



CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE

FINAL MINUTES

Special Meeting
September 26, 2018

Council Member Wolbach called the meeting to order at 8:01 A.M. in the Council Chambers, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Fine, Kou, Wolbach

Absent: Scharff

Oral Communications

Penny Ellson announced that the answer she got from the Citizen Advisory Panel (CAP) regarding traffic safety studies in terms of pedestrians and bicycles was very unsatisfactory. She urged the Rail Committee (Committee) to investigate those safety studies and to understand what the impacts would be to pedestrians, bicyclists, and increased motor vehicle numbers.

Stephen Rosenblum wanted to register a complaint about the Agenda in that there were no hyperlinks to any documentation on Item 2 for the meeting. Also, the provided handout was not adequate.

Jason Matlof urged Staff not to just collect gross traffic counts at each grade crossing but to do specific turning data as well. He voiced that he wanted the Committee to pursue overlaying the Google's phone data on top of any traffic studies. He wanted the Committee and Staff to investigate reconstruction of the Embarcadero overpass to include a drop-down lane and other various ideas that Staff had verbally articulated to him.

Cedric de La Beaujardiers declared he did a visual analysis of if the Palo Alto (City) could install a raised rail in various parts of the City. He was not in support of eliminating any viaduct options until a cost analysis was done. He was not in support of closing intersections or any tunneling options because they were too expensive.

Ellen Hartog articulated that she lived in South Palo Alto and her main concern was the removal of all the trees they were proposing to be removed.

FINAL MINUTES

Agenda Items

1. Proposed Cooperation Agreement With the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Regarding Caltrain Electrification Project.

Robert de Geus, Assistant City Manager introduced Casey Fromson and John Funghi. The item was to provide an overview to the Rail Committee (Committee) about the electrification project Caltrain was constructing and then discuss the draft Corporation Agreement between the City of Palo Alto (City) and the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB).

Casey Fromson, Director of Government and Community Affairs, Caltrain explained that Caltrain is a 77-mile train corridor. Caltrain only owns a 51-mile section between San Francisco and San Jose and that was the section in which electrification would be implemented. The City was the second busiest station on the Caltrain corridor. She declared that many of the locomotives and passenger rail cars should be retired but Caltrain continued to use the trains until modernization was achieved. She noted that 60 percent of riders had access to a car but chose to take the train. In terms of electrification it would be an overhead contact system and then there would be traction powered facilities along the corridor. New Electrical Multipole Units (EMUs) would be introduced and those would replace 75 percent of the diesel trains but Caltrain does plan to fully electrify the fleet in the near future. Some gained benefits of electrifying the tracks would include an increase in the number of trains per hour, more stations, reduced travel time, restoring service at existing stations that were currently shut down, and there would be continued tenant service on the corridor. Key regional benefits included a reduction in greenhouse gases, reduction in daily traffic, and a reduction in engine noise from the trains. Caltrain planned to have a virtual reality tour of the new trains at the end of 2018, early 2019.

John Funghi, Chief Officer, Caltrain Modernization Program continued the presentation with the construction phase. The 51-mile Caltrain owned corridor would be cut into 4 construction segments to minimize community disturbance and all construction work would be performed at night. Segment 3 included Palo Alto and it would cover two stations and a parallel station. Paralleling stations were designed to equalize the power load between passing trains. Pre-construction work was completed and that included identifying everything that was in the ground that would be impacted by construction. Foundation potholing and tree pruning were in progress. In 2019 Caltrain was planning to start pouring the foundation,

FINAL MINUTES

install the poles and build the paralleling station in the City. In terms of trees, 52 were proposed to be removed in the Caltrain right of way and 5 on public property but per the Palo Alto Tree Replacement Plan 120 trees were planned to be replaced elsewhere in the City. There were 200 poles proposed to be installed along the Palo Alto corridor section, pole heights ranged from 30 to 45.5 feet, and the spacing between poles was approximately 180 feet. He stated that there was a hotline in place in case any community members had complaints about construction. All tunnel work would be done between October 6, 2018, through spring of 2019. Train services would be suspended during those weekends but a bus service would be provided for free.

Chair Wolbach wanted to know what a safe distance would be in regards to the El Palo Alto Tree.

Walter Passmore, Urban Forestry Manager emphasized that it would be ideal to have a larger distance than the proposed 25-foot in the Corporation Agreement. He went on to explain that the Tree Protection Zone was defined as a radius equal to ten times the diameter of the tree and in terms of the El Palo Alto Tree it would be in the range of an 80 to 100-foot radius.

Chair Wolbach asked what the communication had been like between Caltrain and the City in terms of trees.

Mr. de Geus confirmed that his experience working with Caltrain had been positive. He added that Caltrain was not legally obligated to have a Corporation Agreement with local Cities.

Chair Wolbach inquired if Caltrain would be amenable to broadening the Tree Protection Zone around the El Palo Alto Tree to the suggested 80 to 100-foot radius.

Ms. Fromson answered that in the Corporation Agreement it stated that Palo Alto would do all the pruning work that was needed to be done to the El Palo Alto Tree.

Chair Wolbach reiterated that it was not just pruning he was concerned about but construction work close to the tree.

FINAL MINUTES

Ms. Fromson announced that Caltrain would take that into consideration and would make sure the right processes was in place to protect outside of the 25-foot radius.

Mr. de Geus noted Staff would investigate that suggestion of changing the Tree Protection Zone for the El Palo Alto Tree. He noted that the City Arborist would be present when construction work was being performed.

Council Member Fine inquired if the potholing process had started in the City.

Mr. Funghi announced that some of it had been started already.

Council Member Fine wanted to know why the agreement was coming to the Committee so late if some of the pre-construction work had already been started.

Mr. de Geus reported that he was not familiar with the timeline but guessed that as other priorities surfacing it got pushed back.

Council Member Fine asked if because pre-construction work had already started if the City was in any jeopardy implementing the Corporation Agreement late.

Ms. Fromson responded that the agreement did have language that stated City Staff would be reimbursed for doing any reviews prior to the implementation of the agreement.

Council Member Fine inquired what the paralleling stations and traction power facilities looked like.

Mr. Funghi announced that they looked like a small facility with some switch gears and enclosed transformers.

Council Member Fine asked if those were being installed on Joint Powers Board (JPB) right of way, parallel to the track.

Mr. Funghi confirmed that was correct.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Fine asked Caltrain to provide a map of the areas the paralleling stations and traction power facilities would be located. He asked who would be responsible for ongoing maintenance for trees and if a pruning schedule was in place.

Mr. Funghi articulated that most trees fall within the JPB right of way and so Caltrain would be responsible for the pruning of those trees. Any trees that were outside of the public right of way Caltrain would prune those as well as per the Corporation Agreement if the trees became a safety hazard. In terms of the El Palo Alto Tree, he cautioned the Committee on making the language in the Corporative Agreement to restrictive and suggested that the Committee let Caltrain work with the City Arborist and Staff to determine the best possible solution to protect that tree.

Council Member Fine announced that the El Palo Alto Tree was sacred and that all methods needed to be performed to protect the tree.

Council Member Kou emphasized that the City Arborist was to be involved with anything that had to do with the El Palo Alto Tree. She advised that language should be added to the agreement stating who would be responsible if there were damage to the El Palo Alto Tree. She wanted to know if the full Council was going to see the contract before it was approved.

Mr. de Geus stated that Staff was recommending the Committee recommend the Corporation Agreement to the full City Council.

Council Member Kou inquired about the Tree Replacement Plan.

Ms. Fromson commented that Caltrain did work with the City Arborist on the Tree Replacement Plan. In the Tree Replacement Plan it indicated the size and type of tree that were proposed to be planted.

Council Member Kou stated that the Council and the community would be interested in seeing the Tree Replacement Plan. Also, she agreed with Council Member Fine that a map would be nice and that the map should show which tree belonged to Caltrain, which trees belonged to the City and which were on private land.

Ms. Fromson articulated that any community member could call Caltrain or come to their office if they had questions. She added that Caltrain was at 35

FINAL MINUTES

percent design for the City and it was a design-build contract and there could be some changes.

Davina Brown articulated that she was a strong supporter of the trench alternative.

Nadia Naik voiced her agreement that a map showing all the trees was a good idea. She stated that the El Palo Alto Tree should have its own agreement and that the problem with the tree was not the pruning but the roots and how the roots travel underground. She suggested that a City Arborist be placed on the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the TAC should be used to vet any engineering decisions or any assignment that is given to Apex Strategies (AECOM).

Cedric de La Beaujardiers voiced his support for the electrification project but he was concerned about bike theft on the trains. He suggested incorporating seats with bike storage to minimize bike theft. He wanted to know what Caltrain's privacy policy was for the video feed they were planning to use inside the trains.

Council Member Kou announced that she would like to have language included in the Corporation Agreement stating that all electrification poles be uniform in design, with an eye toward aesthetics and minimizing the destruction of trees and vegetation. She also wanted to review the original design proposal between Caltrain and Balfour Beatty Construction Group. In terms of Item Number N, Courtesy Review, she wanted to strike the word courtesy and have it say Mandatory Review by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) as well as the Historic Resources Board (HRB). She wanted Green Meadow, Professorville, El Palo Alto Tree, and any other historic sites to be called out in the Corporation Agreement.

Ms. Fromson explained that all historic sites were called out in the Environmental Impact Review (EIR) and that she would have to go back and check why some were called out in the Corporation Agreement and why some were not.

Council Member Kou questioned if Caltrain had consulted the HRB to determine which areas were historic.

Ms. Fromson declared that Caltrain followed all state and local historic policies.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou advised that all historical information should be provided to Council when the item is brought to them.

Ms. Fromson declared that all measures would be taken to minimize tree and vegetation impacts in terms of pole installation and that was all stated in the EIR.

Council Member Kou wanted to know if Caltrain had identified the placement of all the poles that would be installed along the City's corridor.

Mr. Funghi disclosed that the EIR stated the placement of poles and their design and that EIR had been approved. He explained that the Courtesy Review as labeled in the Cooperation Agreement was just a check in with the ARB and HRB to make sure that all the points stated in the EIR were being followed by Caltrain.

Chair Wolbach asked if Caltrain Staff was comfortable removing the word courtesy from the agreement.

Mr. Funghi proposed to work with Staff to strike the word courtesy but also in its place with an understanding of expectation to the various Boards in terms of what the review was supposed to encompass.

Mr. de Geus explained that the City did not have the authority to review and say yes or no to the electrification project but Caltrain was proposing the Corporation Agreement in good faith.

Council Member Kou reiterated that Staff revise and strengthen the indemnification language that was in the agreement. She added that she wanted story poles to be placed in the select locations so that there was a better visualization of how tall the poles would be.

Mr. Funghi reported that the EIR reviewed the height of the poles and it determined what the best height should be. Also, that there were things in the Corporation Agreement that could be changed but there were many things that could not be changed due to safety protocols.

Ms. Fromson added that there were exhibits in the EIR showing what the poles would look like and Caltrain Staff could provide those to the City.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou reiterated that a story pole would be a better visualization than a picture of an electrification pole.

Ms. Fromson stated that there were real life poles existing if anyone wanted to go and see what they would look like.

Council Member Kou asked about light intrusion and noise from construction work being performed at night.

Ms. Fromson emphasized that acoustical blankets were placed around the construction site, all lights were to be faced into the construction zone, and other mitigation measures were written out in the EIR document to prevent light intrusion and noise.

Council Member Kou inquired about what the notice process was to inform residents of construction work.

Ms. Fromson articulated that residents received notices ¼-mile from the track that work was going to be done and those were also accessible online.

Council Member Kou asked if the El Palo Alto Tree could be placed in a separate agreement as was suggested by a public speaker.

Ms. Fromson announced that he believed the EIR had satisfactory language in it regarding the El Palo Alto Tree and that an additional agreement would not be needed. He added that Caltrain Staff and City Staff would investigate if the Protection Tree Zone could be widened.

Council Member Kou affirmed that she did not agree with that and she wanted the El Palo Alto Tree to have its own mitigation measures.

Mr. Funghi announced that the City would be pruning the El Palo Alto Tree.

Council Member Kou wanted to know if Caltrain would be reimbursing the City for the pruning of the tree.

Mr. Funghi reiterated that there was reimbursement language in the Corporation Agreement.

FINAL MINUTES

Chair Wolbach stated he would be supporting a Tree Protection Zone around the El Palo Alto Tree of more than 25-feet as well.

Council Member Fine requested that Caltrain Staff suggest some language to incorporate into the Corporation Agreement about the El Palo Alto Tree.

Mr. Funghi reiterated that they were happy to work with Staff and the City Attorney to come up with some language that would benefit both Caltrain and Palo Alto.

Council Member Fine wanted to know if there was any more information that the Committee should be aware of in terms of the El Palo Alto Tree.

Mr. Passmore stated that his primary concern was modifying the root environment of the El Palo Alto Tree. He was concerned about substantial excavation, any modification to soil compaction, and changing the nutrients and air content in the surrounding soil. He added that the railroad tracks were very close to the large structural roots of the tree. He was not concerned about the pruning of the El Palo Alto Tree.

Council Member Fine asked if the City Arborists had ever tried to map the root system.

Mr. Passmore declared that there had been a root analysis on the park side of the El Palo Alto Tree but the roots were more extensive outside of the park.

Council Member Fine inquired if Caltrain was amenable to the City surveying the root system on the west side of the tracks before construction work was to start.

Mr. Funghi responded it was a qualified yes because there were significant safety rules that applied around a train track.

MOTION: Council Member Fine moved, seconded by Chair Wolbach to recommend the City Council authorize the City Manager to enter into a comprehensive agreement with the Peninsula Joint Powers Board on the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project with the following modifications:

FINAL MINUTES

- A. Direct City Staff and Caltrain to work with the City Arborist to strengthen protection for El Palo Alto in the Agreement Section I. 2.

Chair Wolbach suggested an Amendment to expand the Tree Protection Zone.

Council Member Fine agreed with previous comments that Caltrain should provide a map showing which trees were to be removed, who owned which tree and then a site plan of all the construction work.

Chair Wolbach announced that he would be looking for in the modified Corporation Agreement an analysis of the El Palo Alto Tree's root system.

Council Member Kou suggested an Amendment to take out the word courtesy.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion a new Part B "Remove the word "courtesy" from the Agreement Section N, sub-points 1 through 3"

Council Member Kou wanted stronger language for indemnification.

Council Member Fine asked Council Member Kou if she meant specifically to the El Palo Alto Tree or everything.

Council Member Kou answered that she meant the tree, property, and people.

Council Member Fine was amendable to strengthening the indemnification language around the El Palo Alto Tree but nothing else.

INCORPORATED INTO THE MOTION WITH THE CONSENT OF THE MAKER AND SECONDER to add to the Motion a new Part C "Strengthen the indemnifications related to El Palo Alto"

Mr. de Geus voiced that Staff and Caltrain would need to follow up with the City Attorney and Caltrain's attorney to make sure that the language was legal.

FINAL MINUTES

Jessica Brettle, Assistant City Clerk amended the Motion to reflect what the Committee had voiced.

MOTION AS AMENDED: Council Member Fine moved, seconded by Chair Wolbach to recommend the City Council authorize the City Manager to enter into a comprehensive agreement with the Peninsula Joint Powers Board on the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project with the following modifications:

- A. Direct City Staff and Caltrain to work with the City Arborist to strengthen protection for El Palo Alto in the Agreement Section I. 2.;
- B. Remove the word "courtesy" from the Agreement Section N, sub-points 1 through 3; and
- C. Strengthen the indemnifications related to the El Palo Alto Tree.

Nadia Naik articulated that were comments in the EIR stating that the bridge needed to be modified and that work would impact the El Palo Alto Tree. She agreed that a scan of the El Palo Alto tree's root system had been ongoing since 2014 and getting that information, once it was available, would help the City and Caltrain better understand how best to protect the tree.

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED: 3-0 Scharff absent

The Committee took a break from 9:47 A.M. until 9:53 A.M.

- 2. Traffic Study Scope Review for Palo Alto Avenue Closure and Churchill Closure Alternatives – Discussion.

Rob de Geus, Assistant City Manager introduced Etty Mercurio from Apex Strategies (AECOM) and Nayan Amin from TJKM who would be talking about traffic impacts if Churchill, Palo Alto Avenue, and/or a combination of both were to be closed. He summarized that the City Council (Council) had narrowed down the preferred alternative to seven for the existing four crossings. Council had used the Council adopted criteria, technical data that provided feasibility constraints and impact trade, community outreach, and combining ideas to get down to the preferred seven alternatives.

FINAL MINUTES

Etty Mercurio, AECOM announced that she had a discussion with the Community Advisory Panel (CAP) on the impact reports and was now hoping to continue that discussion with the Rail Committee (Committee).

Nayan Amin, TJKM Traffic Impact Specialists articulated that the scope of work that had been performed in terms of traffic analysis was strictly for evaluating the impacts to pedestrian, bicycles, and automobiles if Churchill and Palo Alto grade crossings were closed. He stated that the consulting team had been using several different methods to collect the data including 24-hour counts and during peak times turning movement counts. The consulting team would be using the Santa Clara County Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Travel Demand Model as well as the City of Palo Alto's Travel Demand Model to determine future projections. Existing data that would be used was data collected in February 2017 and that included turning movements during peak hours and average daily traffic. The CAP had suggested looking at surrounding intersections and roadway segments to determine what the impacts would be to those roadways.

Chair Wolbach wanted to know why the Committee did not receive a Staff report stating the objective the Committee was supposed to be weighing in on, the City map and other critical informational pieces.

Mr. de Geus stated that Staff did not have enough time to get those documents into the Packets. He stated that Staff was not looking for the Committee to narrow down more options, it was strictly informational.

Chair Wolbach declared he thought the Committee was at the point of narrowing down the alternatives and conducting more deeper dive studies.

Mr. de Geus explained that this work was part of a deep dive studies for the seven preferred alternatives and this work would help the Committee later narrow the alternatives down further.

Ms. Mercurio confirmed that Apex Strategies (AECOM) was working on deep dive studies for the seven preferred alternatives.

Council Member Fine asked Staff if they were using any other services beyond Synchro.

FINAL MINUTES

Mr. Amin answered that the VTA Travel Demand Model was on a Cube platform. Synchro was an operational model and provided the average delays that happened at intersections.

Council Member Fine wanted to know what a partial closure would look like.

Ms. Mercurio noted that in terms of traffic impact a partial closure or full closure would produce the same analysis data.

Mr. Amin added that a partial closure means having the gates down during the peak hours for all modes of transportation. For that reason, the partial closure was not being evaluated because Staff was looking at peak times only.

Council Member Kou questioned if Staff determined the safety factor based on collision data and she wanted to know how the collisions were counted if they were never reported.

Mr. Amin answered that was correct and there was no way Staff could count collisions that were not reported. He added that the State of California required that the public report any collision damage if it was over a specified dollar amount to the DMV.

Barbara Hazlett disclosed that she was speaking on behalf of Professorville constituents and her neighbors from Emerson Street. She noted that it was important to add pedestrian and bicycle safety to Embarcadero, High Street and Emerson Street to the scope of the study. She suggested that the consulting Staff do a robust baseline analysis of traffic at all crossings in their existing condition and compare that against all other traffic study impute.

David Shen stated that he was representing the North Old Palo Alto Group and he was a member of the CAP. In terms of the map, he noticed a dot was missing at the intersection of Lincoln and Emerson and Castilleja and Churchill in Southgate. He suggested a discussion should take place discussing the closure of just the top of Churchill. He wanted further traffic analysis done on Emerson, Bryant, Waverly, Cowper, and Webster.

FINAL MINUTES

Mike Forster articulated that he lived in Evergreen Park and he was in support of the Palo Alto Avenue overcrossing hybrid. He was also in support of the viaduct option over Charleston and Meadow.

Nadia Naik acknowledged that the City was short Staffed but she was concerned the public would not be able to keep up if all supporting documentation was not supplied on time. She urged the Committee that they needed to meet more than once a month. She asked the traffic consultant if Synchro was able to calculate train preemption but if it could not do that she was not supportive of using Synchro. She suggested using the INRIX data to determine and understand why people were turning onto Alma.

Penny Ellson stated she was disappointed that the traffic studies focused more on automobiles and not bikes or pedestrians. She voiced that the consultants should talk to the school district about how kids get to and from school and where the major routes were. She also asked if the CAP had discussed safe routes to school.

Adina Levin disclosed she was representing Friends of Caltrain and she agreed with the previous speaker that bike routes and school routes needed to be analyzed. She articulated that if the El Palo Alto Tree were to be in danger, she suggested rerouting the cars to University Avenue but reconstruct University Avenue and its layout.

Neilson Buchanan voiced that he did not know what was going to happen to the Downtown North neighborhood and requested that more outreach be done to that neighborhood.

Kerry Yarkin concurred with a previous speaker that Embarcadero between Webster and Cowper was a real problem area. She suggested to include traffic that occurred during Stanford games.

Rob Levitsky announced that he was not in support of closing Churchill because 400 cars and bikes would be rerouted to other crossings and overloading them.

Stephen Rosenblum stated he was confused on the way a deep dive analysis was happening on two alternatives when the other alternatives were not fully vetted. He supported the alternative of a bore tunnel and viaducts. He

FINAL MINUTES

announced that any alternatives that reduced connectivity should be thought of as a last resort.

Susan Newman was a resident of Southgate and she concurred with all the previous speakers' comments. She wanted to know if there was any information available about the assumption that was built into the Travel Demand Model. She also wanted to know if traffic was analyzed for the Stanford expansion. She was not in support of closing Churchill and she supported the viaduct alternative.

Council Member Fine stated to the public that this was not the official traffic study and it was done to help figure out what the scoping should be, what issues needed more evaluated, and other important points. He suggested to Staff to look at all modes of transportation, to investigate other intersections that the public had pointed out, and train preemption.

Council Member Kou reiterated that she was disappointed that the Committee and the CAP did not receive all the materials on time. She articulated that if Palo Alto Avenue were to close then more analysis needed to happen for University and Embarcadero. She wanted more analysis done around Professorville, the El Palo Alto Tree, and Oregon Express Way. She concurred with a previous speaker's comment that a baseline should be made to see how existing traffic flows. She wanted the consultants to analysis cut through traffic and she agreed that the Stanford expansion needed to be analyzed. She wanted the Seal Avenue Pedestrian and Bike Pathway to be included on the map. She wanted to discuss the Loma Verde bike path and how that path would connect east and west. She concluded that she wanted more analysis done in terms of the south side of Palo Alto and to install a car counter in the Willows area. She voiced that all information should be vetted through the CAP and the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) before it is brought to the Committee.

Chair Wolbach stated that his concerns were regarding data sources, bike and pedestrian safety, the Palo Alto Avenue to University segment and more emphasis and analysis should be put into the ideas of adding more bike and pedestrian tunnels. He wanted to know that if the El Palo Alto Tree caused too many constraints for the Palo Alto Avenue crossing, would all options for that crossing be off the table. If that was the case, then he suggested a study for a University Station Coordinated Area Plan. In terms of data source, he emphasized that it was important to understand the routes of travel and to partner with various companies that had that data.

FINAL MINUTES

Council Member Kou added that she wanted data on road use for all forms of transportation during different weather conditions.

Mr. Amin responded that if data collection were to include collection during different weather conditions, then he would need another year to be able to collect that data and then analyze it. Under normal circumstances data was only collected on dry days with no collisions happening on that segment of road.

Council Member Kou wanted to know why data collection was happening before the holidays.

Mr. Amin answered that data was not collected during the holiday season because they wanted to get data that was not polluted by the increase of holiday visitors. He added that they would investigate data collection for when there were Stanford events. All the public schools would be included in the analysis.

Chair Wolbach emphasized that there is data available from other sources and that the analysis did not need to solely rely on new data collection.

Mr. Amin reiterated that they were planning to collect the origin and destination data from a third-party vendor.

Council Member Kou declared that some of the data collected in February 2017 were collected during the Palo Alto Unified School District's (PAUSD) holiday.

Mr. Amin confirmed that that data would not be used as a baseline.

Nadia Naik stated that the Committee needed to slow down because there was a community meeting in October and November.

Ms. Mercurio corrected that there was no community meeting in October.

Ms. Naik continued to state that the Committee needed to meet more often.

NO ACTION TAKEN

FINAL MINUTES

3. Community Advisory Panel (CAP) Update – Discussion.

Robert de Geus, Assistant City Manager announced that there had been two Community Advisory Panel (CAP) meetings in the past month that had excellent attendance. The CAP Members reviewed the materials for the upcoming community meeting in the first meeting. In the second meeting, they provided input on the traffic scope and logistics, discussed the tunnel idea, and started a discussion on financing. In terms of the August 23, 2018 community meeting, he stated that the public liked the format, location, time for that meeting and there was good attendance. The next community meeting was scheduled for November 28, 2018. The website had been updated and he encouraged community members to check it out.

Etty Mercurio, AECOM added that the CAP would meet in October and November and the dates for those meetings were on the website.

Council Member Kou wanted to know if a map could be put up in the Council Chambers.

Mr. de Geus answered he would look into it.

Penny Ellson articulated that the Green Meadow CAP representative had not been conveying information to the Green Meadow Neighborhood. Also, that there were no Safe Routes to School representative on the CAP.

Nadia Naik reiterated that the CAP meetings were scheduled for October 10, 2018, and November 7, 2018, and then the community meeting was November 28, 2018. She emphasized that it was important to have a conversation to catch people up on what a Comprehensive Plan was, what a traffic study was and how to read it and other basic information that could be helpful. She wanted clarification from the Rail Committee (Committee) and the City Council (Council) on how CAP Members were to communicate outside of a meeting.

Chair Wolbach articulated that he had supported the creation of the CAP but was disappointed that there was no representation from the Safe Routes to School group. He emphasized that CAP Members needed all informational materials several days before the CAP meetings. He declared that CAP Members could talk to each other outside of a meeting and that Staff was planning to provide clarification on that at the next CAP meeting.

FINAL MINUTES

Phil Burton declared he was a member of the CAP and he represented South of Mid-Town. He advised that it was important that CAP Members could share information amongst each other outside of the CAP meetings.

Council Member Kou affirmed that Safe Routes to School Members were invited to come to the CAP meetings along with any other community members.

Mr. de Geus added that there was going to be a special meeting taking place with the Safe Routes to School stakeholder group.

Verbal Update on Interagency Activities

Chair Wolbach reported that it was important that the City of Palo Alto send a letter to Caltrain requesting clarity about the constraints under which the City was operating and how those may change in the future. Also, to include in the letter clarification on grade angles up to 2 percent, 18 ½-foot vertical clearances in terms of train trenches with roadways going over the top, and other possible economic engineering constraints. He suggested getting a Staff Member from Caltrain and the City's lobbyists to attend future Rail Committee meetings.

Council Member Kou noted that Staff needed to reach out to the Elected Officials in Sacramento and find out what rights the City had in terms of the rail corridor and freight trains.

Next Steps and Future Agendas

Chair Wolbach stated that he would be meeting with Staff to discuss if having more Rail Committee meetings were necessary or to slow down the process due to Staffing issues.

Council Member Kou wanted to know what topics would be discussed at the next community meeting.

Etty Mercurio, AECOM answered that the general idea was to bring construction staging information to the public for review, have a finance conversation and then have the traffic studies presented.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned at 11:19 A.M.