



RAIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Special Meeting
Thursday, March 28, 2013

Chair Shepherd called the meeting to order at 9:01 A.M., in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Burt, Klein (arrived at 9:03 A.M.), Kniss, Shepherd (Chair)

Absent:

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Herb Borock was surprised to see the Mayor's letter supporting SB 557 as the bill included language opposed by the Rail Committee. The bill should not be supported in its present form.

2. Approval of Minutes

January 31, 2013 and February 13, 2013

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to approve the Minutes as presented.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

3. Updates

- California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA)
- Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB)
- Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC)
- Caltrain Local Policymaker Group
- California State Rail Plan

John Garamendi Jr., Professional Evaluation Group Inc. mentioned that he could provide the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) report during the discussion of Agenda Item 4.

MINUTES

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist reported the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) discussed and approved the updated agreement with CHSRA on March 7, 2013. The Caltrain Local Policymaker Group agendaized a presentation on the Caltrain Communication Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS) for its meeting on March 28, 2013.

Aaron Aknin, Assistant Planning Director indicated the Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC) meeting in February 2013 focused on comments regarding the Caltrain modernization Environmental Impact Report (EIR). Other cities made a few new comments which were incorporated into the City's letter. He noted that Council Member Burt was elected Chair of the PCC.

Council Member Burt added the PCC heard an update on CHSRA action.

Mr. Aknin reported the California State Rail Plan included future decisions related to rail that needed to be consistent with the Plan. The Plan was drafted quickly in order to take advantage of future federal funds related to rail. Caltrans worked with Caltrain to ensure there was no impact on the Caltrain local service. No environmental review would be conducted along with the Plan; therefore, the Plan probably would not be used for a statutory exemption for High Speed Rail (HSR). Each subsequent action that was consistent with the Plan would undergo environmental review. The next version of the Plan was expected to be released in June or July 2013.

Mr. Garamendi noted the Plan had a ten-year horizon. HSR for the Altamont Pass was planned for 2028 or later; therefore, the Altamont Pass was beyond the scope of the Plan. Early investment funds were being used to make a "higher speed" rail system. The CHSRA did not approve the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with Caltrain regarding the blended approach at its March 7, 2013 meeting. On March 18, CHSRA approved the MOU, and met with the Bond Authority to authorize issuance of a bond in the future. Meetings scheduled for March 29 and April 4, 2013 would continue the administrative process for issuing bonds. He did not expect any other surprises regarding the blended approach. SB 557 was scheduled to be heard on April 23. He did not see much opposition to SB 557, and expected it to move forward. SB 525 sought an exemption for HSR regarding California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) terms for the Altamont Pass improvements. He was concerned about the precedent of an exemption to CEQA for a HSR segment. He expected SB 525 to go to the Senate Environmental Quality Committee, where Senator Hill was the chairman. Language for SB 731 had not changed since his prior update. Several other bills proposed by Republicans in an effort to kill HSR probably would not make it out of committee. There was talk about performing an audit of the Phase 1 initial operating segment between Merced and Fresno; however, the

MINUTES

language was killed. The Legislature was not interested in oversight of the project. CHSRA was trying to resolve legal challenges in the Central Valley. CHSRA would approach the Surface Transportation Board for approval.

Council Member Klein asked why the Democratic majority thought HSR was a done deal when there was no money for it.

Mr. Garamendi explained the Democratic majority passed SB 1029, but did not acknowledge the lack of funding.

Council Member Klein reported Congressman Denham informed Council Members that additional federal funds would not be released for California HSR.

Council Member Kniss added HSR had a great deal of support but no money.

Mr. Garamendi agreed.

Council Member Burt inquired whether Mr. Garamendi was familiar with the new lawsuit filed by CHSRA.

Mr. Garamendi was not familiar with it and was unsure of its impacts.

Council Member Burt noted, according to a newspaper article, the lawsuit attempted to preempt all future lawsuits, and wanted to understand the lawsuit's impact.

Mr. Garamendi was particularly interested in how it would affect the Brady lawsuit.

Council Member Burt stated the article implied the new lawsuit would probably not affect the existing lawsuit. Dan Richard stated it would not preempt future CEQA challenges. The lawsuit was an attempt to preemptively eliminate the possibility of future lawsuits.

Council Member Klein explained the lawsuit did not preclude all future lawsuits. It precluded all future lawsuits with respect to the validity of the bond. The procedure was utilized by many government agencies to ensure bonds were valid.

Chair Shepherd noted information regarding the Altamont Pass in Phase 2 was removed from the CHSRA website, and asked how removal of the Altamont Pass from Phase 2 occurred.

MINUTES

Mr. Garamendi explained it was not contained in the 2012 Business Plan. He assumed it was part of Phase 2 and would be in the future. Elimination of the Altamont Pass may have been part of the deal negotiated with respect to SB 1029.

Chair Shepherd indicated the Altamont Pass was included in the ballot initiative. Removing the Altamont Pass route was another indication of the CHSRA moving away from information originally presented to voters.

Mr. Garamendi would try to get information on that issue.

Council Member Kniss requested Mr. Garamendi explain events concerning the Merced to Fresno segment.

Mr. Garamendi explained it was important for the CHSRA to break ground as soon as possible in the Central Valley. CHSRA was attempting to figure out the route, which was controversial in Madera and Merced Counties. The Farm Bureau and community organizations filed several lawsuits on CEQA grounds. CHSRA was attempting to minimize opposition and move forward with construction.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether there had been definitive progress.

Mr. Garamendi answered no.

Morris Brown agreed with Council Member Klein's comments regarding the new lawsuit. The CHSRA was concerned that a Surface Transportation Board ruling could delay the process. With regard to the March 29, 2013 CHSRA meeting, the appropriation was for the connectivity funds and not Central Valley funding.

4. Report From the Professional Evaluation Group, Inc.

The Chair noted that Agenda Item 4 was discussed within Agenda Item 3.

5. Discussion of Possible Changes to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

a. Discussion of Proposed Rail Committee Guiding Principle 16 on CEQA

Chair Shepherd noted Guiding Principles were the topic of Agenda Item Number 6 as well.

MINUTES

Council Member Klein questioned the need for two Agenda items regarding Guiding Principles.

Aaron Akin, Assistant Planning Director, suggested discussion of Agenda Item Number 5 focus solely on Guiding Principle 16, because it was the topic of discussion at the prior Rail Committee (Committee) meeting and the Council.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether Staff wished to comment with regard to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) specifically.

Mr. Akin reported a number of bills were in process, but nothing particularly relevant to the discussion.

Chair Shepherd indicated the Silicon Valley Leadership Group was interested in CEQA and advocated directly with the Governor regarding CEQA changes. They did not advocate for a CEQA exemption.

Mr. Akin believed the two focus areas for CEQA changes would be in-fill development near transit and adoption of area plans associated with environmental documents.

Council Member Klein suggested the Governor would propose a means to expedite the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) process for High Speed Rail (HSR).

Council Member Kniss felt there was nothing substantial to indicate the direction of CEQA changes.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Chair Shepherd to consolidate Agenda Item Numbers 5 and 6.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

6. Discussion of Possible Revisions and Updates to the Rail Committee Guiding Principles
 - a. Proposed Updates to the Palo Alto City Council Rail Committee Guiding Principles

Herb Borock noted the Rail Committee (Committee) previously discussed and recommended language for Guiding Principle 16. SB 731 was intended to provide greater certainty for projects and to streamline the law for transit projects. Staff's second alternative did not mention streamlining of transit

MINUTES

projects or changing court review. He preferred the Committee use the language originally proposed for Guiding Principle 16.

Chair Shepherd suggested the Committee discuss Guiding Principle 16 first, and then proceed to the other Guiding Principles.

Council Member Burt felt Option Number 2 was more appropriate. The Council did not have the authority to state the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) shall not be modified. The Council could support modest modifications to CEQA that did not fundamentally undermine the City's goals.

Council Member Klein agreed with Council Member Burt.

MOTIONS: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Kniss to accept Option Number 2 of Staff Report Number 3649, the most recently adopted version of the Rail Committee Guiding Principles reflecting all proposed revisions and alternatives for the language for Guiding Principle Number 16.

Council Member Klein noted the language was not the same as Staff originally proposed. Option Number 2 stated the Committee's concerns with respect to not exempting the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) from CEQA and not reducing Environmental Impact Report (EIR) burdens. The Committee should be cautious with regard to language used by the Silicon Valley Leadership Group.

Chair Shepherd concurred.

Council Member Kniss felt Council Member Burt's comment regarding Option Number 1 was important. Option Number 2 was more accurate.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Chair Shepherd requested discussion of Guiding Principles with proposed language.

Council Member Klein noted the language was previously approved by the Committee.

Aaron Aknin, Assistant Planning Director, indicated that was correct.

Council Member Klein felt the language of Guiding Principle 18 was awkward.

MINUTES

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to change the language for Guiding Principle 18 to read: Palo Alto strongly supports revisions to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) governance structure that more accurately reflect the distribution of Caltrain ridership. Additionally, ~~the PCJPB should not consider making~~ such revisions ~~consistent~~ *should be made at or prior to the date with* a of a ballot measure seeking a dedicated funding source for Caltrain operations, should one occur.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

Council Member Kniss presumed the Committee discussed the possibility of a measure for dedicated funding of Caltrain. She wanted it on the record that funding for Caltrain was not dedicated at the current time.

Chair Shepherd reported Future Agenda Items included an update on efforts to obtain dedicated funding for Caltrain. The Guiding Principles allowed the Committee to respond in writing to issues without first seeking Council authority.

Council Member Burt reported the Council and the Committee held extensive discussions regarding Caltrain funding. The Council contributed to the Save Caltrain initiative.

Council Member Kniss had not heard anything recently about this. Caltrain was an important mode of transportation.

MOTION: Council Member Kniss moved, seconded by Council Member Klein to refer the changes to the Guiding Principles to the full Council.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

7. Preliminary Discussion of Palo Alto Grade Separation Issues
 - a. Preliminary Overview of Questions and Issues on Grade Separations and Below Grade Alternatives in Palo Alto

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, inquired whether the Rail Committee (Committee) wished to discuss grade separations and trenching options as one topic or separate topics.

Council Member Kniss preferred to discuss them separately.

Council Member Klein agreed.

MINUTES

Mr. Hackmann noted the Committee previously discussed proactive steps the City could undertake regarding grade separations and potential underground alternatives for rail. It was important to have a vision for High Speed Rail (HSR) within Palo Alto, should funding become available in the future or should the City need to evaluate alternatives or mitigations. Based on the Caltrain Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the increase from five to six trains per hour as part of electrification of the Corridor, mitigations such as separating the roadway from the tracks or trenching the train would not be required. However, as traffic and population density increased, mitigations could become a necessity for the Corridor even if Palo Alto was a part of the segment required to have passing tracks,. The Committee requested Staff outline general assumptions and facts about the Corridor and initiate a discussion regarding specific analytical research. The Staff Report outlined some assumptions known to be true.

Council Member Kniss requested Staff present the assumptions.

Mr. Hackmann clarified that the discussion was an attempt to obtain facts and clarity regarding HSR.

Council Member Klein requested the status of Staff's evaluation of the impact on grade crossings with six trains per hour in each direction

Aaron Akin, Assistant Planning Director, reported Staff was working with Caltrain. When Caltrain provided some type of transportation analysis, Staff would peer review it and then perform an evaluation as necessary.

Council Member Klein asked if the evaluation would be performed in 2013 or 2014.

Mr. Hackmann indicated evaluations were a part of the EIR.

Council Member Klein inquired about the timeframe for Staff's evaluation.

Mr. Akin reported Staff's evaluation would be in reaction to Caltrain's information in the EIR.

Council Member Burt noted Caltrain's last update on the Phase 2 capacity analysis indicated at six trains per hour most grade separations would be favorably impacted as a result of positive train control and other measures. Caltrain did not breakdown city by city which grade separations would be favorably impacted. He inquired whether Staff obtained Caltrain's analysis of Palo Alto grade separations.

MINUTES

Mr. Aknin believed Caltrain provided that information orally or mentioned it possibly at a staff-level meeting. It depended on proximity of the train station to the actual grade crossing. He understood Palo Alto's crossing would not be positively impacted. There would be some negative impact or remain the same.

Council Member Burt indicated Caltrain knew which crossings would be favorably impacted in order to state the number quantitatively. He suggested Staff request that information from Caltrain.

Chair Shepherd noted Caltrain was changing crossing mechanisms for safety reasons. She inquired whether Caltrain was reviewing impacts of crossing mechanisms and increased train scheduling on traffic flow.

Mr. Aknin reported Caltrain had to consider the cumulative impacts of projects, and assumed traffic impact was considered. Staff could ask for clarification.

Chair Shepherd indicated those two factors would change the dynamics of surface street crossings.

Council Member Kniss inquired about the hours during which six trains would operate.

Mr. Aknin stated six trains would operate during peak hours.

Council Member Kniss requested a definition of peak hours.

Mr. Hackmann did not know.

Casey Fromson, Government Affairs, Caltrain Modernization Program at San Mateo County, would provide the hours defined as peak.

Council Member Kniss assumed peak hours would be approximately 2 1/2 hours at the beginning and end of the day, and asked if Caltrain provided the average wait time.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether Council Member Kniss meant the wait time when trains were crossing streets.

Council Member Kniss answered yes.

Chair Shepherd recalled Mr. Rodriguez reported approximately four minutes were required for traffic flow to return to normal after the train passed.

MINUTES

Mr. Hackmann clarified that four to five minutes was needed for traffic on Alma Street to recover each time a gate went down. The exact gate downtime was between 40 seconds and 1 minute. When Caltrain released information for each intersection, Staff would review the data and respond.

Council Member Kniss asked if Staff actually measured wait time at crossings.

Chair Shepherd said that Caltrain was changing the crossing signals for safety reasons. In addition, Caltrain wished to make other changes for safety reasons.

Council Member Burt recalled Mr. Rodriguez analyzed the impact of six trains prior to Caltrain's analysis. Presumably Caltrain performed some sophisticated analysis as part of the Phase 2 capacity analysis to provide the information for crossings.

Council Member Kniss related her casual observations regarding wait times at various intersections in Palo Alto. Trains crossing in opposing directions would increase wait time.

Council Member Burt explained Caltrain's positive train control system integrated smart signaling between trains and crossing signals; impacts would not be known until the system was implemented.

Council Member Kniss suggested Staff present information regarding positive train control when it was available.

Mr. Hackmann outlined four assumptions generally agreed to be true regarding grade separations and below-grade track alignments in Palo Alto. First, grade separation by either elevating or submerging the roadway would likely be less expensive and have fewer construction impacts than trenching, but would likely require property acquisitions. Second, trenching the railroad would likely be more expensive than grade separations before at-grade crossings and would have significant construction impacts, but would likely require few if any property acquisitions when compared to grade separations before at-grade crossings. Third, trenching the railroad was likely to have the fewest visual, noise and vibration impacts on the community once construction was complete. Fourth, trenching the railroad would likely take multiple years to complete, would require removal of numerous trees along the Corridor, and could necessitate the installation of temporary tracks possibly resulting in the temporary closure of multiple lanes of Alma Street. Questions for Committee consideration were: the best method to engage in a community dialog about advantages and

MINUTES

disadvantages of different scenarios; whether to endorse any proposal for grade separations or trenching that required property acquisition; whether to eliminate any grade separation or trenching scenarios based on what was likely to be true; whether to engage the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) and/or the California High Speed Rail Authority (CHSRA) in evaluating the issues; and whether to hire consultants to perform additional work. The Hatch Mott MacDonald contract had money available if the Committee wished to use them as consultants. Staff requested the Committee provide input regarding the direction for evaluating these scenarios.

Chair Shepherd recalled that the cantilever system would also require removal of trees.

Mr. Hackmann stated electrification of the Corridor was likely to impact some trees; however, the extent was unknown. Trenching would have a much worse impact.

Council Member Burt noted Mr. Lebrun's presentation of best practices for electrification infrastructure included a wide range of impacts based on design and circumstances.

Herb Borock felt any discussion regarding grade separations should be held within the context of Caltrain's EIR process. The Committee should participate in the EIR process with information that would elicit specific answers, project decisions and mitigations. The process described in the Staff Report seemed to be independent of project-level work and was a mistake.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, noted the last round of studies in the Palo Alto area focused on four tracks; however, it seemed more likely that two or three tracks would be implemented. Although trenching and tunnels would have less visual impact, they would be more expensive. The Committee should gather information on a range of practical options. Real data concerning noise and vibration was available. The impact on grade crossings depended on train schedules, and Caltrain did not have a final schedule for electrified service.

Roland Lebrun reported Caltrain's gate downtime information had two fatal flaws. First, Caltrain calculated gate downtime with two additional passing tracks which was impossible, because grade separation was mandatory for four tracks. Second, a third track added ten seconds to gate downtime. Caltrain had to add 6-14 seconds to gate downtime at East Meadow and Churchill in order to address safety issues. He suggested Caltrain's

MINUTES

information regarding tree removal was misinterpreted. Trees did not have to be clear cut 20 feet either side of the center track line. Poles would be placed 10 feet from the center track line, and that area had to be cleared. Next a circle of 10 feet around each pole had to be clear cut.

Council Member Burt reiterated that Caltrain's previous analysis calculated downtimes for four tracks; whereas, grade separations were mandatory for four tracks.

Mr. Lebrun indicated page 7-29 of Chapter 7 of the Caltrain Engineering Standards stated Caltrain would not have level grade crossings with four tracks.

Council Member Burt believed there would be less gate downtime impacts in areas with four tracks. However, Palo Alto was not a part of the four-track section.

Mr. Lebrun stated grade separations with four tracks would consume a couple of blocks of area. In his presentation to Peninsula Cities Consortium (PCC), he showed that four tracks on either side of a level crossing narrowed to two tracks for the crossing, and then flared out to four tracks.

Ms. Fromson reported peak hours were 6:00 A.M. to 9:00 A.M. and 4:00 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. The initial analysis would be released at the end of April. Much of the information was dependent on the schedule in regards to the blended system. By law, grade separations were required only if a train exceeded 125 miles per hour (m.p.h.) A new analysis of the blended system with respect to passing tracks or grade separations was needed; however, it had not been designed.

Council Member Kniss reported Maryanne Lee underscored that there was no money for trenching with electrification.

Ms. Fromson agreed.

Council Member Kniss stated if Palo Alto wanted to trench train tracks, then the City would be responsible for paying for it. The blended system contained no option to trench.

Ms. Fromson stated there was no trenching option within the Corridor electrification project.

Chair Shepherd asked if there were grade separation options.

MINUTES

Ms. Fromson replied no.

Chair Shepherd inquired whether funds were available solely for electrification of the train and rolling stock.

Ms. Fromson indicated funds were available for those two items and the Communication Based Overlay Signal System (CBOSS).

Chair Shepherd understood grade separations were required for trains exceeding 79 M.P.H. and asked if that changed to exceed 125 M.P.H.

Ms. Fromson answered yes.

Mr. Hackmann clarified that the Federal Railroad Administration could mandate grade separations for train speeds less than 125 M.P.H. in certain hypothetical scenarios.

Council Member Burt suggested Staff consider another scenario in the capacity analysis. Electrification of Caltrain and a subway connection between Caltrain and San Francisco would increase demand for additional trains at peak hours. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), which prohibited Caltrain from exceeding six trains per hour, could be revised to allow more trains per hour in order to meet increased demand. He inquired about the amount of funds remaining on the Hatch Mott MacDonald contract.

Mr. Hackmann indicated approximately \$65,000 remained.

Council Member Burt suggested the Committee request Mr. Rodriguez perform analyses rather than Hatch Mott MacDonald, because of his background and experience. Having consultants and Staff perform engineering analysis would inform the Committee's input to Caltrain's EIR and begin a dialog with the community. He recommended Staff return with an analysis of the respective contributions from Hatch Mott MacDonald and Staff. He suggested delaying a community dialog until more facts were known.

Council Member Klein was not in favor of spending money with Hatch Mott and MacDonald. Any discussion of trenching had to include Menlo Park and Mountain View, and Mountain View had no interest in trenching. If the City wanted grade separations, then it would have to pay for them. Mr. Emslie suggested each grade separation could cost \$25 million.

Chair Shepherd stated the cost would be \$50 million.

MINUTES

Council Member Klein remarked that the only way to pay for grade separations was presumably some type of bond or a benefactor. The Committee was wasting time and money if it requested any work with regard to trenching, because of trenching's astronomical costs.

Mr. Aknin could talk with former colleagues in San Bruno about the exact cost of three grade separations in San Bruno. Even though the electrification EIR did not include an option for grade separations, mitigations could require grade separations.

Council Member Kniss reported grade separations in San Mateo County were paid through a ballot measure. Electrification did not include funding for trenching; therefore, the Committee should not inquire about trenching.

Mr. Hackmann noted Caltrain did not propose grade separations in its EIR. Grade separations would be an issue in the EIR only if Caltrain determined that the increase from five to six trains per hour at a given intersection necessitated a grade separation as the only way to mitigate it. Caltrain had not determined where passing tracks would be located once a blended system was implemented. Palo Alto was still under consideration as a location for passing tracks.

Chair Shepherd assumed that Caltrain did not have funding for grade separations. The Committee was obligated to obtain data and facts. She wanted a technical analysis of the effect of grade separations on neighborhoods. The Committee needed information in order to understand mitigations proposed by Caltrain's EIR.

Council Member Burt did not understand how the Committee could dismiss an analysis of trenching when it was a City policy position. An analysis was needed to determine whether covered trenching was a viable option. Potential funding sources for trenching were not known. An environmental analysis could show that grade separations were necessary to prevent severe environmental impacts to street structures. An environmental analysis could show that taking of homes would best be mitigated by trenching. The Committee needed additional information.

Council Member Kniss asked what the additional information would include.

Council Member Burt suggested an analysis of the costs and impacts of grade separations and trenching under a two-track system in Palo Alto as well as the number of homes impacted by grade separations for two tracks. Without this information, the Committee could not provide meaningful input to the EIR or hold meaningful community discussions.

MINUTES

Chair Shepherd wanted to understand the course of construction given the various scenarios.

MOTION: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Chair Shepherd to have Staff return at the next meeting on April 25, 2013 with a scope of work for an outside consultant and internal Staff to analyze the alternative scenarios as described in Staff Report Number 3649, along with comparative impacts and costs, and to have the scope of work prepared for review by the Committee, or a Staff recommendation for the full Council on an expenditure of previously allocated funding.

Council Member Kniss requested Staff include an estimated cost of the analysis.

Council Member Burt indicated the scope of work would include estimated costs for Staff and consultants.

Council Member Kniss felt an analysis of trenching was not worthwhile. She believed the Motion was seeking an estimate of the cost for both in-house and consultants to perform an analysis.

Council Member Burt reiterated that Staff would return at the next meeting with the costs and a recommendation for in-house and consultant roles. He assumed some analysis would be performed by Staff and some by consultants.

Council Member Kniss wanted to know the difference between reviewing grade separations and reviewing trenching. An analysis of trenching was not worth the expense.

Council Member Burt agreed with Staff breaking down those costs analyses. The Committee could resume debate over an analysis of trenching once they knew the respective costs.

Council Member Kniss stated trenching related to four tracks.

Chair Shepherd called point of order. The Motion covered both Items 7 and 8, when the Committee stated its preference to discuss the items separately.

Council Member Klein suggested the two items be discussed separately by omitting any discussion of trenching. Having a Guiding Principle advocating trenching did not mean the City should spend money to study it. Another Guiding Principle stated that someone other than the City should pay for it. He agreed with studying grade separations at the appropriate time.

MINUTES

Chair Shepherd inquired whether Council Member Klein preferred that the Motion exclude trenching.

Council Member Klein was in favor of trenching with regard to grade separations. The Motion seemed inconsistent with Council Member Burt's remark to wait until the appropriate time in the EIR. He could not support Staff performing a limited study for both grade separations and trenching. He would support deleting trenching from the Motion. He suggested amending the Motion to not include research on trenching at this time.

Council Member Kniss might support Council Member Klein's suggestion to delete trenching.

Council Member Burt wished to clarify the Motion.

Council Member Kniss also wanted to know the cost of such an analysis.

Chair Shepherd noted the Motion included alternative scenarios.

MOTION RESTATED: Council Member Burt moved, seconded by Chair Shepherd to have Staff return at the next meeting on April 25, 2013 with a scope of work for an outside consultant and internal Staff to analyze the alternative scenarios as described in Staff Report Number 3649, along with their comparative impacts and costs, and to have the scope of work prepared for review by the Committee, or a Staff recommendation for the full Council on an expenditure of previously allocated funding; Staff would return with a scope of work at the next meeting so the Committee could understand the cost of an analysis and the respective roles of Staff and consultants.

Council Member Klein understood the purpose of the Motion, but preparing a scope of work still required time and funds.

Council Member Burt indicated the Committee would not act on an analysis. The Committee would be prepared to make informed responses to the EIR when that time occurred.

Chair Shepherd agreed with Council Member Burt.

Council Member Klein noted he suggested an Amendment.

Council Member Kniss said she would second an Amendment. She presumed a consultant would not charge the City for providing an estimate of its cost for the study.

MINUTES

Mr. Aknin reported a consultant would generally provide a proposal at no charge, and Staff could request the proposal include a breakdown of each subtask within the proposal.

Council Member Kniss clarified there would be no cost for the proposal.

Mr. Aknin indicated the only cost would be Staff time.

Council Member Kniss was not in favor of an analysis of trenching, but would support the Motion for a consultant to return with a cost for analyzing both grade separations and trenching.

Chair Shepherd suggested tabling item number 8 until Staff returned with information.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0, Klein no

Council Member Kniss reiterated that there was no cost to the City for a consultant to provide an estimate.

Mr. Aknin stated the consultant would not charge for an estimate.

Chair Shepherd felt the community was passionate about trenching and grade separations.

8. Preliminary Discussion of Below Grade Alternatives for Palo Alto

MOTION: Chair Shepherd moved, Seconded by Council Member Klein to hear Item 8 on the Agenda for the meeting held on April 25, 2013.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0

9. Agenda Setting

FUTURE MEETINGS AND AGENDAS

- a. Discussion of Touring the Stanford Research Park by Interested Staff, Legislative Advocates, and Rail Committee Members
- b. Discussion of Inviting Governor Brown to Palo Alto for a Tour of the Stanford Research Park
- c. Update on Efforts to Obtain Dedicated Funding for Caltrain

MINUTES

- d. Discussion of PCJPB Member Configuration
- e. Status of Litigation Against the CHSRA

Chair Shepherd inquired whether the Rail Committee (Committee) wished to discuss dedicated funding for Caltrain. Those interested in a tour of the Stanford Research Park should contact Thomas Fehrenbach. The Governor would be invited to tour Stanford Research Park with the Chinese delegation in June 2013. Those two items regarding the Stanford Research Park could be removed from Future Meetings and Agendas. The next Agenda Item would be a proposal from Hatch Mott and MacDonald. She inquired whether the proposal would require more than 30 days.

Richard Hackmann, Management Specialist, suggested Staff could complete it in 30 days, but certainly not less than 30 days.

Chair Shepherd suggested discussion of dedicated funding for Caltrain and Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) membership configuration remain as backup items.

Council Member Kniss asked if there was an update regarding dedicated funding for Caltrain.

Mr. Hackmann read an article indicating a ballot measure in 2016. He would obtain additional information on that.

Adina Levin, Friends of Caltrain, reported Caltrain was considering use of funding approved by San Mateo County voters in November 2012. The County Supervisors would decide that in the fall of 2013.

Council Member Kniss inquired whether the City or County of San Francisco had suggested any type of dedicated funding for Caltrain.

Ms. Levin heard various things, but was not comfortable commenting publicly.

Roland Lebrun opposed permanent funding for Caltrain. After spending \$1.5 billion for electrification and rolling stock, there was no excuse for Caltrain not operating the system at a profit. He proposed adding an additional zone in San Francisco and increasing the charge by \$2 to fund Caltrain.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:09 A.M.