



## HIGH SPEED RAIL COMMITTEE

---

Special Meeting  
July 29, 2010

Council Member Klein called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. in the Council Chambers, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Klein, Shepherd, Price

Absent: Burt

### 1. Oral Communications

Herb Borock, Palo Alto, spoke regarding an item on the June 15, 2010 agenda titled Legislative Update. He said the items were actually about two legislative services contracts. He said the items were continued until the July 29, 2010 meeting. He said that on the current agenda there was nothing regarding one of the contracts. Yet there was an item on an upcoming Council meeting regarding both contracts. He said that the agendas needed to be more detailed and when items were continued they can not be removed from the agenda.

### 2. Approval of July 1 Minutes

Council Member Shepherd said she had not reviewed the minutes.

Council Member Klein said they would continue them until later.

### 3. Discussion of engineering on-call services with Hatch Mott MacDonald (HMM)

Deputy City Manager Steve Emslie spoke regarding the HMM item. He said that Staff recommends approval of the contract since on-call services will be required as the project moves forward. The peer review of technical responses will be critical.

Council Member Klein asked if there was a difference in the amount from the report at the last meeting. .

High Speed Rail Project Manager Rob Braulik said the amount at the last meeting was a preliminary number. Since then the amount has been refined to \$120,000.

Council Member Klein asked if that was an outside amount.

Mr. Emslie said that was correct, the amount billed would not exceed \$120,000.

Council Member Klein said it wasn't like building something some thing new where a precise estimate would be possible. It would vary depending on the services needed.

Mr. Emslie said that was correct. They would be charged on a time and materials basis up to that amount.

Council Member Price pointed out a typo on the report that indicated the High Speed Rail Committee was a subcommittee. She also asked if they could add that the Consultant may be required to insure there are display sized graphics as it was critical to provide engineering information in a format that was accessible to all concerned parties.

Council Member Shepherd asked if they could begin having a running tab of the High Speed Rail costs each month as it comes from the Council Contingency Fund and this is outside of what was budgeted.

Herb Borock, Palo Alto, said this item was not the same as the item that was continued from the last meeting. He said the motion they were about to make was to advise the Council. He said it was listed on the Staff Report for the next Council meeting as a Staff recommendation not a Committee recommendation. He said the Staff report should be revised to reflect proper procedure. He voiced continued concern about the Capitol Advocates, Inc. contract that has dropped off the agenda.

Council Member Shepherd said the narrowing of the Alternatives Analysis would be published the following week. She asked Staff if HMM would review that in addition to the Draft EIR.

Mr. Emslie said that it was for assisting Staff in reviewing the comments on the Alternatives Analysis.

**MOTION:** Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Klein that the High Speed Rail Committee recommend to the City Council approval of the contract with Hatch Mott MacDonald in an amount not to exceed \$120,000 for on-call engineering services with an amendment to include a requirement that the consultant provide display sized graphics.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0, Burt Absent

**MOTION:** Council Member Shepherd moved, seconded by Council Member Price to direct Staff to keep a running tally of costs associated with the Hatch Mott MacDonald contract.

Council Member Klein asked if Staff already did that.

Mr. Emslie said staff does track the contract costs, but they will add a monthly report to the High Speed Rail Committee Agenda.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0, Burt Absent

4. Discussion of Technical Working Group Worksheets (tentative)

Summary of comments made by John Litzinger, P.E., Associate Vice President, HNTB at the Palo Alto High Speed Rail Standing Committee meeting Thursday, July 29th, 2010

Mr. Litzinger brought to the meeting an aerial photo map of the City of Palo Alto. In addition, he brought various track layouts and sample building blocks.

These materials were used to describe various track layouts and designs for a potential mid-peninsula high speed rail (HSR) line in Palo Alto. He superimposed on the aerial map blocks showing the scale of a new HSR station (estimated to be 67,000') next to the existing Caltrain Palo Alto station. He also showed what a 500 space parking garage five stories in height would look (i.e., the scale of one) near a mid-peninsula station. He said the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) has specified a station would require a total of 3,000 parking spaces. These spaces would not have to be all located next to a station but they would need to be within a 3 mile radius of the station. He said the new HSR station could be located on top of a proposed parking garage. He referenced the station could be located vertically in alignment (i.e., a north-south alignment) with the existing Caltrain station or it could be positioned horizontally (i.e., a west-east alignment) across and over the tracks. The new station would include more than just a station for rail but would also include

shops and other commercial retail and service establishments to serve passengers. He referenced the platform length for an HSR train would need to be nearly 1,400' long. He outlined various track alignments and options including aerial, 4-track cut and cover trench etc. with each option requiring a different track right-of-way width. He said the 4-track trench option was estimated could be done within a width of approximately 82'. He also referenced during his presentation worksheets that had been completed at the two previous Technical Working Group (TWG) meetings held in June and July. These meetings are attended by technical staff from communities along the rail corridor. The group totals nearly 40 staff and they are broken up into groups to discuss rail alignment and related criteria for HSR in their particular segment of the HSR line on the peninsula. Palo Alto is segment 6. Palo Alto and staff from adjoining agencies (e.g., Atherton, Menlo Park and others) discuss the worksheets together to facilitate coordination and collaboration of interests and priorities. HNTB plans to hold a series of public workshops on the station design, criteria and options during the last three weeks of September 2010. More information will be forthcoming.

5. Legislative Update

Assistant City Manager Steve Emslie said there was nothing to report as the Legislators were not currently in session.

5. Updates and Informational Items

None.

6. Future Meetings and Agendas

Council Member Klein said that Staff had suggested the August 5, 2010 meeting should be cancelled to allow participation in the High Speed Rail Authority meeting on the same date.

Council Member Shepherd asked if Staff needed to be there for the entire meeting from 9:00 am to 2:00 pm.

Mr. Emslie said that his understanding was that most of the meeting would be spent on the Alternative Analysis Report. Staff felt it important to attend.

**MOTION:** Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Price to cancel the High Sped Rail Committee meeting on August 5, 2010.

**MOTION PASSED:** 3-0, Burt Absent

Mr. Emslie suggested August 19, 2010.

Council Member Klein said that Council Members Burt and Shepherd would be out of town on the 19<sup>th</sup>.

Council Member Shepherd said she would be available on August 20, 2010 if the Committee would like to meet then.

Council Member Price asked what the agenda would be.

Mr. Emslie it would be a more in depth discussion of the Alternatives Analysis Report. He said the 20<sup>th</sup> was a Peninsula Cities Consortium meeting from 8:00 am to 10:30 am, so the High Speed Rail Committee could meet after.

Council Member Klein requested the City Clerk complete a survey to determine a date for them to meet in August.

Council Member Price asked about the first September meeting.

Council Member Klein confirmed they would try to meet once in August and then return to the regular schedule in September.

Council Member Shepherd asked when the revised Alternatives Analysis is released what the City's duty was to respond.

Mr. Emslie said it has not been indicated one way or the other.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 10:05 a.m.