



# CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE TRANSCRIPT

Special Meeting  
September 6, 2017

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

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

Absent:

## Oral Communications

Chair DuBois: Alright, good morning everybody. It's the September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2017 rail meeting. I don't have any oral communications so I think we'll proceed with item one.

None

## Agenda Review and Staff Update

1. Receive and Review Rail Program Briefing Paper From August 2017.

Joshua Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Yes, thank you, Chair and Members of the Committee. I'm Josh Mello, the Chief Transportation Official and we have – the first item on the Agenda today is your rail program briefing paper for the month of August. This is an abbreviated report because we met pretty recently and a larger report at that time. We are still moving forward with planning the September 16<sup>th</sup> community workshop number two at the Palo Alto (inaudible). That will run from 10 AM to 2 PM so the first half of that, we're planning to have a welcome by the Mayor and the Chair of the Rail Committee; similar to the last workshop. Then we're going to give an overview of the problem statement, objectives and evaluation criteria, have some interactive exercises and then we're going to do a sort of brainstorming exercise before we go into the – starting to define some of the constraints. We're going to have people break out into groups and talk about their vision for the rail corridor and start to develop some of their alternatives at a very high level. That will be followed by lunch and then after lunch, we're going to have a presentation on some of the constraints that we've identified to date. These include things like overhead catenary,

# TRANSCRIPT

the water table, creeks, existing grade separations, and the widths of the rail right of way. We'll be speaking in very general terms about the constraints along the corridor and then we're going to have two breakout sessions in the afternoon. The first folks will go to a table of their choosing and talk about specific grade crossing so Churchill, Palo Alto Avenue, Meadow or Charleston. That will be about 30-minutes and we're going to have some interactive tools with some templates for typical under crossings, over crossings, something that represents the amount of distance it would take to go down it, one percent or two percent and various other tools that folks can play with on aerial maps of the individual locations. Each table will be Staffed by a City Staff member, as well as somebody from the consulting team. Then the second breakout session, we're going to ask them to go to a different table. We want to get people's opinions on the grade crossing locations from both people who are very concerned about that grade crossing and may live near it, as well as people who may not have as much familiarity. So, we're going to mix people up a little bit and then that will end with a recap of our discussion and we're hoping that we're going to be able to put together some coherent initial alternative for each of the grade crossings after that meeting. Then we'll return to the public in October and continue that discussion so that's item one in the briefing paper. Item two is the Measure B Caltrain Grade Separation Program Guidelines, we are still asking VTA to change that language in the Measure B Caltrain Grade Separation Program Guidelines. They have not yet agreed to do that and we do have a little bit of a reprieve. Their Board is not considering the adoption of the guidelines tomorrow as they were planning to do. Instead, they will be considering that on October 5<sup>th</sup> so that's a change from when this report was produced. The VTA Board will actually be considering the guidelines on October 5<sup>th</sup> and then lastly, included in your report are expenditures to date for the project team, the contractor that we've been using for our Rail Program management services and with that, I can take any questions.

Chair DuBois: Any questions from the Committee?

Council Member Fine: Could you be a little more specific on the constraints and how you're planning to represent those to folks?

Mr. Mello: There will be a slide presentation and there will be a slide dedicated to each category of constraint so for example, the overhead catenary has a height requirement; this is after a post-electrification. There's also a bumper that needs to be accounted for around the live wires of the catenary so there are clearance issues once that catenary is installed and that would affect the depth of a trench or the height of any kind of overcrossing over the corridor. So, we'll talk a little bit specifically about

# TRANSCRIPT

what those dimensions are and what – how high up an overcrossing would need to be able to clear an overhead catenary. We'll also talk about the right of way within the four mile sections within Palo Alto and what that means for the number of tracks that can be provided for what's going to be used up with the overhead catenary poles and that type of thing.

Council Member Fine: So, I mean that's helpful to kind of understand the level that you will be willing to go into. (Inaudible) questions (inaudible) before how deep you want to go with folks on that. I guess some of these are pretty complex concepts and I'm wondering if there's any idea of if we could like modeling or scenarios to show folks. I know some Cities in the past have done for major transportation projects that they've done mockups in scale or in real life. I'm just looking to my colleagues, I'm just trying to figure out what the marketing is around here. When we talk about some of the other grade separations that we've liked, (inaudible) materials, they are pretty clean, there's a lot going on and folks in the City just seem to hear of them. Last night we had two or three speakers on rail issues and today again, we have three or four and I'm just wondering if we're doing enough on the marketing piece of this.

Mr. Mello: So, that's certainly going to come and September 16<sup>th</sup> is just the very beginning of the alternatives development so we're getting people to start thinking about – starting to put their ideas on the table and then we'll start to visualize those ideas moving forward. We are looking at bringing on a more comprehensive public relations team that can do some of the graphics at the level that I think we need to explain some of these concepts so we're certainly moving in that direction.

Council Member Fine: It would be helpful to hear what that plan is long term because I do think the fact that we're doing this project on the rail corridor and the grade separations, it should be front and center for Palo Alto's. It just really struck me as we were talking about this last night that people need to know this clear and loud the whole time that we're doing this process, you should engage with it, it's still going on and it may not be perfect but we want you to know about it. This shouldn't come as a surprise because then we are going to have calls to redo things and that would be legitimate cases. So, it would be nice to hear from the City just what are marketing and communication plan is more in depth.

Chair DuBois: Any other comments? I think those were some good points. Again, we talked about the electrification poles, are we going to be discussion kind of the single pole scenario at the workshop?

# TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: The only real constraint that's identifiable at this point with the overhead catenary would be the height – the clearance height and then the bumper that is required – the envelope that's required around the wires. (crosstalk)

Chair DuBois: (Inaudible)

Mr. Mello: Single pole versus double pole, I think that would come more into play when we start to really refine the alternatives. If we're looking at buildings come type of structure, where do those poles lie within the foundations of the structure and that type of...

Chair DuBois: Do we expect the width to be different if the single pole versus double pole?

Mr. Mello: Yes, I think – again though I think that would come a little bit later in the alternatives development. When we start – if we were to start perusing something like an overcrossing, we'd have to look at where the embankments and the retaining walls would be for that. How that relates to the width that's required for both the trackage and the overhead catenary?

Chair DuBois: I'm just concerned, when we talked about constraints, that we have very knowledgeable residents that would be – like we saw last time. We had some numbers -- traffic measurement, they're going to focus on that and so if we say that has to be double pole width, they are going to ask why aren't we considering single poles? They are going to see impacts to trees and I do think that we should think about how we communicate that and maybe be clear that there are two options.

Mr. Mello: I don't think we would be saying it has to be double pole width. I think we would say that if it was two poles, this would be the width. If it was a single pole, this would be the width and you know, it's dependent on the width between the tracks on whether Caltrain can advance a single pole versus a double pole solution.

Chair DuBois: I also think I'd really like to see an opportunity at this workshop to have an explicative discussion about the trench. I think last time we focused on individual grade seps and there was really no time in the discussion for that and if we do that again, I think we're going to have a bunch of people who are interested in trenches who feel like they really didn't get a chance to talk about that. Then I guess the last thing that I would say is I hope to see all of you guys at the workshop. I think it's important that we be there as the Rail Committee and ideally, you guys can

# TRANSCRIPT

stay all day. The other – the couple other quick items, so the – I think these are probably the most critical item but my understanding that the VTA Board is talking about not bonding grade separations and that they are talking about releasing only two million dollars in 2018 for planning and that's it. I don't know if that's coming up in the September 7<sup>th</sup> meeting. I don't know if you have seen the agenda but I think we need to be all over and that's probably one of the most important things we should be doing right now. Then I do think that I appreciate you continuing to bring up the language at the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting and again, we need to figure out what we can do to put some pressure on the VTA Board. So, I don't know, do you have any insight to the bonding issue?

Mr. Mello: So, tomorrow at the September 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, VTA Board will be appointing the Measure B Citizen Advisory Committee but they will not be discussing anything regarding the program guidelines. They've postponed that to the October 5<sup>th</sup> meeting and the program guidelines don't mention anything about bonding or how the financing will work. It mainly just sets the framework for how the funding will be distributed and it relies heavily on this implementation plan that VTA is planning to advance in early 2018.

Chair DuBois: So, there's not a separate Finance Committee discussion happening?

Mr. Mello: I can check in on that. There's nothing on the Board agenda or the TAC agenda about the structure of the financing for Measure B but I can check in with that – on that.

Chair DuBois: Again, I've heard that they are not going to bond the entire thing and they are going to pick categories to bond and right now, grade seps is not one of those categories.

James Keene, City Manager: Tom, may I say something? I think that's a really important question and just overall, I've asked the Staff and we've been talking about on the financial modeling side of adding some capacity outside of transportation with other folks. I think even in the near term to start, almost sort of reverse engineering some of the potential solutions and identifying costs and factors that come into play and how they might be funded. I mean not drawing any conclusions but I think as you talked as Rail Committee before, we've got to be doing a lot of things in parallel here. So, for example on the financial side and I do think that at this point about us being very actively involved with the different levels of VTA and other officiates on the – what the funding stream is going to be on the Measure B money is really critical also so well stated.

# TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Then I know I asked last time and I forgot the answers so I'm going to ask again, when are we going to see the circulation study? Is there a deadline for that?

Mr. Mello: We're going to have some initial results at a very high level for the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. I'm hoping to get you something before that meeting to review but we'll have some preliminary high-level findings that we'll be able to talk about at the September 16<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chair DuBois: So, have you seen any results yet? I mean...(crosstalk)

Mr. Mello: I have not, the modeling is still underway.

Chair DuBois: Ok, great. So, we did have a speaker card come in on this item so Richard Brand if you'd like to...

Richard Brand: Well, good morning. Did you stay here all night? It seems like it right? So, yeah, a lot of things that you talked about last night and I wanted to comment first of all, which I didn't have time to say last night but I did give it to you guys for hanging in here and doing good work. Staff too, I think Staff has risen to this occasion and I don't think any of us realized what a chickling this project was going to be because it's so complicated. I would say – Mayor Scharff, you said it last night that the Council needs to recognize the importance of the rail – this project and the Rail Committee and I think Staff is going to need a little more help here. I heard Jim just ask for that and I think this project being this huge, large project, which came out in front of the public, all four of us last night, is going to take a lot of work. I think that we're going to find a way in the City to support all that work from the Staff. A couple things on the poles for the centenaries, High Speed Rail, there are four tracks and it takes more poles because the wires have to be strung further across more width so once again when we run up against this project called High Speed Rail. Also, last night Vice Mayor Kniss, she was talking about trenching and Bart did trench. Bart trenched underground from Milburn north to – I guess – I think all the way to South City. Anyway, they did trench and the problem is that Bart can go up and down grades greater than even electric High Speed Rail trains or Caltrain. So, trenching is an issue and again, it's a complicated project. It's going to take work and thank you for doing the work and Staff too.

Chair DuBois: I like the hat, Richard.

Mr. Keene: Yeah, we're going to get – we've already ordered them on Amazon for the whole Committee.

# TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Can we get a whistle? Alright, my next – last speaker is Adina Levin.

Adina Levin: Good morning Council Members and Staff, Adina Levin with Friends of Caltrain. So, a couple of thoughts following up to the conversation about the Measure B funding and the potential to bond against it and the topic of how to get grade separations funded sooner rather than later. Several of the factors that are really driving needs for capacity on the corridor is something that we're really concerned about and working on and have a number of different kind of initiatives here. Some of them are in terms of having the most people care about this issue included in San Jose and all up and down the corridor. San Francisco is having a vision of DTX to Diridon and the idea of Google moving into Diridon and having tens of thousands of people there. Caltrain connecting into downtown San Francisco with central subways soon and then their plans for the downtown extension, more tens of thousands of people. They are going to need to be able to be prepared to potentially have an increased frequency which is going to require the grade separations sooner than we think. So, that's a way of getting more people engaged in that with that messaging and there are opportunities to do that directly with interested folks in San Jose, employers with regard to the Caltrain business plan, with regard to leaders in San Francisco and then also in San Mateo County as they contemplate additional ballot measures. So that strategy of – right now the conventional wisdom is that a grade separation is really a project that benefits one locality so why would I want to do anything extra to make sure that any particular locality gets their project but there's going to be those needs for capacity and frequency sooner than we think. So, that is the message to play out through these various different localities and various different decision processes. One that I left out is that State Rail Plan is about to be coming out any minute now and that has a potential to have a higher-level look at those needs and potentially look at state funding too. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Great, thank you. Alright, we're going to move on to item number two. Go ahead.

NO ACTION TAKEN

## Action Items

2. Receive a Presentation by SamTrans on the Draft Dumbarton Transportation Corridor Study.

# TRANSCRIPT

Joshua Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Great, thank you Chair and Members of the Committee. We're joined today by Melissa Reggiardo from SamTrans. She's the project manager for the Dumbarton Transportation Corridor study and she's going to give you a presentation on this study that was released a couple of weeks ago. Also, provide from times for Q&A after the presentation.

Melissa Reggiardo, Principal Planner, SamTrans: Good morning, thanks for having me this morning. So, I'm Melissa Reggiardo and I'm the project manager for the Dumbarton Transportation Corridor Study. If you've been following the Dumbarton corridor over the years – the many years that it's been studied, you'll notice from this presentation that this study is a little bit different. You not only focus on improvements in transit on the Dumbarton rail bridge, which was the focus of previous studies but we've also tried to look at improvements on the Dumbarton highway bridge and the approaches on each side of the bridge. We thought that this time around it was a little bit more important to develop a more holistic two bridge vision that would ultimately emphasize transit. I just want to note that Caltrans is the owner and the operator of the highway bridge so any recommendations for that bridge that we put forth as part of this presentation is part of the study and would need to go through Caltrans planning processes next. Of course, SamTrans is the owner of the rail bridge so we have a little bit more control over that facility and of course, I just want to remind folks that the study also attempts to focus on both short and long-term improvements and the phasing of those improvements over time. This is a snapshot of the Dumbarton highway bridge on a Friday afternoon. Major backups on the arterials on both sides of the Bay and people that live in the area, both on the peninsula as well as the East Bay, love to tell us that traffic has gotten a lot worse; presumably because of the recent employment growth we've seen in both San Mateo and Santa Clara County. Generally, we see about 76,000 trips go across that bridge each day and traffic flow is very much directional, as you probably already know, with almost eighty percent of the traffic in the morning heading to the peninsula presumably for jobs and of course, that trend is reversed in the evening. In terms of major headlines, the corridor requires phased improvements over time. There are many, many challenges and so first and for most any recommended improvements to either bridge or the arterial approaches requires consensus and corporation from a lot of different entities. We've attempted to list some of the most important ones here. Also, there's very little public funding dedicated to any Dumbarton corridor improvements, particularly the reconstruction of the rail bridge. So, we've included in our study a high-level analysis of potential public-private partnerships and that certainly this would need to be looked at



# TRANSCRIPT

in the next phase of the study and of course, there are also environmental challenges; again, especially in terms of reconstructing that rail bridge. I suppose the last challenge that I will mention is the challenges of connecting rail service to the East Bay to locations such as Union City, that requires Union Pacific right of way. SamTrans ownership of the Dumbarton corridor ends in Newark and so there would have to be an agreement to use their right of way to get to locations like Union City. The preliminary findings that I'm about to present are based on a comparative analysis of alternatives. This analysis was based on our project goals, which we've listed here and just to note that these are preliminary or draft recommendation. Anything that is selected to move forward will require some additional study and in some cases, some additional planning work and environmental and additional design. So, I'll take you through the alternatives studied, as well as those recommended for further analysis. I'll start with the short-term and I'll then move into the long term. One option that we examined in the short term is the best service on the highway bridge. It includes four routes, the Dumbarton Express services DB and DB1 as they exist today. As well as two new routes in an attempt to serve major employment centers so a route going to Menlo Park and Redwood City. Then another going to Santa Clara County, more specifically Mountain View and Sunnyvale. Frequencies are proposed to be bumped up from what operates in the corridor today. It would be increased to about 15-minutes in the peak period and 20-minutes in the off-peak. Short term best service would be accompanied by short-term approach improvement, primarily operational in nature but the point here is that we need to speed up that bus service to make it more attractive. Short term bus service would cost approximately \$50 million to implement and it would produce approximately 14,000 daily transit riders across the Bay. I just want to note that's TransBay ridership and not total ridership. We have total ridership if you're interested but we're really focused on getting folks across the bay. Frankly, there's really not that much you can do by 2020; it's just a couple years away so we're recommending that we would carry this forward. Another option in the short term is bicycle/pedestrian multi-use path on the Dumbarton right of way from Redwood City to East Palo Alto. The bike/ped path was examined as an option that it could potentially be paired with a higher capacity transit option to either bus or rail and it's assumed to require a few different overpasses and so the capital cost is around \$60 million. The bike/ped path was challenging for us because our regional travel demand model is not good at estimating ridership for or use of a bike/ped path. It's a very localized improvement and it's a very macroscale model so we didn't feel comfortable directly comparing that bike/ped path with major transit improvements like (inaudible) bus service or even rail service. Generally, we assumed that this bike/ped path would be

# TRANSCRIPT

implemented as long as there was room in that 100-foot Dumbarton right of way. As noted before, enhanced bus in supporting arterial improvements are recommended for 2020 but the bicycle and pedestrian path is not currently recommended purely because of this limited right of way issue. We believe that some of the mid-term alternatives that I'll discuss in this presentation next, could better utilize that right of way to move a larger number of people. However, as part of this study we have suggested other bicycle improvements in the study area that could help enhance connectivity to the bike/ped path on the highway bridge. Also, any transit alternative that we put forth for further analysis would of course accommodate bikes on board; whether it's bus or rail. Again, to implement any of these services a number of entities would need to be engaged so we've attempted to list them. Targeted for the mid to long-term, which we consider to be 2025 to 2030, is the combination of a couple different services on both the highway bridge, as well as the rail bridge and I'll start with the highway bridge. First this includes further enhanced bus service operating in express lanes on the highway bridge. Bus service would operate at even greater frequencies; 10-minutes in the peak and 15-minutes in the off-peak. I think a major benefit of this mid-term improvement is that we're proposing that buses could operate within the Dumbarton right of way on the peninsula to help speed up that bus service and make it a little more reliable. It wouldn't have to compete with other vehicles on the roads. More specifically, we've looked at what we call the Dumbarton right of way to 101 fly over or really a fly down or basically a fly down to - from the right of way to US 101. So, it would be providing a way for express buses, public-private, to use that right of way and to get to planned express lanes on US 101 in a relatively quick manner. There are two potential configurations for express lanes that we looked at on the highway bridge. One is a reversible express lane option so a lot like how the Golden Gate Bridge operates today with a movable barrier providing an additional lane of capacity in the peak direction; requires a zipper vehicle. The second option is just one express lane in each direction and it's believed that express lanes on the highway bridge could be completed in the mid-term or 2025 under a fairly aggressive schedule. The option that implements one express lane in each direction is much better in terms of increasing bus ridership as it restricts general purpose (inaudible). Additionally, more (inaudible) intensive approach improvements on both sides of the Bay are also identified for 2025 to further reduce those bus travel times. Frankly, we probably need to address those approach improvements prior to the express lanes on the highway bridge itself, given that those are the areas of major choke points. Lastly, we're suggesting that the right of way to US 101 connection for buses is carried forward as a mid-term improvement. In the long-term or 2030, we're proposing those increased frequencies up to 10-

# TRANSCRIPT

minutes in the peak and generally, the capital cost of these improvements is about \$850 million in the mid-term with an additional \$80 – about \$80 million in the long term. These improvements together would generate over 21,000 daily transit trips across the Bay. Also targeted for the mid to long term is the rail shuttle on the rail bridge, which is basically a commuter rail service that would shuttle from Union City Bart to Redwood City Caltrain at 15-min peak frequencies, 30-minutes in the off-peak. Generally, frequencies that are pretty quick for commuter rail but generally less frequent than the bus services that we've looked at. At least a portion of the rail shuttle, we think from Redwood City to Newark could potentially be completed by 2025; again, under an aggressive schedule. The remaining portion from Newark to Union City could potentially be constructed by 2030. The first phase of the rail shuttle includes the reconstruction of the rail bridge and we're proposing that it's a double track facility so the capital cost is around \$97(inaudible). Double tracking the rail bridge would of course provide operational flexibility into the future and this contributes to a good reliable rail service. The second phase of the shuttle from Newark to Union City would cost a little bit under \$300 million. The rail shuttle all the way to Union City would produce approximately 15,600 daily transit trips across the Bay. While ridership reports are less for the rail shuttle, it is still in line with the existing rail services currently operating in our study area today. This includes Caltrain services from Redwood City to Palo Alto, as well as Bart service in the Fremont and Union City areas. The rail shuttle on the rail bridge paired with this enhanced bus service on the highway bridge is proposed for further examination together because we believe that they serve different travel markets. The enhanced bus on the highway bridge is very, very good at serving tri-cities to peninsula trips, employment trips, it can provide a one-seat ride to major employment destinations. However, we think the commuter rail option -- the shuttle rail option, at least a first could be very good at serving longer distance trips. Especially pending future coordination with services like ACE and Capital Corridor. We also examined a busway alternative on the rail bridge, which is also considered to be a mid to long-term option. This option is cheaper because it doesn't require those rail connections in the East Bay and in fact, the busses can be operating on locate streets in the East Bay, they are not proposed to be dedicated lanes. Despite the fact that the alternative would produce more ridership, we're not recommending it because if you were to pair it with the enhanced bus on the highway bridge, it's essentially duplicative service. Also, the busway on the rail bridge would not be able to form the same seamless connections that we envisioned for a rail service. Those connections with ACE and (inaudible) corridor and potentially Caltrain in the future. Then I would just like to note that the busway, like the other bus options we looked at, performed very

# TRANSCRIPT

well from a ridership perspective because we proposed very, very high frequencies. To summarize, the following is proposed in the mid-term or 2025 enhanced bus service on the highway bridge would operate an express lane. Also proposed for 2025 are further approach improvements on each side of the Bay, as well as the bus fly over from the Dumbarton right of way to the planned express lanes on US 101. On the rail bridge the rail shuttle from Redwood City to Newark with a double-tracked rail bridge. Total capital costs for everything combined is about 1.8 billion dollars and of course a lot of entities would need to be involved and they are listed at the bottom of the slide. To summarize what is proposed for 2030, we basically pick up the frequencies on the bus service on the highway bridge and we'd expand the rail shuttle service from Newark to Union City. The capital cost is about \$377 million; again, entities that we need to involve at listed. Then targeted for the even longer term, which we consider to be 2035 or beyond, is the conversion of the rail shuttle to what we call the rail commuter. That's a rail system that would eventually interline with the Caltrain mainline. The option would send some trains direct from Union City Bart to Redwood City and then some would direct to San Francisco. Other trains would turn south at the Dumbarton Y and serve a new Willow Road transit station and turn south serving major employment centers before expressing to San Jose. So, those stops would be Palo Alto, Mountain View and Sunnyvale. The services would operate at 6-minute headways in each direction so combined about 30-minutes. As I mentioned this option is seen as a little bit longer term but just as important as underlining with Caltrain is, like I mentioned before, foraging these more seamless connections with more regional services ACE and Capital Corridor. The regional connections would certainly expand the travel market and will be essential in increasing rail ridership in the coming years. Then after the rail shuttle is constructed, the additional capital cost of underlining with the Caltrain mainline may be as low as \$327 million. There is certainly additional cost analysis is needed in this area just due to unknowns related to the future of Caltrain, as well as mostly High Speed Rail. The rail improvements paired with enhanced bus on the highway bridge, as I described earlier, would produce approximately 23,300 daily transit riders across the Bay. Where we see a really strong source of ridership from ACE transforms and to us, this signifies that the tri-valley and central valley to peninsula market for jobs is probably pretty underserved. The potential for Dumbarton to connect to a larger real ridge regional rail network is also compelling as we continue to see housing and jobs pop up in different parts of the Bay. Additionally, the combination of enhanced bus on the highway bridge and rail service on the rail bridge also performs best in terms of reducing overall auto miles. So, to summarize, based on our comprehensive analysis where we looked at things like enhancing mobility,

# TRANSCRIPT

cost-effectiveness, equity, environmental concerns, safety concerns etc. We think the solution is really a two-bridge solution and one that focuses on transit on both the highway, as well as the rail bridges. It's a little bit of a departure from your typical alternatives analysis that chooses one option of a bunch but we think the key is really -- the key really lies in serving these different transit markets. There are a lot of options for funding and financing and we tried to list some of the most important ones here. There's a small amount of funding for Dumbarton stations as part of San Mateo County's Measure A but certainly, it's a small amount and these costs are fairly high. So, additional State and regional funding would absolutely need to be pursued. Potential options include SP1 or Regional Measure Three if it's to pass. Additional (inaudible) contributions could potentially be solicited, we could also pursue State and federal grants. We're looking at value capture mechanisms which can take a couple different forms, potentially include special assessment districts or developer contributions. I mentioned before but we've looked at public-private partnership structures at a fairly high level in the study but we need to look at it further. I just want to mention that the alternative packages and phasing that we've presented in this presentation are just one way you could do it. Certainly, if you had less money available, you could build out a rail spur from Redwood City to Menlo Park first before you get across the Bay. Lastly, partnerships with the State, there are regional rail plans coming out, ACE, Capital corridor, Caltrans and MTC and all of those relationships would become very important in implementing any of these major infrastructure projects. In terms of next steps, we presented preliminary recommendation to the SamTrans Board in early August. We then held a couple different public and stakeholder meetings in mid-August when we posted the draft report to our website. We're currently collecting comments and feedback through the month of September. We'll then do our best to address comments to the extent that we can and produce our final report. We hope to go back to the SamTrans Board by the end of the calendar year, though that certainly depends on how many comments we receive and how much time it takes to integrate those comments. So, with that, I can take any comments or questions.

Chair DuBois: Thank you very much and thank you for coming. Thanks for the presentation. I do have three members of the public that want to speak so the first speaker is Pamela Jones; followed by Adina Levin.

Pamela Jones: Good morning Mayor, Council Members, and Staff. I'm Pamela Jones, a resident of Menlo Park whose family moved to Palo Alto in the 1920's so I have deep roots here. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you regarding the Dumbarton Transportation Corridor Study. Simply stated, there's a fundamental fatal flaw with this study. It failed to

# TRANSCRIPT

provide a County solution to a tri-county challenge. Redwood City, Atherton, Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, Newark and Union City have demonstrated a high level of social responsibility by attempting to solve the Dumbarton corridor traffic transportation challenge. Two Counties working together and the third County, Santa Clara, for whatever reason is essentially absent from the study; as well as the solutions. As well as the Cities of Menlo Park and Mountain View, with the exception to offer some bicycle lanes, bus lanes, and bicycle routes. Without question, the residential communities most affected will continue to bear the enormous burden of through traffic now approximately 81,000 cars per day. Specifically, the Willow Road and University Avenue, residential community approaches -- and Marsh Road, as detailed in section four the existing and future condition. This study attempts to accommodate increased traffic from the East Bay to Santa Clara County without concern for the quality of life of the two residential communities most affected. The most logical solution to the Dumbarton corridor traffic crisis is the addition of the original south access route which Embarcadero and/or Oregon Avenue. There will no longer need to any grade separation or flyovers on the Willow Road and University Avenue. This would further affect the quality of life for the residents in the Menlo Park community of Belhaven, as well as the City of East Palo Alto. The cost of the southern approach and the preserved inconvenience of moving the Palo Alto airport and the golf course is mitigated by the health and welfare of the residential communities and school. Funding in part is a social responsibility of the corporations whose employees use Dumbarton bridge and they too must help address the environmental impact onto the wetlands. Dumbarton is a tri-county, multi-city issue and the southern Dumbarton bridge approach can no longer be ignored. Your Policy T-53 must be rescinded and the doors open to an inclusive situation which we will have shared burdened of all of the challenges it brings to us. The environmental impact questions can be easily solved by the brilliance that we have of our local Universities. We have a substantial amount of creativity here so the issue is really about, what do you want to do to be a part of the solution; rather than to increase the problems that exist due to the Willow Road, as well as the University Avenue approaches to the bridge? Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Our next speaker is Adina Levin and followed by Richard Brand.

Adina Levin: Good morning, Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain. First of all, at a high level, I want to express thanks and appreciation to SamTrans for conducting this study and really putting forward a bold, multi-modal vision that will – would have 20,000-30,000 riders in the out years of the forecast. Also, really a level of usage that would justify the substantial (inaudible) that

# TRANSCRIPT

will take to get aspects of this project delivered and also thank you for bringing this discussion here to Palo Alto and to Santa Clara County. We're really glad to hear this at a large scale and also have a good number of questions that we have for this study with regard to having the most effective outcome and addressing that traffic congestion that affects so many of the people who commute in this area. I want to focus on two of them that really pertain to Palo Alto's potential use and benefit. The first has to do with mode share so we know from the work that went into – from information that Stanford has published, that they have about fifty percent of their people coming over with the Dumbarton bridge and not driving alone today and now. Yet, in this study with its ambitions and major multi-modal plans, it has a goal of reaching a thirty percent mode share by 2040. Meanwhile, we have the City of Palo Alto's Transportation Demand Management Program achieving a ten-percentage-point reduction in service and employee driving only in one year of pilot programs. We have the other Cities that represent the bulk of the peak direction traffic; Palo Alto, Menlo Park, Redwood City, and then Mountain View and Sunnyvale. They all have transportation demand management goals and strategies and therefore, there is a really low hanging fruit opportunity to partner with these neighboring Cities to provide support similar to how Stanford supports their people who do that commute. That has the potential to get a large amount of commuters out of single-occupant cars, even today and with some of the great low-hanging fruit bus transit improvements. That's a short-term opportunity that's not covered in this study but could potentially be worked on as soon as humanly possible. A second question and concern have to do with some of the proposals to address the congestion by increasing vehicle capacity so there are a number of different projects in here that basically add up to freeway-izing 84. So, a grade separation at University, grade separation at Willow and then a turnaround close to Marsh, which for a large number of people who are coming to Palo Alto Stanford Research Park, Menlo Park would require people driving 10-miles out of their way. So, there's a question about well, how well will it be used but then secondly, if it is used, one of the appendixes in the report says that because of – without all of this mode shift, there is expected to be only seventy-eight percent of driving demand will be met. So, what does that imply? That implies that if you relieve that congestion by freeway-izing 84, there could be an additional twenty-two percent of people – more driving. So, by improving the freeway, you more people being tempted to drive alone, which raises the question is if people did use that, they would still need to come into Palo Alto up University or up Willow. There's no more room there and there are no plans to add capacity so Willow towards the hills towards 101 or University towards the hills towards 101. So, one of the key questions about

# TRANSCRIPT

effectiveness is what would be the change in the end to end trip time, given the fact that there might be even more people trying to drive into – just moving the bottleneck upstream. So, that's concern about the relative effectiveness of that piece of that project. You know over and above the potential local implications for Belhaven and East Palo Alto where that major highway infrastructure would be added.

Chair DuBois: Thank you.

Adina Levin: That's it, thank you.

Chair DuBois: Our last speaker is Richard Brand.

Richard Brand: Good morning again, Richard Brand of Palo Alto and I'm just representing myself but I do want to appreciate and thank SamTrans for coming and making the presentation. As you know, I've been pushing for information and this Committee is – I applaud the Committee for picking up on this project because I think the important part about this project is regional. If you look at the issues that rail connection across from our Bay, regionally could go with ACE. There has already been some official talk about ACE coming in and splitting on the East Bay and coming across a new Redwood City or Dumbarton rail bridge into Redwood City. I think that's an important element and we want to look at how we, Palo Alto, and Santa Clara County can use this. I applauded you about the problem we have with Santa Clara County. We know that funding is a big issue and some of the money for this Dumbarton project was diverted from the Dumbarton rail project down to put Bart down to Milpitas and south. I think they owe us that money but that's another story. I won't be commenting about directly to SamTrans on their proposal. I will only say that if you look at what Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit did, they rebuilt an existing rail line with a similar swing bridge. They had environmental problems in the San Francisco Bay and they also had to put in automatic train control which is brand new and they did this for \$600 million. So, I'm going to comment to SamTrans and I think they are price tagging this thing is a little high compared to if you look at what SMART did to get a rail system going for a much longer distance. I think the important thing for this Committee is to look at and follow what they are going to propose and so I will only say that we follow closely with SamTrans but also Sams people, I would say that our County is interested. I don't know – I'm not going to ask Josh to re-put up one of the slides here but up in Redwood City if you look at – in your packet there, slide 15 shows the right of way. Yes, that's it – back, back, back. Oh, maybe it's the other way. It should be right there. They're actually -- down in the lower left-hand corner, it's truly a 'Y' in Redwood City. The rail right of way does



# TRANSCRIPT

go horizontal there at the end where you see the line that goes north on Caltrain but in Redwood City, there's actually the track right of way that cuts back down towards Atherton. It doesn't go into Atherton but in fact, those are still existing and it has rails on it. I think if we could look at this as a service that could cross the Bay and come down our way as well if we looked at working the regional elements here. This gets into MTC but this is an option and I think what we need to do is – I've been working with Joe Simitian to see what we can do in Santa Clara County to make this happen once you get your things established. Again, you can tell there's a lot of interest and I will tell you, a Rail Committee that I attended at Melissa's meeting in East Palo Alto a month ago, there were about 80 or 90 people there and the fellow asked how many people were from Palo Alto? There were about 20 hands so there are people in our town that are interested in fixing this problem. As Adina has said, we know about the issues on the bridge. If that bridge gets closed down and even if you put buses on it, they are – that bridge is a problem as we know so I would only say that thank you for SamTrans for coming and thank you for the Rail Committee. Oh, I know the last thing is RM3 funding. There is a possibility the regional people are looking at funding from grade cross – sorry, from toll increases on the Bay bridges. I think we need to look at how that can – in any way we can help SamTrans to work that and we need to take that to our County Supervisors. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Alright, do we have any comments, feedback, questions from the Committee? Yeah, Adrian.

Council Member Fine: Just a couple, I mean are tolls a potential funding source here (inaudible)? Are tolls a potential funding source for this?

Ms. Reggiardo: Potentially so Richard had mentioned RM3. We – I think we currently, as it exists now and it could totally change, have about 130 million dollars for Dumbarton on the list of projects to potentially be funded by RM3. So, in that respect, yeah, tolls could be an option. Also, something that we started to touch on in the report is the possibility of congestion pricing as part of the express lanes and charging basically a toll on a toll to allow people to use the express lanes during peak periods.

Council Member Fine: I guess I am asking because I see – what's interesting here is when you mentioned you were looking at alternatives or two bridges roughly and including all the different modes. There's an opportunity here to cobble together funding from all the different sources and make a case that gosh, the bridge is getting full of cars so we, therefore, fund more buses, bikes and trains and things like that. It would nice I guess, as this project

# TRANSCRIPT

progresses to kind of see what are those funding splits and which parties or which modes are subsidizing the others. I think that would be a helpful argument here. I'm encouraged by this and I think there's a lot of nice stuff. When I look at this, this little inset Map B that goes to Google, Microsoft, Nasa, Yahoo, I mean this stuff makes sense. I guess two things that stand out to me is one, instead of bus – of course, it would be great if that southern spur where some kind of rail system. I think one of the speakers spoke to that and then I think this – also its imperative that I've heard some options include Redwood City and some don't. It seems like the right thing to do if you're going to build this out. There are (inaudible) commercial presence there in Redwood City and then just a last question, the Dumbarton Express service you were looking at 10-minutes headways under some of the – just during commute hours?

Ms. Reggiardo: Yeah, during the peak hours which I think we assume are a four-hour peak in the morning and four-hour peak in the evening.

Council Member Fine: Ok and do we know how many folks in the Dumbarton because I know like Stanford Research Park is – they love them and it's like fifty or something people, is it something like that?

Ms. Reggiardo: Yeah, do – are you asking for current ridership?

Council Member Fine: Yeah.

Ms. Reggiardo: So current ridership is not that high and it's actually been going down along with every other bus ridership service but I think it's approximately – I want to say 2,000; that's not an exact number.

Council Member Fine: Ok, thank you.

Ms. Reggiardo: But presumably with high frequencies and if we were able to speed up the bus service it would increase.

Council Member Fine: Love that, alright, thank you.

Council Member Filseth: I want to thank you – first of all, thank you very much for joining us this morning and giving us this -- this is just really interesting. I wanted to ask a couple questions, in your assessment of sort of – the number of trips that would be handled by an expanded bus service versus rail and so forth. It looked like you folks were estimating that the first rail stage would handle 15,500 riders a day whereas the first bus stage would handle 21,000 riders a day. Given that the rail is probably going to be

# TRANSCRIPT

faster, why is – I mean you would sort of expect the opposite right? Why is that?

Ms. Reggiardo: Yeah, well so I think a big reason is that we – when deciding what to model, we wanted to model the best services possible and so for buses, there was a lot more flexibility there. We could propose them at much high frequencies so when you take four bus routes and operate them at 10 to 15-minute frequencies, that's a very, very good robust service.

Council Member Filseth: So, you could actually run the buses more frequently than the trains?

Ms. Reggiardo: Potentially. You don't see commuter rail services operating at those 3-minute combined frequencies. Its – so that's – we felt the best we could do on the rail side was 15-minute peak frequencies for that rail shuttle. Though I mean if there is enough ridership, you could justify operating more frequent service.

Council Member Filseth: Ok, and then how much faster would it be to get from Point A to Point B on the rail? Would it be a lot faster or would the buses be almost as fast?

Ms. Reggiardo: I'd have to dig into our operational plans for that one but if you're interested, I can do that.

Council Member Filseth: I'm just curious whether it's a big difference or a little difference.

Ms. Reggiardo: I don't know. I don't want to give you the wrong impression by guessing.

Council Member Filseth: Then the ridership projections, the 15,000 versus the 21,000, are those duplicative? I mean are those the same people or are they actually accumulative? If you did both, you'd have 15,000 on rail plus another 21,000 on buses.

Ms. Reggiardo: So, the 21,000 figures and the 15,600 figures are those services modeled separately. So, the bus alternatives would produce 21,000 by itself and the rail shuttle would produce almost 16,000 by itself. If you were to combine them, you get about 23,300.

Council Member Filseth: So, that's actually quite a bit of overlap. Ok, cool. I want to make a philosophical point here so I think I'll keep this really brief. (Inaudible) what we're going to do but I think one thing that these analysis

# TRANSCRIPT

highlights are kind of the geometry problem of the regents since we're talking about the regent here. I think what it highlights is that as we plan for growth in the region, it's going to be just vastly more expensive to get people in and out of the mid-peninsula than it is other places, both in terms of dollars and displacement of existing communities and stuff like that. To put it a little more concretely, it's going to be much more expensive for the region to support the next Facebook employee in Menlo Park than it is to support the next Google employee by Diridon Station. So, since we're talking about decades of growth and transportation, it's something probably that you ought to keep in mind.

Chair DuBois: Greg, any comments? A couple of just question for you Melissa, who actually owns the rail bridge right now?

Ms. Reggiardo: SamTrans.

Chair DuBois: Is there really any point in refurbishing the bridge? It's in such bad shape so would you basically be rebuilding a new bridge?

Ms. Reggiardo: Yeah, my understanding is that the difference between a refurbishment versus almost total reconstruction is not that great. So, we've taken the conservative approach and so our cost estimates assume an almost reconstruction I'd say.

Chair DuBois: I was kind of surprised that the – it looked like the bus – the bike improvements were more expensive than the bus improvements and I was curious as to why that was.

Ms. Reggiardo: The bike/pedestrian path?

Chair DuBois: Yeah.

Ms. Reggiardo: It's purely because of the overpasses, which at this point have been mandated by Caltrans.

Chair DuBois: Ok, the (inaudible)...

Ms. Reggiardo: That's what brings that cost to about 60 million dollars.

Chair DuBois: When you talk about express lanes, are those regular HOV lanes?

Ms. Reggiardo: We've modeled them as express lanes meaning toll lanes so it would accommodate HOV, buses, as well as toll-paying vehicles.

# TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Ok but carpooling would be allowed?

Ms. Reggiardo: Included, yes.

Chair DuBois: I think – have you guys spent much time looking at kind of the Marsh Road/Willow Road cut through traffic and are there any suggestions or proposals for those streets?

Ms. Reggiardo: Yes, I didn't go into it – into a lot of detail but generally, as part of our look at approach improvements on each side of the Bay, a big one that we looked at – at the beginning of the study that we were convinced was the ultimate answer was Willow Road express lanes. They were originally proposed I think in the 2020 gateway study and they were proposed as lanes. So, we took that idea and our engineers took a look and said oh my gosh, we think they should be tunnels. So, we went forward with that design, that's included in our report, and what we found was that it was very difficult to connect those Willow Road express lanes to express lanes on 101; given very tight geometries and the recent reconstruction of the Willow Road interchange so our focus shifted. We sort of abandoned that idea, it had a lot of issues, and instead, we focused on the next best transit option we could provide on Willow Road which is bus-only lanes in the peak. So, we shifted our focus to those and then where else we could put those express lanes to provide a direct connection via express lanes from the East Bay to the US 101. Our focus shifted to Bay Front Express Way with a connection to 101 at Marsh and this is what is recommended. We sort of delve into the details of our approach improvements but we feel this could be a benefit in terms of taking that regional traffic and diverting it from both Willow and University. Basically, we proposed a few different improvements, a grade sep at Bay Front Expressway and Willow to basically help separate that regional and local traffic with the regional traffic basically making a right on Bayfront with an eventual connection to 101 at Marsh. More regional traffic, whether it goes to Facebook or to Palo Alto would basically take Willow or University instead. Certainly, more analysis is needed in this area but we think it's the alternative that should be looked at further.

Chair DuBois: Was there any consideration at the other end of somehow connecting Willow to Sand Hill Road; like getting all the way out to the hospital?

Ms. Reggiardo: No, we – that was a little bit beyond our study area.

Chair DuBois: Then in terms of the funding, I mean we're looking at some good projects ourselves and I'm wondering how you guys were thinking

# TRANSCRIPT

about that? There's a lot of agencies here so are you thinking of some kind of joint powers agency to fund this?

Ms. Reggiardo: That's a very good question. Nothing has been decided yet but certainly, there would need to be some sort of group that would come together to help flush out the many challenges as part of these big infrastructure projects; funding probably being the biggest challenge. So, it remains to be seen which way it will go whether it's an MOU or some sort of Committee, I'm not quite sure but that will be decided in the next phase.

Chair DuBois: In terms of the connections on the East Bay, so this is all – I guess SamTrans to land and then it connects to AC Transit or other agencies, is that correct?

Ms. Reggiardo: Yes.

Chair DuBois: So, do riders have to make the shift? Get off one bus and get on another bus?

Ms. Reggiardo: Potentially. So, AC Transit operates Dumbarton Express today and we've been sort of agnostic about who operates it into the future. Presumably, we would plan the bus service so that it lines up with East Bay services operated by AC Transit, as well as SamTrans in the peninsula. The rail services I think offer the greater benefits in terms of reducing transfers and this is – when I bring back ACE and Capital Corridor, bringing up the potential possibility of having ACE just come across that bridge. We haven't brought that up in our study but certainly, it's a possibility and ways to basically streamline the regional rail services so that you're reducing the transfers needed on each side.

Chair DuBois: Then the last question, (inaudible) is mentioned here. What kind of value capture is available on this project?

Ms. Reggiardo: It's unknown at this point. Things that we've mentioned in the study are some sort of special assessment districts so where we feel there's a benefit to be around a certain radius around transit stations. There could be an assessment fee charged to businesses, that's a possibility. Related to that, if there are sort of these development areas identified so maybe there could be some sort of developer fee. It's really high level at this point and these are – I think the next phase must require additional public-private partnership analysis. Maybe even before further design and then environmental before it proceeds forward.

# TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: But what – I’m just curious, what process did you use to generate these alternatives so far?

Ms. Reggiardo: To generate the alternatives that we modeled?

Chair DuBois: Yeah, it was just – was it just SamTrans sponsoring this and coming up with these alternatives?

Ms. Reggiardo: Yeah, so our process was essentially we established project goals and we came up with a very, very large list of potential alternatives both on the highway bridge and the rail bridge. We put them through a screening process based on those goals to basically narrow down the list of alternatives that we thought were the most viable. Then we assembled them into packages for modeling purposes so in an attempt to use our travel demand model to project potential ridership. The process is documented at length in the report.

Chair DuBois: Do you guys have a good way to model rail traffic?

Ms. Reggiardo: Yeah, I think the – we used the [SCAG/VTA] regional travel demand model which I think is – how should I put it? It’s the trusted source of transit ridership in the region managed by VTA and run by a variety of consultants who are approved to run that model.

Chair DuBois: It’s specifically rail, it’s not an automotive model?

Ms. Reggiardo: It’s all transit so it’s can model our rail alternatives, it can model our bus alternatives, it also produces metrics related to vehicles and congestion levels. So, it spits out a variety of outputs that we use to evaluate the various alternatives. What it doesn’t do is project potential usage of a bicycle/pedestrian multi-use path.

Chair DuBois: Great, ok, thank you very much.

Ms. Reggiardo: Sure.

Mayor Scharff: So, just briefly, how does the ay trail interact with this at all in terms of bike and pedestrian?

Ms. Reggiardo: Good question. Since we’re not proposing the bicycle/pedestrian path on the Dumbarton right of way from Redwood City to East Pal Alto. We’ve suggested a potential alternative that utilizes existing and proposed portions of the Bay Trail instead. It’s a little bit more

# TRANSCRIPT

(inaudible) but it could be a potential to get folks from the Redwood City area to the Palo Alto area.

Mayor Scharff: Do you know the timing on the Bay Trail there?

Ms. Reggiardo: I do not off hand. If you're interested, I could pull up portions of the Bay Trail that we reference in our report.

Mayor Scharff: No, I was just wondering (inaudible) because I heard they had funded it but I was wondering when they were going to – because right now it ends at the foot of the Dumbarton Bridge.

Ms. Reggiardo: Right, I – if I understand it correctly, there's a portion in East Palo Alto that I believe they have funding to build out but don't quote me on that. Then, of course, there are plans throughout the Bay Area that I think is – the timelines are a bit staggered.

Mayor Scharff: So, the other question and just switching gears a little bit, is when you – so what kind of support have you gotten at MTC for these different alternatives and how much do you need MTC to move forward with it?

Ms. Reggiardo: MTC is acted as a stakeholder, as have many Cities and other transit agencies like VTA, ACE. So, they know what we are doing and one thing that they are doing is sort of picking up where we've left off with our short-term bus and approach improvements. They are doing their own study in the Marsh/Willow Bayfront area so I see that as a benefit. Certainly, we will need their continued support to move forward, especially in terms of funding.

Mayor Scharff: So, if you don't move forward with rail, would you still use the rail bridge then? I was a little unclear on that.

Ms. Reggiardo: It's not part of our current proposals though certainly – I mean if rail advances to the next phase of the study and if we proceed with the environmental document, we would keep the best option on the rail bridge alive as an alternative.

Mayor Scharff: Right but you would run rail on the rail bridge?

Ms. Reggiardo: That's what we're proposing. We think that's the best use of the rail bridge given that you can run buses on the highway bridge.



# TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: Right and that's what I was thinking. Could you make it a pedestrian bridge as well and run rail? I mean it would seem like – I've walked – I've run across the Dumbarton Bridge, that's no fun. It really isn't, it's awful. You know the high line in New York is so nice and I mean – it just seems like if the trains aren't going to run that frequently, it could be really pleasant.

Ms. Reggiardo: We definitely considered that. We ended up screening out the option of a bicycle/pedestrian path on the rail bridge primarily because it's already offered on the highway bridge.

Mayor Scharff: Yeah, but it's awful on the highway bridge.

Ms. Reggiardo: Understood, that's – I'd -- and we've – as part of our study proposed better striping, better pavement, better lighting. I mean there are things that can be done in the short term that can make that experience much better. Also, if you're – if you've ridden your bike out there, you'll know that it's not – no longer a class one facility when you get to Marsh Lands so there's a lot of improvements that can happen. We did not continue to look at bicycle and pedestrian access on the rail bridge because it does require an expansion of the bridge, which we have recommended as part of a two-track system. Mostly, you really have to expand it because there's sort of – there are safety issues with the bicycle/ pedestrian path where you'd almost have to provide a vehicle lane to get to folks if there were a potential accident. So, it's a much larger sort of expansion of the bridge to provide rail plus bicycle/pedestrian as opposed to two track rails.

Mayor Scharff: Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Great, thank you very much.

Ms. Reggiardo: Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Our next item is...

Mr. Mello: Just to close this out, we'll be drafting a letter that will we'll be bringing to City Council prior to the end of the public comment period for this study.

Chair DuBois: Ok and do we have any ideas what we'll be saying?

Mr. Mello: I think we have a little bit of concerns about the portions of the project that might add SOV capacity across the (inaudible). I think we'd like to see a little more modeling as to where those trips begin and end and what

# TRANSCRIPT

streets they use this side of the bridge. Then I think we may have some comments on the bus service operational plan but we're still really digging deep in the report and not quite sure what the response is going to be.

Chair DuBois: Ok, thank you.

NO ACTION TAKEN

## Interagency Communications

Chair DuBois: So, our next item is interagency communications. Does anybody have anything? I would say that I met with Dave Pine and we talked about regional coordination. I think there's some interest that if Cities could align their construction periods, it could be tremendous cost savings for Cities up and down the peninsula. So, just the idea of – if we need to close Caltrain for a period of time, if Cities were able to align it could really impact the cost that each City sees and he seemed very open to that.

## Next Steps and Future Agendas

Chair DuBois: I guess the last item here is future Agendas. Based on our meeting last night, I'd be really interested in guys maybe sending me your ideas for how, when, where the Rail Committee could meet to better engage the public. I think we'll probably have to agendize that for future rail discussion but I would really appreciate getting some input. I do think that we probably want to keep an administrative meeting but – which could be this meeting at this time and then we could add some additional meetings that would be more public outreach.

Mayor Scharff: I guess what I was thinking about that was I was looking for Staff to put together a proposal and then they could come forward to us and we'd have a discussion about it and see what works and do that. I do think the first step is for Staff to sort of go review that and come back to us.

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: I certainly agree. I think we want to do some drill-downs based on last night's Council discussion/direction on the specifics and timing of topics as it would come forward for the community discussion. Then bring some recommendations for the Rail Committee as to how that interaction might best proceed.

Chair DuBois: Again, the frequency and if we need to go weekly or bi-monthly, we need to figure that out.

# TRANSCRIPT

James Keene, City Manager: I think we may – well, we'll bring you some options but I think there may be some different time of day events too.

Chair DuBois: (Inaudible) weekends or evenings.

Council Member Fine: So, Tom I am just taking a note to email you some ideas but it kind of jives with what I was saying earlier where I think we do need – we need some kind of plan here on engagement, getting folks out there even if it's just being loud at times. Just in terms of some of the ideas that we were tossing around last night, if this Committee is to serve as a forum for folks who may want it to be at times focused on geographies or at times focused on specific problems or maybe even groups of people. So, maybe it's like we want to go and hang out by the Cal. Ave underpass during commute hours and see what the bikers think.

Mayor Scharff: I think the other thing I am going to do is I am going to point a couple of alternatives to the Rail Committee for when people can't make it or if they are conflicted out of a particular item or something like that so that we always have four Council Members. Given that there may be a lot of meetings that we have with the Rail Committee and someone may not be able to make it.

Mr. Keene: If a – Molly is not here and I best weigh in, I think the info sharing is good. I'm not sure all of you individually mailing the Chair your ideas and your thoughts doesn't kind of create a little bit of a Brown Act thing. So maybe you would just send them to me, to us and we'll share them with the whole Committee. That way we can also share them publicly at the same time.

Chair DuBois: Yep, sounds good. Great, I think with that...

Mr. Keene: I had one last question, I apologize for this. Going back to your earlier request about the event on the 16<sup>th</sup> and doing something related to the trench. I'm just curious when we say that, what is the scale or the scope of the trench when we're talking about that? I mean I don't want to get into a big discussion about it but...

Chair DuBois: It's just that the way the meeting structure has been by individual separation – grade seps and I think a lot of people have heard of the trench or are interested in the trench. It's not on the agenda the way the discussion has been managed and it never comes up.

Joshua Mello, Chief Transportation Official: The morning brainstorming session would certainly be an appropriate time to discuss large solutions like

# TRANSCRIPT

a trench or a City-wide solution. So, we can make – we can be sure to structure that portion to accommodate folks who want to discuss something larger than just individual grade separations.

Chair DuBois: I mean I think it would be helpful for that to be explicatively brought up.

Mayor Scharff: There are two trenching alternatives. I think we've...

Mr. Keene: That's what I meant, that was my point.

Mayor Scharff: I think we need to break them out separately and if we – I think we need to really emphasize the constraints of a Citywide – of an entire rail corridor trench because I actually think that's a rat hole there. Really, I can't imagine it making any sense but I do think we need to break it out and at least have that discussion.

Mr. Mello: The morning brainstorming portion is going to be more of an unconstrained session where we're going to look at pie in the sky options and then that will be followed by a discussion of what some of the constraints are. Then there will be a little more constrained discussion in the afternoon with people having a better understanding of what some of those constraints are.

Mayor Scharff: Are we going to have – you're talking about each intersection – some – each intersection – each grade crossing. Do we have a discussion on the Alma crossing as well?

Mr. Mello: Yes, so the afternoon there will be two sessions. One – the first 30-minutes people will be able to pick which location they want to discuss and they will go to that table. If we have a whole bunch of people that want to talk about Churchill, we'll add additional tables for Churchill. Then the second session, which will also be 30-minutes, we're going to ask people to go to a different location so that we get people's opinions on grade crossings that they may not be as familiar with. We'll get a diversity of opinions on the different locations.

Mayor Scharff: You know this is an interesting vote with your (inaudible) approach. So, let's sort of keep some sort of sense of how many people are interested in each grade crossing.

Chair DuBois: With that, meeting adjourned. Thank you, guys.

Adjournment: Meeting adjourned at 9:19 A.M.

# TRANSCRIPT