workshop and upon review, we noticed that there was some arbitrary language inserted into the Staff report that had not previously been seen by the Technical Advisory Committee or the Policy Advisory Committee. This language was in the section that deals with the program guidelines for the Caltrain grade separation program under Measure B. Basically, they were attempting to restrict the funding to grade separations that kept the track bed at the existing level, which raised concerns from Palo Alto, Mountain View, and Sunnyvale. So, we reached out to Staff at the other two Cities and also, organized some of your advocates to attend the Board Meeting – the Board workshop on Friday. We also sent a Staff Member to read some comments and as a result, the VTA Staff has agreed to remove that

TRANSCRIPT

language as those guidelines move forward so we will keep an eye on those guidelines and we may need to organize again if any similar language reenters the program guidelines in the future. The Board did not take any action on Friday, it was a workshop.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, City Manager.

James Keene, City Manager: (Inaudible) We've coordinated at the level – at the City Manager level between the three Cities and I think that going forward we're going to work on developing or renewing the collaboration and the joint positions and stuff that we took on the original Measure B work. So, that we're – it's not just Palo Alto speaking on this as much as possible but all three Cities.

Chair DuBois: Any questions?

Council Member Fine: Is there a point where the VTA guidelines become finalized? Where they can't...

Mr. Mello: Yeah, there is a point where they'll be officially adopted by the Board.

Council Member Fine: When is that?

Mr. Mello: It should be at their next meeting, I would imagine. VTA Staff is going to have to revise them, based on what they heard on Friday. They may bring them back to all the Committees before they go back to the Board or they may not. It would be the beginning of June. I can check on that and get that out to you guys.

Chair DuBois: I heard that they made statements committing to fund all eight-grade separation and was there much discussion about funding for planning activities?

Mr. Mello: They have said to me in our meetings with VTA Staff, that they were going to try to access Measure B funding in the first two years to do planning and implementation work.

Chair DuBois: Great.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: Let me correct my statement, there is a Board meeting on May 4th, where they will be dealing with the bus route restructuring. I am not quite sure if they are also going to add program guidelines but if they do, when that Agenda is published, we'll notify the Rail Committee.

Chair DuBois: It seemed pretty clear that we're going to have more time. It seemed like they are committed to eight grade separations and we don't necessarily rush as much as we thought we did. I am glad to hear that we are talking to Sunnyvale and Mountain View. I've heard that some of the VTA Board Members said that if we can come back with a coordinated plan, that they would be open to adopting that as the preferred approach. Anybody – any other comments on this item? I have one speaker on this item and then we have members of the public that wanted to speak for oral communications. I think we'll do item one and then we'll go back to oral communications. So, Nadia?

Nadia Naik: Hi. Nadia Naik from CAARD. I was at the VTA meeting. I talked to Scott Hayward. From what I understand, they are bringing back to the different Committees and they're supposed to decide at their early June meeting. I think the biggest news is that nobody talked about race to the top at all. It was very much – they want Sunnyvale, Mountain View, and Palo Alto to really work together on what the guidelines were. They talked about really trying to fund all 8-grade separations and not having it be whoever gets there first, which I thought was super important. They did not talk about planning. I did notice that in the bike section they had very specific stuff on a percentage for planning so we definitely have to fight to make sure that that gets in there. We also talked or I made a public comment about them potentially trying to encourage the Cities to work together to reduce costs by staging the construction or minimizing operating – shut down time for Caltrain so just to keep that in mind. Thanks. Oh, sorry, they did say that they want to hear from the City specifically so the more people from the City of Palo Alto who can – and Council Members, who can talk to the different members, that would be super helpful. Particularly, to [Genie Bruens] who is the Los Altos Council Member who is the VTA Chair, the MTC Chair and also our Caltrain rep on the Caltrain Board. Thanks.

Chair DuBois: One more speaker, Adina Levin.

Adina Levin: Ok, so thanks very much to the City of Palo Alto and the other Cities for stepping up and explaining why the, well intention, condition from the VTA that was designed to be fiscally prudent but was just completely misguided and wouldn't achieve the goals. Thanks for speaking up and in advance, working with the Cities on coming up with a solution. Having

TRANSCRIPT

watched closely how the County of San Mateo has done grade separations over time. I do hear the concern about kind of race to the top and maybe the first project will get all the funding but realistically, in San Mateo County we're --, they have had money for 20-years. They have been doing projects spaced out as different Cities get ready and it really hasn't been the case that there was an initial rush in 1990 whatever, when they first passed Measure A. I think making sure that the money gets dived up fairly is reasonable but I wouldn't be as worried that somebody would get it all immediately. The other thing that I am concerned about is also having watched that, is that if there's a desire – so the desire to get as many projects funded is important but trying to split it eight ways, depending on the costs and the needs of the project. My concern is that if you try to split the money eight ways, that might not be enough to go around and you might wind up with fewer than eight projects because there's less overall money because this is matched money with State and local and so on sources. In looking for the right solution, I would encourage thinking about how to – how the Cities work together and divvy the money up fairly but to make sure that projects will actually get done and not getting the pie so thin that maybe they won't get funded. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Ok, so we're going to go back to Oral Communications.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Agenda Items

2. Review and Authorize the Mayor to Sign a Letter to Union Pacific to Inform Short-Haul Freight Operator Request for Proposals Regarding Peninsula Grade Separations

Chair DuBois: Which is a joint letter to Union Pacific.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Thank you, Chair. At your request, we place this item on the agenda. If you want to speak it or if not, we can cover it.

Chair DuBois: Sure, I can speak to it. At the Policy Makers Group meeting, the Cities discussed and agreed to working on a joint letter. This is a draft and I think it's still subject to edits but I think today, the idea would be to given approval for the Mayor to sign the final version of the letter. Also, to

TRANSCRIPT

give any feedback we have on the letter itself. Any comments?

Mayor Scharff: Tom, who drafted this letter?

Chair DuBois: I think several Members of the Committee, including Jillian from San Francisco's (inaudible)

Mayor Scharff: So, we're going to sign on as a joint letter, right? We're not sending this by ourselves.

Chair DuBois: Right, exactly.

Mayor Scharff: I noticed – so, it's a draft and I noticed there are a bunch of typos and ...

Chair DuBois: It's an early draft.

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible). Has there been a later draft?

Chair DuBois: I haven't seen one yet so I think this is an opportunity for us to give some feedback and then basically have you sign a final draft.

Mayor Scharff: So, do you have – but I only sign it if everyone else signs, right? That's the plan?

Chair DuBois: That's the plan.

Mayor Scharff: Ok. Do you have any feedback on the letter or do you find it...

Chair DuBois: I do but why don't you...

Mayor Scharff: No, I wanted to hear what you have to say.

Chair DuBois: I was actually going to scan it while you talked. There's one place that I want to change but go ahead.

Mayor Scharff: No, that's really all I had. I mean I wanted to hear what you have to say on it since this came out of the (inaudible) working group, right?

TRANSCRIPT

Yeah, so I sort of wanted to hear what you guys were thinking of trying to achieve and that kind of stuff.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, it wasn't drafted during the meeting. Obviously, it was drafted outside. There's a reference to supporting – hang on. Ok. Eric, do ahead. Yep. Go ahead.

Council Member Filseth: Just real briefly. If they agree to two percent grade, that gives us maximum flexibility in what we want to do with the separation, is that right?

Chair DuBois: Yeah. We do have one speaker, two speakers. So, Herb Borock, why don't you go ahead and make your comments.

Herb Borock: Yeah, the Local Policy Makers Group originally didn't make decisions, it's essentially advisory to Caltrain, essentially and they alternate meetings between – with Caltrain and High Speed Rail. Tomorrow, I guess will be one of the High Speed Rail meetings and at last month's meeting, at the suggestion of Vice Mayor Seagull of Mountain View, they wanted to get a letter that was of the collective view of the LPMG and I guess they got two volunteers, Ms. Gillette and Mr. Seagull, to draft a letter. On tomorrow's agenda for the LPMG, it does not have this letter on the agenda. It has just a simple single item about the LPMG and what it wants to talk about. So, as I understood it, the purpose was to get a collective view of LPMG and that's what I think this would be. Also, as discussed at a previous meeting here, the Rail Committee did not have the need of flexibility that the previous Committee had where this Committee made decisions. That is -- that there would be time to make recommendations to the Council and then the Council could act. It seemed to me since it's not an agenda item tomorrow on the letter at the LPMG, then most likely if it's going to be making a collective decision that would be the following months. There's more than enough time for a final letter to come back through here and to go to the Council directly. Also, at that point, the LPMG may decide that they want individual letters coming from each city that say the same thing as opposed to just something that's their advice to the Staff of Caltrain. One other thing that they talked about for making the change in freight would be that you could put the horns at the bottom of the train. In terms of the grade, as you'll hear from – on the next agenda item, High Speed Rail has no attention of changing the grade on the rail and the freight would need to interrelate with Union Pacific for freight that goes outside of the peninsula; that comes from outside the peninsula. Where they will be going on Union Pacific's

TRANSCRIPT

tracks that are not electrified and that gets into the question of that relationship between the two of those. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you.

Nadia Naik: Good morning.

Chair DuBois: Two more speakers, Adina Levin – oh, I'm sorry. Nadia Naik and then Adina Levin.

Nadia Naik: Hi, Nadia Naik with CAARD. So, specific feedback on the actual letter. Just after the bullet points where it says we believe that these projects and changes are complimentary and achieve the most benefit for all parties. I think we can take that out. I'd be surprised if anybody who signs onto this letter has actually even read the agreements or knows what they say. As you know, we've presented to this Committee before about our consternation about the fact that these letters never even made it to the Caltrain Board. I don't think there's any reason for us to say that we deemed that they were fabulous or not. I think we could just move forward from there and saying that we're interested in talking to Union Pacific. I would also differ with what Herb says. I think the point of the Local Policy Maker Working Group is that it seems to be the only forum that is a way for the all of the Cities to kind of give a united front and though they do not have technical power, I think there's a lot of political will there. So, signing onto a joint letter, a single one that is signed by all of the Cities is actually a very powerful message. I don't think that the goal is to have every City do a one off. I think they want everybody on one letter and it's important. When it comes to the two percent grade, Caltrain's own guidelines which are available online, allow the trains to go up to two percent. Union Pacific already operates on the Caltrain line. We already know that Union Pacific can go two percent. In fact, in (inaudible) they up to 6 percent. It's not an issue and it's also not a problem for High Speed Rail. They can easily climb and down, that's how they're eventually going to get to the town of [Hatchbees]. That is actually not part of the issue and this is an easy letter for them to sign onto. We know from people who have talked to Union Pacific that it's technically possible so I think it's low-hanging fruit and it's just a good way for all of us to work with our fellow Cities in signing onto something together. I will say that there are other things related to freight that we should look at in the future. There are some things about clearances on the sides of the train and on the top of the train that will actually have an effect on the price of grade separations, which is part of the work that we should

TRANSCRIPT

continue to do through the Local Policy Maker Working Group. I'm happy to talk to Staff about the more technically details on that. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Adina Levin.

Adina Levin: Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain. I strongly agree with what Ms. Naik just said in terms of the value of Local Policy Maker Working Group and having the Cities work together and present a unified voice to Caltrain and High Speed Rail and blended system freight etc. I wanted to build on what Nadia had just said. I want to talk a little bit more about the item that she eluted to which was that I wouldn't recommend that Palo Alto diverges its letter. Keep the letter the same but if this was something that the Local Policy Maker Group together wanted to include at the meeting, this is something that you might want to consider whether to agree to it. There's a California State law that goes back to the days of trains that – the operator would need to kind of stand out on the side of the train and look for passing cows and it's about the side clearances of a freight train. What that means is that it makes level boarding, basically imposable if you follow this rule. Level boarding is a part of Caltrain modernization Phase 2. That project would get you too long trains and level boarding that would speed up the entire system in addition to being more accessible and this rule prevents that from technically being done. This is another type to work with freight on and the question is whether that should be included in this letter at this time to make sure that in going to this short-haul operator, that doesn't preclude working to clean up this legal barrier or to agree to work on that later. That's another definitely related topic that needs to be hashed out with freight in order to achieve the goals for Caltrain modernization with level boarding and fast, smooth operations. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thanks. So, I'll make a Motion if nobody has comments. I would move that the Rail Committee recommends Council approve having the Mayor sign this letter on our behalf. With the final letter, substantially similar to this current draft.

MOTION: Chair DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Fine to recommend to the City Council that they direct the Mayor to sign the letter to Union Pacific on behalf of the Rail Committee, with the final letter substantially similar to the current draft.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

TRANSCRIPT

James Keene, City Manager: Hey Tom, a quick question? Do you – I mean what's your sense of when we'll have a final letter?

Chair DuBois: I think Mr. Borock was right. It will probably another month.

3. Receive a Presentation From the California High-speed Rail Authority and Discuss the Status of the California High-speed Rail Project.

Chair DuBois: Ok, so moving onto item number three, which is to receive a presentation and discuss High Speed Rail. Ben?

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Thank you, Chair. Today we have Ben Tripousis, who's the lead for the San Jose to San Francisco segment of High Speed Rail and he's going to give you a presentation, followed by an Q & A.

Ben Tripousis, High Speed Rail Authority: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Members for the opportunity to update you on where we are with the development of the High Speed Rail project from San Francisco to Merced. I'll give a brief overview. Given the amount of time that's past since this latest incarnation of the project, it has been undertaken and there've been a great many changes to the project. Certainly, in the peninsula corridor between San Francisco and San Jose, there are many new stakeholders and community members that are just coming to understand the project, as well as policy makers who weren't engaged at the outside. My presentation will include a brief video history of how we got here and how we arrived at blended services and working with our Caltrain partners on the development of the peninsula corridor. Briefly, again, we're working on the dark blue line that you see here that is the Phase 1 section of the High Speed Rail project between San Francisco and Los Angelo's Union Station in Anaheim; roughly a 520-mile section. That Phase 1 project is expected to be completed by 2029, followed by the yellow alignments that you see here that would extend the Phase 2 section of the project from Sacramento – forgive, my Merced to Sacramento and from Los Angelo's Union Station and eventually, to San Diego and making the entire Statewide system 800-miles in its entirety once it's completed. The next time someone asks you if High Speed Rail is ever going to be happen, you can say it's happening. It's currently under construction in the central valley with 119-miles of construction from Madera to just north of Bakersfield. Over \$3 billion dollars' investment of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds of federal dollars committed by the Congress in the Obama administration and that construction is

TRANSCRIPT

currently underway and this can give you an indication of what's going on. Sorry. [Watched a short video] So, that gives a quick understanding of the level of work that's currently underway and that work is generating significant economic impact in the central valley. Coming from the – over a thousand construction jobs that are currently active on the project. The labor income associated with that, that you see here. Ultimately, the economic impact that comes from that investment in the central valley. As has always been the goal of the High Speed Rail Authority, a small business in California has a major role in the development of the State-wide project. The authority, as you may recall, has a thirty percent small business goal, 10 percent disadvantaged business goal and a three percent disabled veteran's business goal that really has become a mandate more than a goal. All of our primary contractors have met or exceeded those goals and as you see here, we have over three hundred small California businesses currently engaged in development of the State-wide program. We worked to actively maintain that by providing resources and any opportunities for small business to connect with the program on a regular basis. We hold regular, pretty big conferences, regular small business conferences, opportunities for small California businesses to connect with prime contractors that may ultimately, be doing work on the project and we try to do that on a regular basis. How we arrived at where we are being really lead by the 2016 business plan. That was the first fiscally constrained plan, that is to say, laid out. A plan for the development of the first revenue service that is extending from San Francisco to Bakersfield by 2025, with the investment that we currently have available in Prop. 1A, Cap and Trade, and federal funds that are allowing us to complete that first revenue section and that's what we're in the midst of developing. The work that we are completing here is really aimed at the environmental clearance of the project's section from San Francisco to Merced, roughly 123-miles. That environmental review is occurring in two project sections, San Francisco to San Jose, which is largely the 50-mile Caltrain corridor. We're partnering with Caltrain on both the electrification of Caltrain and the follow on High Speed service in the peninsula corridor. Then a separate high-speed system from the Diridon Station in San Jose to roughly 8-miles east of Merced. Where we'll connect with the central valley Y work shown here in the teal box on the screen. That's being constructed as a component of the work that's being done in the central valley. We'll have, at completion, four stations that will be operating within the Transbay Transit Center ultimately. If Transbay isn't accessible because the downtown extension isn't completed yet. The Transbay Power Authority is currently working on it and we're partnering with the TJPA on that. We will stop initially at the 4th and Kings Station but ultimately, operate out of the Transbay Transit Center. The Millbrae STO

TRANSCRIPT

Station connecting San Francisco International Airport, the San Jose Diridon Station, where we'll have as many – in fact, more transit connection – multi-motor connections than even the Transbay Center. Finally, the Gilroy Station where we hope to develop it in partnership with the City of Gilroy. Develop an activity center in and around the station that's developed there and Gilroy could very well become a regional hub in its own right as future rail services are contemplated over the hill to Salinas and Monterey and Hollister. Oops, as I mentioned, we've been wanting to fill in the gaps of how we got here and have put together a short video describing how we arrived at the alternatives and really arrived at blended service in the peninsula corridor and this will give you a little indication of how we did that. [Watched a short video]

Mr. Tripousis: So, that gives a us a little understanding of how we arrived at blended service and all of the work that's gone into the development of the project today. As the video mentioned, our current schedule has us in the yellow-bordered box that you see here. We're in the misted of design and technical analysis into the depths of the detail on environmental review. We're looking at not just the alignment but the station footprint. We'll be doing ongoing outreach over the course of the next year. Our next milestone will be the identification of our preliminary preferred alternative in August of this year. Followed by the release of the draft environmental document by the end of this year. Make the draft available for public of comment by the end of this year and then, work toward completion of our environmental analysis by late summer of 2018. In terms of stakeholder, our reach the – that effort will be ongoing. We have just completed additional open house meetings along the peninsula. We will continue community working groups. We are, as one of the speakers earlier mentioned, having a Local Policy Maker Group meeting tomorrow evening. We alternate those LPMG sessions with the Caltrain Modernization Program so we provide a High Speed Rail update every other month at the LPMG. We work with the City, County and State Staff on a regular meeting in support of the Local Policy Maker Group meeting and then we are in the midst of ongoing Community Working Groups and Technical Working Groups with each of the communities. We take opportunities like this to meet with Cities and City leadership as often as we possibly can and really invite your direction in terms of other, either neighborhood groups or stakeholder groups that we could reach out to and meet with on a consistent basis as we go through this process. To ensure that we're getting as a broad cross section of community comment as we possibly can. Just briefly, in terms of how we narrow the alternatives to blended service. We have looked at quite a wide swath of alternatives over the life of the analysis. Dating all the way back to the program review – environment review that is mentioned in the video. Including alignments like

TRANSCRIPT

the Altamont corridor and impacts associated with Altamont. The Highway 101 and Interstate 2080 corridors as potential alignments for High Speed Rail. As the video pointed out, initially looking at a fully grade separated, four-track system that had High Speed Rail completely separate from the Caltrain commuter system. A new tunnel alignment to connect into downtown San Francisco as a possibility and also, looked at the potential of a mid-peninsula station either in Palo Alto, Mountain View, or Redwood City to respond to the demands of all of the jobs in the mid-peninsula. All of those components of the project have been reviewed to this point and we've ultimately landed on the blended service that we're in the midst of analyzing and partnering with Caltrain to complete their electrification project. The goal here was to maintain the smallest footprint of operation for future High Speed service, minimize the impacts to property owners and the environment. We're currently looking at a combination of alternatives specific to particular elements of the project that I'll touch on in a minute and the initial stations. As I mentioned, operations out of 4th and King in advance of getting to the Transbay Transit Center, the Millbrae STO Station and the Diridon Station. Let's see, ok, I'll get to that in a moment. Our goals here are to – really, the core principle behind blended services is to reduce the overall cost of the investment in increasing capacity of the peninsula corridor, increasing that ridership. As you all know, Caltrain is already oversubscribed and part of the goal of completing electrification is to expand their opportunity to increase capacity. It really is about increasing the capacity in the peninsula corridor. It's not about High Speed Rail or commuter rail, it's about ensuring that we create an opportunity for folks to get off of 101, use rail options as a commute option more effectively and consistently. Obviously, the environmental benefit associated with the clean, green, electric system and looking at ways to improve the safety in the peninsula corridor. As the video identified, the authority has committed \$713 million to the Caltrain electrification project, in addition to \$105 million for the completion of positive train control, which is currently under construction. As well as an additional State investment in – of \$20 million to the electrification program. Briefly, the project alternatives that we're refining through this environment analysis include the location of a light maintenance facility in Brisbane and essentially the Bay Lands properties. Working with the city of Brisbane and the property owners at that location to identify a site that could work for a light maintenance facility for the operation of the high-speed system in the peninsula corridor. We're working with Caltrain and I want to stress that Caltrain, as the owner of the peninsula corridor system is really providing the leadership on the best way to achieve a blended operation. Our operations team are working with Michelle [phonetics][Bushard] and her operations team to ensure that the

TRANSCRIPT

four trains per hour per direction – four high speed trains per hour per direction that go into service once the corridor is fully electrified, works in tandem with the Caltrain commuter system and the expansion of Caltrain commuter electrified service and doesn't negatively impact Caltrain commuter service in any way. It doesn't degrade Caltrain service so we're working very closely together to identify the best solutions as it relates to passing tracks in this case. Really, to all of the improves in the corridor but specifically, as it relates to the day to day operations. Scheduling trains to ensure that we maximize that capacity that I alluded to earlier. We are also looking at two option for the alignments getting into and out of Diridon Station, at the south end of the peninsula corridor. Looking at in the event that we're getting into Diridon Station in an (inaudible) alignment. At Diridon, we're looking at two possible alignments, an aerial and at-grade alignment. We're looking at two viaduct options that look at different alternatives for waste to minimize the impacts of a viaduct alignment by making the alignment shorter. Looking at one alternative that extends from the Santa Clara Station into Diridon and one that extends from I-880 into Diridon. I mentioned safety, one of the primarily elements of the follow-on work that we will be doing with Caltrain in the peninsula corridor is extending their fencing program and minimizing pedestrian access to the corridor. Trying to improve safety by completing the fencing along the corridor, as well as installing four-quadrant gates at all of the crossings. Excuse me. The Federal Railroad Administration doesn't require fully grade separated crossings until trains operate at 125 MPH or better. The trains in the peninsula corridor, both Caltrain commuter and future High Speed trains will be operating at a 110 MPH in the corridor but we want to take steps to try and increase the safety of the corridor to the greatest extent possible. Then work with local communities over time to grade separate all of the crossings. Obviously, we all agree that the best outcome for the entire system is to fully grade separate all forty-two crossings in the peninsula corridor but that is going to be an effort that we take on overtime. Both the cost of that effort and the time that it would take to construct those facilities is significant so by working with the local communities, we can identify what their specific needs are but in the meantime, take steps to improve the safety conditions while we begin operations in the corridor. Some of the common elements of the alternatives that we're looking at include the 4th and Kings Stations, the Millbrae Station, operating at 110 MPH both for Caltrain and High Speed, four Caltrain commuter trains per hour per direction and four – I'm sorry, six Caltrain commuter trains per hour per direction and four High Speed trains per hour per direction. We're looking to modify the hold out rules at the Burlingame's Broadway Station and the Atherton Station. That is where trains are held out in order to accommodate

TRANSCRIPT

passengers accessing trains that are stopped at the station because of the way that the platforms are situated. At those stations, we'll work with those Cities to modify the platforms at those locations and eliminate the hold out rule therefore allowing trains to pass through more effectively.

Chair DuBois: Just a quick question?

Mr. Tripousis: Yes, sir?

Chair DuBois: The Staff report mentioned the Stanford Station. (Inaudible)

Mr. Tripousis: It's right at – it's virtually at the stadium site itself. Just (crosstalk.) Right – yeah, Town and Country. (Crosstalk) Yeah, it's Town and Country so we'd be working – yeah, only on game day. It's only event driven so we'd be working with Stanford to address those issues rather than modify that particular location. Briefly on outreach, as I mentioned, this is an ongoing effort. We'll be continuing outreach and we just completed a series of meetings in San Francisco, Mountain View, and San Mateo. We're in the midst of completing outreach in the San Jose to Merced section but this is virtually a bridge maintenance approach to community outreach. We begin at one end, complete the route and begin again. Again, the point to be made is that we are happy to come speak with and present to have a conversation with any part of the community, any neighborhood, any stakeholder group, that is interested in engaging in a discussion about the project or has concerns or questions about the project. Wherever possible, we are more than happy to do that. You see some of our recent activities that we've engaged in here. Obviously, it includes a broader cross-section of folks as we can get to. The business community, local neighborhoods, local Councils and the like. That's a brief update of where we are. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: Yeah. Actually, (inaudible) the public. I have four speakers. The first speaker is Stephen Rosenblum, followed by Herb Borock.

Stephen Roseblum: Hi, my name is Stephen Roseblum. I live near the California Avenue Caltrain Station and I've been speaking before the Rail Committee and the City Council for many years about the High Speed Rail Project probably as long as the project has been active. I keep making the point and everybody realizes that whatever is done with High Speed Rail will affect the environment of Palo Alto for a century at least. It will be here for a

TRANSCRIPT

long time and ever since its founding as a City, Palo Alto has been divided by train tracks and I think it has been a situation which was livable during the time it was a farming community but now that it's densely settled and high urbanized, I think don't think it's any longer an acceptable situation to have grade level crossings. Especially, when we're talking about ten Caltrain in each direction. That's twenty total trains and four High Speed Rail trains in each direction, making twenty-eight trains per hour. That's almost 2-minutes per train. I don't see how we're going to have any gate up time at all at the four crossings. I mean, you can engineer all you want but with trains going 110 MPH, there's no way they're going to allow any car or truck to be on the track and hit by a train going at that speed and certainly, there's no way it's going to stop. I don't know think that there's any way that we can (inaudible) having a quad. crossings or any kind of other grade level crossing in Palo Alto. Not only for safety reasons but also for communication between both sides of the City. People won't even be able to walk across or bicycle across the track in a situation like that. I think Palo Alto is providing a great benefit to the people of the State by having High Speed Rail go through our community. I think the people of the State should be willing to spend the money to make sure that they mitigate these environmental impacts on our environment. The Council has spent its own money – the City's own money to study grade level crossings and in spite of the fact that I've been to many of these meetings that Mr. Tripousis has talked about, I see no evidence that Caltrain has paid – I mean that High Speed Rail has paid any attention to strong requests from the communities to grade separate. They argue that it's too expensive. Well, if it's too expensive, then they need to get more money and I urge the Council and the Rail Committee to see that these ideas are pressed forward. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Herb Borock, followed by Richard Brand.

Herb Borock: I want to talk about grade separations and passing tracks within the context of the environmental review. The presentation referred to a preferred alternative but whatever alternative that's preferred in the environmental impact statement and report will have analyzed with the range of feasible alternatives. That will include the various passing track options that have been discussed by the High Speed Rail. The fact that a three-track passing track through Palo Alto is not the preferred alternative in the project description, it does not mean that it's been ruled out. At the Local Policy Makers Group meeting in – 2-months ago that Council Member Tanaka attended, he asked how to get Caltrain and High Speed Rail undergrounded and the response was that the federal standard that is followed by High Speed Rail is that the least environmentally damaging

TRANSCRIPT

practicable alternative and that undergrounding for High Speed Rails perspective does not result in that. Either underground tracks or an underground Diridon Station so that talking about putting anything underground means everything underground, including freight. From High Speed Rails perspective, you're not going to get the tracks underground. In terms of the grade from their point of view, except going to Transbay Terminal, which is underground so it has to go underground there or not wanting to have to change all the trackage and bus routes near Diridon Station where they're going to have a viaduct. Everything is going to be at grade for tracks. Now the way to get a project sponsored, whether it's Caltrain or High Speed Rail, to address the funding for grade separations, is through the environmental review process. I didn't think that we did that with Caltrain and I think that was a mistake and that's our only choice here with High Speed Rail. I agree with Mr. Roseblum, the previous speaker, that it's not our responsibility to pay for the grade separations. It's the project sponsors which is – in High Speed Rail case, it's the State. From that point of view, we already know that this idea that we should be having all these meetings about how we're going to fund grade separations as if it's a given that it's our responsibility to do it, I think is a mistake. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Richard Brand, followed by Nadia Naik.

Richard Brand: Yes, good morning again, Richard Brand. I appreciate this presentation from Mr. Tripousis. Interesting, a lot of this discussion and the need for funding, as Herb kind of addressed, would not at all be necessary if the alternative route, which was mentioned in the presentation through the Altamont Pass, was chosen. That route would take High Speed Rail up to the central valley, over the Altamont Pass, which is Ace Trains/AM Track/UP. It's an existing, very class one rail line going between San Jose and ultimately, Merced now. If that route had been chosen, we wouldn't have this problem at all because the interface to San Francisco would occur in Redwood City. Connection coming from Fremont to – over the Bay on the old Dumbarton right-of-way into Redwood City and then up to San Francisco. The 'Y' would occur at Fremont, where the trains would then have gone down the existing AM Track/Ace/UP right of way into San Jose. This would have been much less expensive than building a very expensive tunnel through the Pacheco Pass. Unfortunately, the people – our friends down in San Jose, for which the rail station is named down there, elected to have this as their option to do directly and so we're struggling with this. I just want to – this is—you know, that trains left the station literally. We – this decision has been made but I do agree that we shouldn't be fighting for funding for a decision that was made by another body to take the more expensive route, include

TRANSCRIPT

Pacheco Pass tunnel and the grade crossings that we're struggling with today. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. It's Nadia Naik, followed by Adina Levin.

Nadia Naik: Good morning. Good morning, Ben. How are you? I was hoping that through the Chair, we could get some questions answered by Ben today because he would have more detail. Despite the fact – as Herb Borock said, they're not looking at the midline, long passing tracks as one of the preferred alternatives. We have not yet seen any detailed maps that showed exactly how far into Palo Alto that line would go. I have zoomed and zoomed and zoomed into the best of my maxability and I can get – it looks like it passes Cal. Ave but obviously, we, as a City, should request to get a lot more details on that. I also wanted to know from Ben, why the joint working group that's looking at Caltrain operations, the joint study that they are doing. Why are they not considering more than six trains an hour for Caltrain? Caltrain is already a five and when they electrify they will get six but we expect that to be at pretty full capacity really quickly. None of the scenarios in the SMA joint report that they've put out, which is the Swiss company that the High Speed Rail has hired, has looked at a scenario with more than six Caltrain trains in the future. As – if I put on my Friends of Caltrain hat, that doesn't seem correct. I mean, we need to have a robust future Caltrain and it makes sense for us not to cap that. Lastly, I would just point out to the Committee that Ben reported that the FRA need to fully grade separate a corridor at 125 MPH but you should also know, in the United States, there is no place where we operate twenty trains an hour. Even at 110 MPH, that is not grade separated so there are other places where the Acela is that the trains go by at less than 125 and don't need to be grade separated but there is twenty an hour in a densely-populated community. There is potential that either CPUC or the FRA will have decided that that's actually not going to be appropriate in the future and we should keep our eye on that. Specifically, through the Chair, if we could ask for Ben to give us a detail on how far down that midline passing track goes into Palo Alto and also, when is the 2018 business plan due? Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Great. Adina Levin, followed by Tony Carrasco.

Adina Levin: Good morning Ben Tripousis and Committee. Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain. The item relating to the blended system that I'd like to draw attention to is the discussion of the passing tracks and how that would work with regard to the blended service. It was great to hear Mr. Tripousis

TRANSCRIPT

to say that they are working closely with Caltrain to avoid negative impacts to Caltrain service. I have up on my computer the slides that are going to be presented tomorrow night in Sant Carlos and there's a slide that says there's a preferred alternative that is no passing tracks, which would require Caltrain to periodically wait for High Speed Rail to pass at existing four track sections. The slide is saying Caltrain will be sitting and waiting for the fast trains to pass and a detailed slide explaining that -- at least the last version that I saw in January, said that the Caltrain trains would be delayed by an average of, I think it was 6-7-minutes and if that's the case, we would be losing with the blended system the speed that we're picking up with electrification. Here's a project that our region and State and the feds. if they will, will be spending \$2 billion dollars on and then losing a significant component of the benefit of that project. That would not be good so I would really urge this body's attention to urge for more detail being made available by High Speed Rail and Caltrain to enable clear discussion of the different choices and tradeoffs of passing tracks. Including how to make sure that we get better at local service and not worse local service when the High Speed Rail is implemented. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Our last speaker is Tony Carrasco.

Tony Carrasco: Tony Carrasco, (inaudible)5 El Camino, Palo Alto. My issues are that I've lived here in Palo Alto for 40-years. The train tracks here permeable at that time. You could walk across them and the two sides were connected. As we move forward into more service, which we desperately need. This permeability has decreased significantly and steadily over the last 40-years. I urge you to look at grade separations and make it convenient for the pedestrians. That is our biggest open space is the sidewalks. Make them comfortable, make it interesting for people to walk across this barrier that's happening now. I think this project will last 100-years. I think we have to do it right now. There's no point doing it wrong without grade separations and then saying some day later, we'll fix it. That has not been Palo Alto's character. Not in my 40-years of looking at development review in this community so please take the time and connect it for seniors and for younger people. Connect the two sides of our community well so that it's interesting and good. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Alright, come back to the Committee. Anybody have questions or comments?

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: Alright, why not. If we don't get Caltrain electrification and if the feds. don't fund it, how does that effect High Speed Rail plans?

Mr. Tripousis: Excuse me. Obviously, electrification is the lynchpin of extending High Speed service from San Jose Diridon to the Transbay Transit Center. That's something that all of the funding partners, the Authority, all of the Countries, MTC, are in engaged in and committed too. That hasn't and won't weigh in and so our expectations are that in the event that federal funds aren't forthcoming, we're going to work together to identify another strategy to fully fund electrification and allow it to move forward.

Mayor Scharff: I understand, at least from, I guess from Caltrain that if they don't get the money by – what is it? June 31st...

Mr. Tripousis: June 30th, yeah.

Mayor Scharff: ...the whole things fall apart.

Mr. Tripousis: The current design built contracts and I would defer to Caltrain on the exact detail of this but the current design-build contracts would not be extended after June 30th. The goal is to identify the funding prior to that so we can move forward with the current design builder. That doesn't mean that a follow-on bidding process can't be put together in shorter – in the event that we have to extend the time but our – all of the partner's goals is to identify the funding sources and the State and Secretary Kelly's office is very engaged in that conversation to try and address the issue before that deadline lapses.

Mayor Scharff: So, do you have any more information about where we are with the feds or where the process is?

Mr. Tripousis: We – Director [Heartnet] has a weekly update call with the partners. They are advocating very vigorously with our federal partners. Certainly, support from people like Senator Orrin Hatch, who will house the facility in Utah. To construct the trains and is very committed to moving the project forward but there's no new information about where the funds will show themselves on the upcoming budget. We're looking at – really in the next couple of weeks by the time the May revise comes out. The hope is the full funding grant agreement will be part of the final budget to be voted on by the Congress.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: If everything goes according to the schedule that you laid out there. What actually – what kind of construction would actually happen on the San Jose to – well, why don't we just say, what happens through Palo Alto in terms of what construction looks like and when does it start? What does construction mean since we already have trains?

Mr. Tripousis: In terms of follow-on construction for High Speed, we're -- part of the work that we're doing with Caltrain now is to identify those locations where there would require some track modifications to increase speeds and where there are turns that don't accommodate higher speeds. Passing tracks, once those specific locations are identified in terms of grade separations, the Authority has committed, as most of you know, funds to the City of San Mateo for the grade separations of 25th, 28th, 31st Avenues. We're partnering with the County of San Mateo and the City on those grade separations so that grade separation, for example, would be underway. In terms of specific to Palo Alto, it would really depend on where we land in terms of passing tracks and how far those passing tracks extend down the peninsula.

Mayor Scharff: I never see pictures with Palo Alto on those passing tracks when I see this stuff but yet, everyone sort of indicates we may still put it in Palo Alto?

Mr. Tripousis: We're happy to provide more details as Ms. Naik suggested about the extent of the passing tracks. The three alternatives that we're looking at are what – are generally identified as the short middle four, the long middle three, and the long middle four. Palo Alto is certainly a part of the long middle three and the long middle four. The challenge with passing tracks which is why working with Caltrain's operations team along with our network rail operations team to land on a scenario that potentially minimizes the need for passing tracks. So, it accommodates blended service in the same that it's done most predominantly in Europe. Where the operations of the trains are the way that you mitigate impacts or delays on the system. Not by providing additional infrastructure. The reason we are looking at that as an option is because there are significant tradeoffs to infrastructure in the corridor. The goal of the blended system is, as you well know Mr. Mayor, has been to minimize the impacts from a construction standpoint to the peninsula communities. The tradeoffs here are regardless of where the passing tracks are identified and however long they are, there will be impacts associated with the development of those passing tracks. Our goals are to try and minimize that and if we can do it operationally and still

TRANSCRIPT

maintain the integrity of both the commuter system and the High Speed system, that's our goal.

Mayor Scharff: When do you expect that final decision to be made?

Mr. Tripousis: Well, our preliminary – as I mentioned, the preliminary preferred will be in August so our target is August at the moment.

Mayor Scharff: This August?

Mr. Tripousis: Yes, sir.

Mayor Scharff: Ok and then when again, would you expect construction for the High Speed Rail (inaudible) to then occur? (Inaudible)

Mr. Tripousis: If we are able to maintain our schedule and complete the environmental review by late next summer. My expectation would be that early to mid-2019, construction would begin.

Mayor Scharff: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Tripousis: Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, Adrian?

Council Member Fine: Just one quick question for our Staff. As we do go forward with our CSS process on grade separations here in Palo Alto, are we considering the different passing track alternatives or have we – kind of stuck with one?

Mr. Mello: We would have to consider whatever is still under consideration by the Authority and by Caltrain.

Council Member Fine: So, we're not going to get any certainty on that until August then? Ok.

Chair DuBois: I wondered if you could give us a little update on what's happening in southern California.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Tripousis: Well, as you may know, along with the investments in completing the environmental review here and the construction in central valley, the Authority has committed over \$4 billion in investments to improvements along the Metrolink corridor, where we will also be running a blended system in southern California. The Rosecrans/Marquardt grade separation project, which is a large at-grade crossing currently and a significant safety issue. The Authority has committed funds to that grade separation project, which is currently moving toward construction. There are other similar improvements that are being made there. We're also looking at investments in modifying LA Union Station so there are investments in advance of the actual construction of the system that is currently being completed. The goal is – our – my southern California counterpart, Michelle [Bame], the original director for south California is in the midst of completing the environmental review for the Palmdale to Burbank, Burbank to LA Union Station in Anaheim -- Los Angeles to Anaheim project section. She's on a very similar timetable to what we are on in terms of trying to complete the environmental review for those sections in their entirety by the end of next year. Once that's completed, the entire Phase 1 project from San Francisco to LA Union Station and Anaheim will be shelf ready so as funds make themselves available, whether they are Cap and Trade or 3P funds and investment or Bond funds, as they are made available we can move forward with construction once those are shelf ready.

Chair DuBois: So, for the quad gates crossing I guess, how much are you expecting to fund per crossing?

Mr. Tripousis: I don't have an actual dollar amount but we expect to fund quad gates, period. We're not looking for any local investment on the development of the four-quad gates.

Chair DuBois: So, like a quarter of – like \$100,000 a crossing?

Mr. Tripousis: Probably closer to \$250,000, just the back of a napkin but I'm happy to get a more detailed answer for you on that.

Chair DuBois: Is it the same solution, quad gates, regardless if there's passing tracks there or not?

Mr. Tripousis: The short answer is yes and we'll have to work with the local community and in this case, the California Public Utilities Commission to

TRANSCRIPT

ensure that even the addition of four-quad gates, given the expanse of a crossing with four tracks, meets their safety standards.

Chair DuBois: So, there's no standard today that says if you have four tracks, it has to be grade separated?

Mr. Tripousis: Well, the – there is some debate about whether or not the PUC has a directive or guidelines that require that. Our expectation is that we'd be able to address the safety concerns with four-quadrant gates. Again, the safest alternative is a fully grade-separated alternative and part of our analysis will determine the impacts of whether they're grade separated or not. The impacts at those crossing – one of the speakers talked about the gate downtime impacts. Those are significant impacts or significant potential impacts at grade crossing from a transportation standpoint. If there are well beyond significant impacts at those crossings, we need to mitigate those. In some cases, those mitigations may be – may require a grade separation so we have to work with the local community to consider that.

Chair DuBois: Ok. So, you said about \$4 billion improvements in southern California. I think it's like \$2.9 in northern California. Is High Speed Rail operating under an assumption that is kind of cost per mile in northern California versus southern California? Do you know what that number would be?

Mr. Tripousis: In terms of what the level of investment cost per mile is? I don't have that off the top of my head but I am happy to get that for you Council Member.

Chair DuBois: It'd be interesting to see.

Mr. Tripousis: Certainly. Really, investment per mile as opposed to cost per mile.

Chair DuBois: Yeah. I mean, you showed us kind of what's going on in the valley. Building a lot of grade crossings – sounds like they are building grade crossings in southern California. Currently, we need a grade crossing so you know, I guess it will come out as part of the EIR but I think some kind of matching funds at a minimum are – our County tax funds are not going to be sufficient (inaudible).

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Tripousis: Well, again, the San Mateo project is a good example. We partnered with San Mateo because both the County and the City are investing their own funds in those grade crossings projects. It makes it more feasible to fund those in partnership. They – as it was pointed out, the costs of fully grade separating 42 crossings in the peninsula corridor are significant. Where ever we can partner to deliver those improvements then it makes those improvements more feasible.

Chair DuBois: So, back to the passing tracks. The option with no passing tracks – I mean, does that still enables High Speed Rail to meet its time commitment?

Mr. Tripousis: That's our expectation and that's part of the equation. That really – that's a core principle of our operation. The travel time has to be met, the impacts have to be minimized, the effects of no passing tracks are an operation that includes no passing tracks, can't as I said to degrade the proposed commuter system. All of those taken together have to provide the outcome that we are looking for.

Chair DuBois: I mean, as one of the speakers said though, could it degrade the Caltrain efficiency?

Mr. Tripousis: That's what's we have to avoid. It's not a choice, it won't be a matter of well, ok, people are just going to have to wait for another 6-minutes. That's what we're trying operationally to avoid and ensure that Caltrain improves its system, improves its operation and we can operate blended service in a no passing track configuration.

Chair DuBois: So, that means basically, that trains – all trains are running on time...

Mr. Tripousis: Yes.

Chair DuBois: ...when those passing situations occur.

Mr. Tripousis: Yeah, the goal as I said at the outset is to increase capacity, not minimize it.

Chair DuBois: Ok. I guess there was also the question about are we basically capping Caltrain at six trains per hour into the future?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Tripousis: Well, that's part of the operations discussion that we're having with Caltrain. Certainly Caltrain, as a practical matter, offered capacity that would have been theirs on their system. The four slots that have gone to High Speed Rail certainly we four slots that could be utilized by the commuter system if High Speed Rail wasn't operating and there is a limit to the number of trains that we can operate in the corridor. We still think that there is some flexibility in terms of the system's ability to absorb more trains.

Chair DuBois: Ok and when is the business plan due?

Mr. Tripousis: I don't have an exact date for the 2018 plan but I would expect it would be roughly this time next year.

Chair DuBois: Ok. Great, thank you for coming to present. Does anybody else have any questions or comments?

Mr. Tripousis: Thank you for having me here. Appreciate it.

Chair DuBois: Thanks.

NO ACTION TAKEN

4. Receive Presentation and Discuss the Planning Efforts for Community Workshop Number 1 Scheduled for May 20 at Mitchell Park Community Center

Chair DuBois: Alright, moving on to Item Number Four, which is an update on the upcoming workshop.

Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Alright, thank you chair and Members of the Committee. I'm Josh Mello the City's Chief Transportation Official. We've been completing a lot of work since the last Rail Committee meeting on preparing for the May 20th community workshop Number 1. I wanted to give you an update on our planning efforts and also get some feedback from you on the structure of the workshop, potential options for outreach for the community and some other items as well. If you remember at the last Rail Committee meeting, you authorized us to move forward with stage one of the Context Sensitive Solutions alternative analysis and our main goal in stage one is to convene a public workshop, which has been

TRANSCRIPT

scheduled on May 20th at the Mitchell Park Community Center. The goal of that workshop – I'll get a little bit more in detail as we go through, is to bring everyone in the community together and provide a little bit of background information on the rail corridor in Palo Alto, existing conditions, some future constraints that we've identified and then also, begin to discuss the problems around the current railroad corridor. Then start to talk about some evaluation criteria that we could use to determine success in the future with our rail program. As I mentioned, the workshop is current scheduled for a Saturday, May 20th. It would begin at 10 AM and we would have a working lunch so it would be a catered event. Then we would reconvene after lunch and do some work around the performance measures and problem definition and break at about 2 PM. It will be at the Mitchell Park Community Center, Palo Alto Room. That room holds up to, I think 200? Yeah, 200 people. We're expecting about 100 but we can accommodate 200 in that room. Again, the purpose would be to have some presentations in the morning to begin the conversation around what has occurred prior – what work has occurred previous to this. Also, some of the operational constraints along the corridor and then we would have a working lunch followed by some interactive sessions in the afternoon. This will be the community's introduction to the rail program. It's really intended to be a soft introduction, where we can help feel out the tone of the community and help craft the next stage of the public engagement process. What we currently have on the agenda and we're open to any comments that you may have on this. Scott from CirclePoint would give an introduction and then an agenda overview. Then we would like the Mayor and Chair DuBois to provide a brief overview of the rail program and explain why we're there. Then we would move into a project background section and I would like to lead a visual survey of the existing grade crossings and the areas where we have new grade crossings that are on the books and show some photos. Talk about some of the circulation issues and then we could also present some of the traffic and circulation data that we have developed as part of that circulation analysis using our travel demand models. We would talk about existing conditions and then we would talk about if we don't do anything, what does it look like 10-years down the line? 20-years down the line? That brief overview and intro by the Mayor and the Chair would be followed by a working lunch. Our goal would be to mix people up during lunch and get them to talk to some folks that they may not normally talk to and continue the conversation over lunch. Then in the afternoon, Scott and facilitators from the project team, City Staff, as well as the consultant team would lead breakout sessions at tables where we would identify the – some of the problems that people experience in the – along the rail corridor and try to get to the heart of the matter of what is the problem that we're actually trying to solve. That's very

TRANSCRIPT

important first step in the CSS process and then we would talk about how do we define success? So, these are the problems and at what level do we want to solve those problems and which problems have priority over others? Then we would have a report back at 1:30 and a Q&A and we've actually reserved the room until 3 PM, I believe? So, we don't expect to cut people off. We would allow the conversation to continue until it ended organically and we have the room until 3 o'clock. We don't want to artificially constrain the conversation. I think people are going to have a lot to say on that day. We've developed a brand. This is an image of the post CAARD that we've developed and again, we're open to your comments. We're calling it the Connecting Palo Alto. That would be the brand for the whole rail program. Again, we don't want to have any pre-conserved notions about what the solutions are or what the problem is so this is a very general brand that gets to the heart of the issue, we think, which is reconnecting the City across the rail corridor. The first – the front page of the brochure has some photos of our existing stations and grade crossings, a map of the corridor with the existing conditions and then a half mile buffer along the corridor. We would actually – we're recommending mailing this to all addresses within a half mile buffer of the corridor and that's actually about 18,000 addresses and the cost for that mailing would be about \$13,000.00. We are open to reducing that number or expanding it if you think that we should expand the buffer or reduce the buffer. The back is an invitation for them to participate in not only the meeting on May 20th but also the entire connecting Palo Alto process. We've created a web link, CityofPaloAlto.org/connectingPaloAlto and that's the place where we would enable people to sign up for the email list. We would also have updated information, interactive surveys, that would be the one stop shop for anybody who would want to get involved in the Connecting Palo Alto campaign. We're planning to do an email blast. We have several email lists that we maintain in the transportation division related to bike projects, parking, all things transportation. We would use that as well as an email list that the City Manager's Office maintains for neighborhood organizations and advocates. That website is incorrect. I apologize, it's cityofpaloalto.org/connectingpaloalto. Rail was already taken by our rail safety initiative. We'll do immediate advisory, we're already reaching out to Palo Alto Daily News, Palo Alto online and the Daily Post. We're hoping that they will run some articles in advance of May 20th. We'll also be doing regular posts on neighbors, to invite people out to the May 20th event and a big push on social media as well. Then, I have also invited –I've reached out to Midpen Media Center and we're going to ask them to record the event and we've recently uploaded a bunch of files and videos from some previous rail events that happened a couple of years ago. We'll be uploading those to the Connecting Palo Alto website as well. We're going

TRANSCRIPT

to some interactive surveying at the workshop so there's a tool called [Swifty] – [Sifty], excuse me. Meeting Sift, which enables people to use their smartphones to actually answer survey questions in real time at the meeting and then it shows the results up on the screen. It's a good icebreaker and it's a good way to keep people engaged throughout the process so we'll be asking some key questions at the workshop about where people live, what are their top concerns? We're going to use the workshop as a way to gauge the public's opinion on how we can keep them involved throughout the process. So, we don't want the workshop to just end and people to walk away and not know the next steps and not have any follow-up. We're actually going to be asking some pretty delving questions about how do we keep you engaged? What's the best way for you to receive information? Would you be interested in participating in a standing group that could meet and we will also be able to identify people who could potentially be on some type of Citizen Advisory Committee if we elect to move forward with that? We're also going to be doing informational interviews so Gary Toth recommended that we have an open house type format at City Hall with City Staff. Where individuals who can't make the May 20th meeting, can come in a visit with us. I've set aside two days on my calendar – entire days between now and May 20th where we're going to invite members of the community in. We're going to have two rooms and be able to interview two individuals at once and we have a series of questions that were developed by Gary that help us gauge their view of the existing problems. It touches on some of the constraints that we may have moving forward and also, solicits their feedback on what our future stages should look like as far as community engagement. This is a very – this is a draft list of stakeholders that we would invite in for interviews. After this meeting, feel free to email any individuals you think we should invite for interviews. This is not meant to be an all-encompassing list. We're certainly open to inviting another individual in. Post workshop we'll be compiling data, the surveys, the interviews, the interactive sessions. We're going to prepare a workshop summary, which we will come back to the Rail Committee before doing any more additional work and we will present that summary to the Rail Committee. We're going to take a little bit of a hiatus on public engagement over the summer while people travel on vacation but we will be doing a lot of technical work. Over the summer, we will be visiting you, strategizing on how we move forward into stage two. I think we will have to have a pretty robust discussion about what the community engagement process looks like moving forward, based on what we learned on May 20th. Then our goal is to have a second community workshop in September and before then, we may decide that we want to convene the TAC and/or a Citizens Advisory Committee as well. With that, I conclude my presentation

TRANSCRIPT

and we're open to any questions or comments that you may have regarding the May 20th workshop.

Chair DuBois: Thanks, Josh. Let's go to members of the public. I only have one speaker – two. If you want to speak, please get your CAARDs in. The first speaker is Adina Levin, followed by Nadia Naik.

Adina Levin: Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain. A couple of things, one is that I'm glad to see people being asked questions about what the goals and the problems that they want to solve, which is really a prerequisite to coming up with a solution so it's good to frame things in that way. One additional thought about the community outreach and the noticing people who live in proximity to the crossings is important. These are also paths that are traversed by a very, very wide variety of people in the community who are coming from a little bit further away so I would strongly have recommended reaching out through the school communities. Where there's a lot of interest in school kids being able to get safely across the tracks and also, through the business community and TMA and Stanford for people who live and work in the area. Also, use Caltrain, who can look at the needs from that perspective. Who might be coming and going from a little bit further away but this is a key piece to their path as well. One thing that I am not seeing is questions about land use and the area around the crossings and through the corridor. Maybe that would wind up coming up later in the process but one of the topics that logically comes up around grade separations is also land use in that area and that might be something to start asking a question about also in terms of people's vision. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Nadia Naik?

Nadia Naik: Hi, Nadia Naik with CAARD. After attending the VTA meeting and the listening to Ben Tripousis's timeline and then thinking about the fact that High Speed Rail is now saying that we may not know about the details about passing tracks until August. I feel like we have a very jammed timeline for what's really a very complicated process. I've been doing this for 8-years now and I would say that even if you put those of us who've been following this for a long time all in the same room, we probably couldn't agree on a single solution or even a definition of the problem. I'm wondering if we could tweak this meeting to be more about sort of a status update for the community of here's where we are, here's what we're hearing, here are the things that we are wrestling with, how do we engage you the community, how do we go through what's going on and it gives us time to really prepare

TRANSCRIPT

some really good materials and maps and what have you, that will have a lot more of the data that people are going to be expecting. What I'm really worried about is that you're going to be doing all these great pre-community meeting interviews, which will most likely tickle probably the thirty most active people in our community. Then you're going to put them in a meeting where the first 2-hours you're going to talk at them in kind of big generalities and then you're going to throw some more technical stuff at them and give them 45-minute breakout sessions and say great, what do you think? I just – that seems like a lot and I'm worried that there – that it will actually to the opposite of making them feel engaged. It's going to make them feel actually more rushed and so it may be better to sort of do some hand holding and explain to people that this is what we're struggling with. These are the processes that we're working. Get kind of – you can have a lot of early surveying but maybe not necessarily have this goal of having a project definition because I don't know that you'll be ready by then. Really, you'll have a lot more data by August or September, whenever the next meeting would be. To be able to come back to the community and it allows us as a City to work with the other data that Hatch Mott is developing in terms of the traffic study and the circulation study. It allows us to get maybe some preliminary numbers on what are all the different alternatives that the community members are likely to ask about and what those would mean. I think we need to be really careful as well about any graphics that we show. For example, the old Hatch Mott study had literally, specific homes that would be taken out and specific roads that would be closed. I would be super hesitant to put anything like that up at a meeting when you haven't really had a good community conversation yet. I guess what I am encouraging is given that we've got wiggle room now on VTA and they won't decide until June. Given that the High Speed Rail already just said that they will know by August what's happening with those passing tracks, which by the way, on every map I've seen go south of Churchill. That's a 67-foot right of way, just for the record. Then looking at the fact that we will have a lot more data by September, it just feels like that might make more sense. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Our last speaker is Richard Brand.

Richard Brand: Yes, Richard Brand again. It looks like the usual suspects here today in what we're talking about. I second what Ms. Naik said about information for people. They are going to come to this meeting and want to know about things that I just learned about in this meeting this morning about this passing track and coming down four tracks into our City, which I was not aware of that situation. I think that's an important thing for this workshop to have that information as much as we can. I know we're kind of

TRANSCRIPT

the tail waiting for the dog to tell us when to the passing – architecture is going to be completed. One of the other things I'd say though, Josh, you ought to work with TMA on this. We've got this group, the TMA, that we've established and we're funding them and I think that would be – that's part of their domain. To work on this and have them involved as well so thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thanks. Ok, so back to the Committee. Questions or comments? Eric, I haven't heard from you much.

Council Member Filseth: Just really quick, I would assume that the nature of this would get us sort of a lot of discussion and questions about other kinds of rail issues than grade separation. You know, quiet zones and Project Safety Net and stuff like that. Is that explicitly part of the agenda or are you trying to keep it focused on grade separation?

Mr. Mello: So, we're not focusing on any solution at the meeting on May 20th. We're just talking about existing conditions and future conditions. Starting to talk about the problem from the community's perspective or problems and then we're going to talk a little bit about how we would define success as related to those problems. We would certainly entertain any question the community has about other treatments besides grade separation and we'll be prepared to answer and discuss any of those during the Q&A session.

Council Member Filseth: I mean, just an observation but you know, a lot of what we're focused on in this room is coming up with a solution to a problem that doesn't completely exist yet, ok? Which is twenty trains an hour and so forth, right? It may not – that particular problem may not be terribly tangible to a cross section of the community that you invite to this. That's all.

James Keene, City Manager: Can I just add something to Josh's comments? We're going to issue an invitation to the community and people are going to show up for all different kinds of reason who are at different levels of knowledge or expertise. To have a meaningful engagement process, I think we have to meet people where they are and listen to any kind of issue or comment that they raise so I do think if PSN comes up or Track Watch or quad gates or noise, I don't think we can be dismissive of that. I think we need to collect that. I think that all sort of informs the impact that exists in some of the railways, in the City that effects people. We have to both be -- try to come back to some of the even bigger things we ultimately have got

TRANSCRIPT

to meet. I do think – I think we don't want to turn anybody off who shows up right now.

Council Member Filseth: I think that's sort of part of the distilled here, which is if people come and ask about this and this kind of stuff. We need to be prepared to do something, right? Ok. Even if it's not the sort of related to what we're talking about here.

Chair DuBois: Adrian?

Council Member Fine: Thank you. So just a few comments and some questions. I do want to second, I think Mr. Brand who brought up the TMA being involved. I think that would be a helpful stakeholder. I'm a little interested about the fact that we'll be hosting multiple community workshops and this is a big problem. You're going to be getting a different set of people showing up to each one. What's the core constituent we want and whether the stakeholder group should be involved in these meetings, perhaps? Even though I know they are not set up yet. We don't really have that group together and this Committee may want to look at what that group is and how it's composed. So, there's something there about steadiness among participants. I also actually want to concur with Adina Levin when she mentioned these questions about land use. Eric brought up track safety and safety watch. Those are going to be questions that these community groups will have and will occur here even if it's not our main focus at these things. I think it would be helpful to kind of bring up some of those ancillary (inaudible). Whether it's land use, whether it's park space, whether it's track safety, just so that the table is set for folks. I think that's it for now but just those two comments.

Mr. Mello: Just one quick response. We've thought a lot about how do we maintain continuity. Do we – there was a great idea that actually Ed had thrown out there which is that people could earn badges for each workshop they come to, which I think is a great idea. We're thinking very hard about how to keep people involved and you know, the last part of the workshop on May 20th, as well as a big part of the interviews we're going to be doing. Is how do you think we can do that effectively and is it convening a stakeholder group or is it doing some type of interactive thing where we award people who stay engaged. I think our goal is to try and get people who aren't typically engaged in these so we can hear a wide variety of opinions and diverging interests.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Fine: I think that's important but we should also acknowledge that there are going to be the usual suspects. Some of the folks in this room are probably going to be there and that's a benefit to us too. There might be something helpful in terms of getting some agreement from those folks as well, that they can continue on this process. Badges, nice idea.

Chair DuBois: Greg?

Mayor Scharff: I'm good.

Chair DuBois: A few comments. I like the idea of badges or achievements, gaming jargon.

Mr. Keene: We could on a video game. (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: Unlock Palo Alto. Hats – rail hats. I know you've got to marketing plan here. It's less than a month away so I'm a little concerned about getting the word out. I think, just looking at the mailing here. I know it's probably a draft but it's pretty dense. I think we really need a clear call to action and this your participation is vital, it's kind of buried at the bottom. It's kind of – I would highlight that and pull it up. The other thing looking at this is the front of it connecting Palo Alto, I'm not sure that's -- what that means is clear and I would maybe be very explicit that it's about grade crossing improvements. Alright, so I agree that we should be open and a lot of people are going to ask questions about all these things but the text here is really – your kind of framing it around the VTA tax and the need to improve grade crossings. I would just make sure that that's really clear. Somebody just looking at a postCAARD in a stack of mail. I'm a little bit concerned too about the schedule. It's kind of a slow start. I think if we can start maybe promptly at 10, we'd get a little bit more time. I hope in the 10:30 kind of background that we'll – you'll include all the crossings, including Oregon Expressway, Embarcadero, University, to help frame the question again about east/west connections. I saw in the Staff report that there's some discussion about possibly an information station and having people indicate priorities. I'm wondering if we could still do that. Just have that out from maybe lunch time till 3 o'clock and maybe from 2 o'clock to 3 o'clock, we could squeeze that in. I think it might be useful to get – I think the instant survey stuff is cool and maybe that's another way to do it but some people may be more comfortable with more physical kind of information stations. I was going to call outreach to the school newsletters

TRANSCRIPT

as well and I hope that's part of the marketing plan. I think there's time to get them in all the PTA newsletters. I don't know what – I see Claudia in the audience here. I don't know how we'd reach out to Stanford community but including them on the list. I don't know if it's part of the plan but I think it would be good if we collected emails when people showed up and created another mailing list. I am glad to hear – I mean, we discussed last time that the workshop could be used maybe to identify community members who would be interested in ongoing engagement so I was glad to hear you say that that's going to be a possible focus. I think we should actually maybe explicitly ask people during the workshop on who would be interested in committing to ongoing participation. I am also glad to hear that you're going to be involved in those interviews and I guess would -- one questions I had is when in the circulation study supposed to be completed? Is that during the summer?

Mr. Mello: I have a couple comments related to (inaudible) earlier but I'll answer that question first. We've already moved forward with existing conditions analysis using our travel demand model. It's really up to the Committee as to how far we move forward on that. We know we had some fits and starts early on but...

Chair DuBois: (Inaudible)

Mr. Mello: ...we're ready to go forward. The goal of that was to actually be a parallel process to the Context Sensitive Solution alternative. It's actually a separate task so I think we'd move forward with that over the summer and start to get some data on different scenarios but we'd want to come back to you with what scenarios we analyzed.

Chair DuBois: I thought the – just a basic circulation study was moving forward. Is that on hold?

Mr. Mello: We did the existing conditions, which is just as is. What's going to happen – what's happening now.

Chair DuBois: Is that going to be published?

Mr. Mello: We can provide that at the next Rail Committee meeting if you're interested. We also plan to analysis up to six scenarios and if you remember, those would be where we look at grade separating, one intersection,

TRANSCRIPT

removing one, all types of hypothetical scenarios but you know, our thought now is that those scenarios would need to be informed by the public process.

Chair DuBois: I think that's good but to Council Member Filseth's point is the existing conditions consider the twenty trains an hour?

Mr. Mello: We can bring that at the next Rail Committee meeting. We can add that to the agenda, a presentation on existing conditions.

Chair DuBois: But does that include...

Mr. Mello: Does that make sense?

Chair DuBois: ...the planned twenty trains...

Mr. Mello: Yes, it includes the increase in frequency.

Chair DuBois: I think that would be really useful and also maybe help frame the coming problem at the workshop. If people really aren't tuned into that. Then you said you had some other comments.

Mr. Mello: First you asked about which grade crossing we would cover in the presentation. My intention is to cover all of the existing and proposed grade crossings. We would address Oregon, show images of Oregon and Embarcadero, Churchill, all of the existing. We would also talk about the proposed bike head crossing near Loma Verde. There's also a proposed bike/ped. crossing at Everett that is on the books so we would talk about anything that's been planned previously, existing or future. Then the information station, we're planning to have information stations located about the Palo Alto room at the Mitchell Park Community Center before the meeting and then during the meeting. These would include some interactive stations. We would also have information on the grade crossing work that Menlo Park is doing. As well as Mountain View Rengstorff and Castro so that our community members would be informed on what our neighbors are working on. That would be – they'd be able to visit those before or during lunch and throughout the...

Chair DuBois: So, the note said didn't have time so I thought it got cut. Is that still happening or...

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: Yeah, there's going to be information stations around the perimeter. I've already brought the -- I've already notified the school community about the meeting at the City's school traffic safety meeting last week and Penny Ellsen and the PTA group is going to help promote the May 20th. We'll do some more intense outreach.

Chair DuBois: Again, I think Claudia has a connection, don't you? Yeah, if you could make sure the final message is sent to them for publications.

Mr. Mello: In regards to emails, we've set up a gov. delivery email list specifically to this program and people can sign up on the website. We can also collect email addresses at the workshop and manually add people and people will also be able to -- if they received the postCAARD and can't attend the meeting, they can go online and sign up for email updates. Then, we can certainly ask people and try to identify specific people that want to participate more robustly at the workshop on May 20th, which could lead to the formation of some type of stakeholder group.

Chair DuBois: I think the other comment that was good -- I do think that we should mention at the workshop that the possibility that some of these options could result in ceasing homes but I also think that we should be careful about showing specific materials with specific houses. I think it's way too early for that. Yep?

Mr. Keene: Make a couple of comments. Sort of scattershot but I agree with what Adina said about the adjacency issue. I think we want to be careful of not signifying that this is just an issue of either possible taking or those impacted by noise or those kinds of things. I mean, this connection issue is for the entire City so we want to make sure that we're doing some targeted outreach there but I think that this is something that clearly affects the whole City. I think that the follow-up meeting that the Rail Committee will have after this session will be really important because we're going to learn a lot and I think we should -- I want to compliment Josh and the Staff on really pivoting pretty quickly to try to put this together in the CSS sense in the problem definition piece and we'll do the best we can to get this going. I think what's going to be really informative is what we learn between who shows up, what are we hearing, where do we begin to go from there? I want to also just sort of say that I think this is very -- this is going to be very different than most of the things that we've already done. I mean we did a process a number of years ago on infrastructure with the [iBrick] Committee and that sort of thing. I mean, in one sense, that was an easy thing to do. I mean it's just identifying some issues or problems and then going out and

TRANSCRIPT

saying hey, let's fix this stuff and let's find the money. It was relatively painless to the community and it was all basically just sort of good stuff. The idea of impacts on folks or asking people pay or those sort of things is that it just wasn't there. I mean, this is – we recognize how big this is but I don't think that it's going to be something that is going to be continually unfolding and if – I think we should recognize that part of what we're doing in the early stages of engagement is to be able to build almost a sort of narrative that can be communicated to the community in the future about how we now have come from where we were to this point, where we are now. Ultimately, that the Council can have the confidence that you've been informed enough to make some decisions. I will predict this, that we will never have full – this full engagement as we really need until you actually make some choices and decisions. Then, no matter how much outreach we will do, then people will really start to wake up. Do you know what I'm saying? Oh, my goodness, I understand this now. As I always like to say, we have a representative government but we also sort of have a town meeting form of government and the only challenge is that a different town shows up every week. You make one decision and there's a town there. Then you make a decision based on that and everybody hears about that decision and then a new town shows up and says, why'd you guys make that decision? We're going to – I think we're going to have to recognize that we want to design everything as carefully as possible but I think we need to have a real mindset about adapting and fine tuning as we go on and how we really build this narrative and communication piece about what's happening. I think is what's going to be really key to building the trust and confidence you're going to need because this is ultimately, more of a campaign than it is anything else. I mean we will get to a point – I would predict, that what you want to achieve can't be addressed solely with say, the Measure B funds and the share of that. We're going to have to look at how we then potentially, look at other funding sources that may have a direct impact on us. We're really going to have built a lot of confidence and shared commitment in that for that to be able to happen. That's way down the road but I think we need – should acknowledge that.

Chair DuBois: It seems like a huge piece that's not mentioned in here is funding. Is there going to be any indication of cost for different types of construction or anything? Just – or available funds and funding gaps?

Mr. Mello: On May 20th, we're not talking about solutions. We're only talking about problems and evaluations criteria. When we start to get to the alternatives development, we're going to have to talk about what kind of

TRANSCRIPT

fiscal constraints we're operating under and you know, that's going to be a big part of this whole conversation is how...

Chair DuBois: Even talking about the problem – I mean, funding is a problem. It should be brought into the mixture.

Mr. Mello: Well, we're certainly going to talk about what existing resources are out there but we're not doing to get into specific details about how much 'X' type of grade crossing costs or that type of thing.

Council Member Fine: Just one last time to Jim's point about whether we're going out for funding in the future and also, to your point earlier about working some (inaudible) along the corridor. It might be helpful to set the context of what we're do – what other Cities are doing and how we may work with them as well. I think there's some sentiment in the community that we're competing for these – for Measure B funds. That may not be the case now and that's probably important context to set for folks. That we can actually work collaboratively with Sunnyvale, Mountain View, etc.

Chair DuBois: Great. Alright, well thank you guys for the hard work on this and I'm looking forward to it. Anything else on this item?

Michele DiFrancia, Mott MacDonald: (Inaudible) I don't mean to interfere with the process but does the next Rail Committee meet after the May 20th workshop and would there be a need to meet before the workshop?

Mr. Mello: I think that's up to the Committee. I think we're ready to go. We'll certainly be reaching out to the Chair and the Mayor in advance to help prepare you for your presentation. I would suggest that we regroup after the workshop.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I'm just looking. When is our next meeting scheduled?

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: I'm showing May 24th.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, right after the workshop. We'll keep that date. I don't expect that you'll have everything analysis by then but there might be early indications.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: Yeah, I think we'll have a verbal report and some preliminary survey data but we'll have the full summary probably the following meeting.

Chair DuBois: Ok. Let's move on I guess.

NO ACTION TAKEN

Future Meetings and Agendas

Chair DuBois: The last item on agency communication, future agendas. Any comments on those items? Just one comment that I had for future agendas meeting. After hearing the update from High Speed Rail, should be thinking about having Caltrain come in at some point? Alright, if nothing meeting adjourned.

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: Actually, I do – one announcement. For the men in the room, there was a cell phone found in the men's room, right out the door here. If anyone is missing their cell phone, I've got details.

Chair DuBois: Alright, with that, the meeting adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 10:04 A.M.