



CITY COUNCIL RAIL COMMITTEE TRANSCRIPT

Special Meeting
Wednesday, June 7, 2017

Chairperson DuBois called the meeting to order at 8:30 A.M. in the Community Meeting Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

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

Absent:

Oral Communications

Chair DuBois: This is the Rail Committee meeting for June 7th. First up is Oral Communications. We have one speaker, Richard Brand.

Richard Brand: Good morning, everybody. Richard Brand at 281 Addison and I would just like to speak out about our last meeting in April of this Committee. I was rather amazed when the Director of Northern California High-Speed Rail program admitted to us that two of their three options to bring four tracks into Palo Alto from the north and one of them as far down as Cal. Avenue. I think this is – I urge you to take an action to take this to Council because I think that the City and residents of the City – many of them, if not all of them or most of them don't know this and I didn't want to bring this up at the workshop. I thought that was an important workshop to have but I think this is something that needs to be addressed. We need to get more information from High Speed Rail people. Four tracks, that's going to be a major blow to residents living along the right-of-way in the northern part of the City. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thanks. The second speaker is Nadia Naik.

Nadia Naik: Hi, good morning. I just wanted to report that the – I'm sure Josh will probably say it but the VTA guidelines have the decisions for the exact language has been pushed to their August meeting. That gives us time to fix the language because you will want to fix the language because it currently says that they will fund the cheapest alternative and clearly, we would have beef with that sort of language. It doesn't – we're entitled to our piece of the money. They shouldn't really decide whether an alternative is the cheapest or not and cheapest is relatively cheaper to what? I just want

TRANSCRIPT

to point that out and also, the Caltrain business plan is a topic that has come up. Their next meeting is July 6th, where they are going to be discussing this. One of the things that we, at Friends of Caltrain – I'm wearing that hat right now, have been encouraging the City, that Palo Alto really needs to think about this – Caltrain as an asset that we pay for. So, what do you want out of that asset? Any communications that we, as a city, can give Caltrain that tells them what kind of short, medium and long-term goals we expect as they continue to invest in the corridor and improve their services. That would be great stuff that they could include in their business plan going forward. So, it's great that they are doing a business plan but there's probably more stuff that we could talk about in those things. Then, lastly is - I think that is it for now. I'll put the other ones on the other items. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Is this another Oral Communication? This is the last speaker, Roland.

Roland LeBrun: Thank you. So, very briefly I want to segue on to what the first speaker said. That is that in the south, we are the – we basically are where Bakersfield (inaudible). I don't think anybody is really talking about suing them just yet but we are definitely talking about coming up with our own little alternatives down there. Bakersfield was called (inaudible), a locally generated alternative but it's more serious than that. It's becoming really apparent that these people – actually, all you have to do is get them into LinkedIn and look at their bio's. None of these people have had any kind of experience designing High Speed line so it's not necessary – probably independence because it's not real high speed line. This is a serious problem in the south and recent developments is that (inaudible) exist now, I think it's called [WSB USA]. When they got this \$7 million dollar (inaudible) contract, it mentioned a bunch of projects in the UK including a cross rail and High Speed too. They have actually been terminated on both projects. They had a very, very, small contracts and in English, it's called not retained. So, I'll just leave that with you but my recommendation to the Board is basically to terminate these people and either issue another RFP or actually, grant a contract to the other company who are eminently qualified; the other people who did the channel tunnel rail link and the current other program managed just for High Speed too; they also manage the program for cross rail by the way. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you.

Agenda Items

TRANSCRIPT

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

Chair DuBois: Alright, so we are moving onto Item Number 1 which is, I guess is review and update on the rail program.

Josh Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Great, good morning Chair and Members of the Committee. I am Josh Mello, the City's Chief Transportation Official. Included in your packet is a briefing paper that was prepared for the previous date of the schedule Rail Committee. It has now been updated in the past couple weeks. You'll be provided information on what's transpired in the last couple of weeks at the following Rail Committee meeting. In your briefing packet, there's an overview of the community workshop, which occurred on May 20th. We'll go into further details on that later in the agenda. There's also a list of folks that we have reached out tentatively to, to invite to our Technical Advisory Committee. We have received some confirmations that some of these folks will be able to participate in our Technical Advisory Committee. We have not convened that Committee yet. We'll talk about the plan for that Committee with you in the coming meetings. There's also a brief discussion on the center OCS pole design. Chair DuBois asked us to look into the pole design in Atherton and there's a rep. from Caltrain today, who will be presenting and can answer a lot more of these questions. Our current understanding is that as it's a design built contract, there are certain parameters and mitigation measure that the design-build contract is required to follow. This includes preservation of existing vegetation where feasible. In some cases, it's feasible to install center OCS poles if there is adequate width between the tracks. In Atherton's case, there's a lot more width between the tracks through most of Atherton than there is in Palo Alto so there are some opportunities to install center OCS in Atherton. There may not be the same opportunities in Palo Alto and there are some detailed drawings of the different pole types at the back of the briefing packet. Then lastly, the packet includes a look ahead for the Rail Committee. This is a tentative list of what we propose to place on the agenda for the Rail Committee over the next year. Finally, there are the consultant's expenditures to date report on the last page of the main briefing packet and then it's followed with drawings of some of the OCS pole designs. That concludes this presentation.

Chair DuBois: I think some of these items are on the agenda today so I think we should probably discuss the poles and trees in the next item. Are

TRANSCRIPT

there any comments on other items in this update? Questions?

Roland LeBrun: (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: On the next one. We did have one speaker. On the next item? Ok. Thank you. I do have one comment, I think on the Technical Advisory Committee, I think we should really include Pat Burt. I mean, he is highly knowledgeable about rail. He's been to City's regional representative for a long time. Well, so we didn't – the committee did not pick these members and I don't think we want to but again, I just think it's an incredible oversight.

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible) I think Pat is very political and I don't think we should make it (inaudible).

Chair DuBois: I'm not sure how to respond to that. Sure, I mean he's been an elected official so he's political but I think on the rail side, he's just incredibly knowledgeable. He knows a lot of facts about the situation. I guess I make the motion to add Pat to the Technical Advisory Committee.

MOTION: Chair DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to recommend to the City Council to add Patrick Burt to the Technical Advisory Committee.

Council Member Fine: Ok, so it's on the floor so I guess you guys should speak to it.

Chair DuBois: Sorry?

Council Member Fine: (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: Go ahead.

Council Member Fine: Does Staff want us to make Motions and go in choosing and voting people in or out of the TAC?

James Keene, City Manager: Can you speak a little more directly to the role of the TAC?

Mr. Mello: Currently, the TAC is strictly agency representatives who serve in

TRANSCRIPT

a technical capacity with their respective agencies. The role would be to help us work through the alternatives and some of the analysis from a technical perspective.

Council Member Fine: Thank you. I would be willing to support certain – adding certain groups here. Whether it's thinking Transform or maybe a member of our PTC if that is helpful to Staff. I completely agree former Mayor Burt is an expert on this and I hope he continues to contribute but I don't really see our role as just picking people out and throwing them on this Committee.

Mayor Scharff: I think we should leave this up to Staff. We tend to leave stuff up to Staff like this when we get involved. Especially on a Technical Advisory Committee and especially since it's agency representatives. I think it would be inappropriate to add someone who is basically political.

Chair DuBois: Any other comments? Ok.

Council Member Filseth: I second it for discussion.

Chair DuBois: Ok. I guess later today we are talking about feedback from the workshop and other types of representatives. Ok, so let's go ahead and vote on the motion. Who's for? Against? Alright, failed.

MOTION FAILED: 1-3 DuBois yes

Chair DuBois: Any other comments on this update? We also have further agenda – future agendas as an item so maybe we should come back to that one as well.

Council Member Fine: Do you mean the schedule and come back to it again?

Chair DuBois: Well, I guess the Rail Committee agenda look ahead, on Page 5.

NO ACTION TAKEN

2. Receive a Presentation From the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board and Discussion of the Status of the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Ok, let's move on to Item Number 2.

Josh Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Thank you. With me to my left is Lori Low. She is with the Cal Mod Program. Cal Mod includes both the electrification and the new vehicle purchases for Caltrain modernization and Lori is going to give you a brief overview of the Cal Mod program. Then answer any question that you may have.

Lori Low, Government & Community Affairs, Caltrain: Alright, thank you for having me Chair and Committee Members. I am Lori Low with Government Affairs and Community Affairs with Caltrain and Cal Mod. I come today with an update on our electrification project and we're happy to report that we, in May, received our federal funding from or execution of the federal funding grant. So, \$73 million dollars have been approved in prior years. One hundred million dollars was approved in Fiscal Year 2017 and then \$100 million dollars has been recommended in Fiscal Year 2018. The grant was for \$647 million dollars. On the EMU, the electric vehicle side of things, we have a website now, Calmodtrains.com, which allows for public input and feedback. We'll be having different poles to help make the decision on the design. We recently had our exterior design pole and it lasted a week and the results from that has determined the inspiration and direction of our design for the exterior. An upcoming will be the seats – the seat colors and also the bike design of the on-board bike system for the trains and that will be later this summer. On the infrastructure side, the timeline is – well, first I will say that the EMU contract for Stadler, they got a full notice to proceed on June 1st, and we are expecting the full notice to proceed with the infrastructure side on June 19th. For –with Palo Alto, our OCS design review will happen with Segment 3 and so I believe you just received a hand out of the work segments for the corridor. So, we've been progressing through Segments 2 and 4 and starting at the northern ends. So, South San Francisco in Segment 2 and Santa Clara in Segment 4. That is how we started and we're moving through the design review process for that. So, segment three, which is what Palo Alto is, design is currently at 35 percent and then we're happy to share the design of the poles within the JPP right-of-way for informational purposes with the Committee and Staff, of course. The design review of the poles at 65 percent at the stations and the color type will be discussed and we'll be asking for input in early 2018, for Palo Alto. Field construction, we anticipate in Palo Alto to start late summer/early fall –actually, overall and then we'll be updating our schedule based on the latest and TP schedule. Then we'll get back to CSCG, the Staff of the Cities with that information. Does anyone have questions at this point?

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: We have members of the public, I think who want to speak and then we'll come to the Committee if that's ok?

Lori Low: Sure. Ok.

Chair DuBois: Right now, we have two speakers – it looks like three. The first speaker is Roland. Ok, so we will go to Nadia and then Herb Borock will be second.

Nadia Naik: I just had a question, I just received a copy of a letter from Brian Kelly to Caltrain about the electrification funding so if you could talk a little – if you could a little bit about what that means and what the ramifications are? I just forwarded it to all of you so we're all just getting it at the same time. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Ok, Herb Borock.

Herb Borock: Good morning Chair DuBois and Committee Members. Caltrain and the City already know what the cross section is of the rail corridor in Palo Alto. It knows how far apart the tracks are, how far the trains are and the platforms are from the tracks so you don't need to have a lot of time spent on spinning a design of color or anything else. You could tell us right now whether we can have central poles or not or whether we need two poles or one directly across because it depends upon the fact that you can't have any electrified equipment over the platform itself. Those constraints, I think, are important to know as early as possible and while the drawings (inaudible) are interesting, I would have preferred to have seen, on the previous item report, just that high-level discussion of what the corridor looks like in Palo Alto. To see what is feasible and which types of poles that we would be having along the Caltrain corridor within the City of Palo Alto rather than within the town of Atherton. That is different from the detail design that you can put off till phase three of the project. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Our third speaker – Roland, how do you pronounce your last name?

Roland LeBrun: That depends. (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: In French.

TRANSCRIPT

Roland LeBrun: (Inaudible) but you can call me Roland the brown too. To understand the poles -- I'm sorry for you but I've got some bad news. I explained this to them in the EIR scoping comments is that you cannot put center poles in the middle of the high-speed line. There's a very specific case when you can have center poles on a high-speed line. It's when you have the stations and you have got four tracks because, after the tracks split, you can have center poles that serve both the platform and the high-speed line. The reason you can do that is that you're not going to have two trains that are going to be using the wire of the same center pole at the same time. If you put the center pole in the middle of the high-speed line, the issue that you've got -- I don't know if you have seen this, you've actually got a quarter of a mile long which basically is a wavelength going to the wire. That intern transmits a vibration to the pole and that vibration effects the wire on the other side. Seventy-nine mile an hour thing is not an issue. At the 110 MPH, at the very minimum, you are going to get some kind of (inaudible), you're going to have premature pentagraph way and you're going to have premature way. In the worst-case scenario, you are going to have a complete (inaudible) failure. I mentioned this in scoping comments. The people who did the review for the High Speed Rail Authority for six hundred million dollars, picked it up also but they just ignored it. That's all I am going to say about that. The FFGA, that FFGA did not qualify for an FFGA because they have to prove a minimum of ten percent increase in capacity. Right now, our bullets have 76 seats, they are running at over 137 percent of capacity. VMU has got 550 seats but we are going to lose 200 seats per train. That should have never gone through. Their response was that they have 3,068 seats per hour, which is like 60 seats increase or whatever, going up to 4,112. I shot a PRA and I said how do you account for this? The first PRA was non-responsive and so I chose to shoot a second PRA. The last point that I would like to mention -- you need to get a copy of this letter, is the letter that Secretary Kelly sent to them, that puts five significant conditions on the six hundred million dollars in Prop. 1A bonds, which you have Sea Bass. Guess what, they are saying that we need to do some constraining because we want to do 110 MPH. So, the (inaudible) we've got now is that Caltrain is environmentally clear at 79 MPH alignment and the High Speed Rail Authority is willing to give them six hundred million dollars on the condition that they -- actually, it's not just a question of straightening the tracks, which is basically moving the tracks and everything else to achieve 110 MPH, but also have a track configuration that allows them to run high-speed trail as well as Caltrain. That is not environmentally clear so my question to you is what's going to happen to the verification? Right now, I don't know. I think this is a good question to ask Caltrain. Thank you.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Thank you. Do you have any responses to some of the public issues?

Ms. Low: Sure. Regarding the capacity question, we are going to have six trains running per peak hour per direction, instead of the five trains now; which also factors into the capacity increase. As well as the turn, over so because the EMUs can start and stop and go to more stations within the same amount of time, that also allows for the amount of people going on and off the train to increase. So, that also factors into our capacity. As far as the Atherton pole design, having center poles in Atherton was part of an example used in the EIR and again, they – it is correct, that it has to have a certain width in order to do that. As we look at Palo Alto and do the design process there, we're going to have to see if there's even that width possibility. For Brian Kelly's letter, I will need to check in about that and see – I can get back to you with a response.

Chair DuBois: Thank you. I'll turn to the Committee. Anybody have any questions or comments? Yeah.

Council Member Fine: Thank you. Just a few things, I echo what some of the public has said. It would be really helpful if Caltrain shared early and often what the pole design is. To Mr. Borock's comments, there probably are places where you know what you can't do and even if we could see that, that would be helpful; in certain sections of the train. Then, just so I can be clear, in terms of the capacity issue, you are just going to more trains with more stops per hour but less seats per train?

Ms. Low: The addition of the Bombardier trains increased our seat number so when we started the process with the FTA, those weren't included.

Council Member Fine: You weren't counting those?

Ms. Low: But it does – we increase our capacity by the needed amount.

Council Member Fine: I know but it's occurring by more trains per hour and the train may be smaller sets, is that correct?

Ms. Low: Yeah, they are more nimble, they are more capable of being able to do those stops and starts so that does allow us to increase the capacity.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Fine: Ok, and then, I mean, are those sets expandable in the future, like with the Bombardier that we have done now?

Ms. Low: Yes, they are and as part of Cal Mod 2.0, we're looking at how can we get to 8-car train sets.

Council Member Fine: Ok, thank you.

Chair DuBois: Any questions? Mayor? No. Just following up on Council Member Fine. I guess why do we have detailed Atherton drawings and not any Palo Alto drawings at this point?

Ms. Low: If you look at, again at the diagram here. Atherton is part of the segment two piece of work that – this is the progression that they are making with the designs. So, they started here and moved down and started on segment four and moved down. Then we will be starting segment one and three and then moving down with the design.

Chair DuBois: I do think that there's going be a strong community interest on center poles in Palo Alto. We have a lot of homes nears the tracks, probably more than most communities and those trees provide screening of the tracks. What's the required distance in the right-of-way there?

Ms. Low: I can get back to you with the required distance.

Chair DuBois: Isn't it like 25-feet on each side or something like that.

Ms. Low: Yeah, in order to get the safety clearance but we ...

James Keene, City Manager: I thought it was even more than...

Mr. Mello: (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: I thought it was in the report somewhere.

Ms. Low: I think where possible, Caltrain will definitely try to do it. We want to do what's best for the community. We want to make sure that we protect as many trees as possible and that we have as least amount of impact for the community so where possible, we will try and do it.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: We just did a bunch of clearing to put in fences along the sides. I guess right here it says 21-feet.

Mr. Keene: Twenty-one feet. The fences are further out than 21-feet.

Chair DuBois: I mean it would be really great if Staff or Caltrain could give us an estimate of trees if any additional trees are going to need to be cut down.

Ms. Low: Yeah, we have to do a draft tree plan and we'll be meeting with the City later this summer to discuss that. Then, the actual either trimming of the trees or removal of trees would happen later in winter 2018. Again, we would be working with the City later in the summer.

Chair DuBois: Is there any exception process?

Ms. Low: In terms...

Chair DuBois: Of that 21-feet?

Ms. Low: I think its basic safety like you need to do it in order...

Chair DuBois: So, even if you have the center pole, it doesn't change...

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

Chair DuBois: Ok. I mean I think aesthetics are also going to be a concern, especially through neighborhoods. Then we also have our historic Palo Alto tree that is pretty close to the right-of-way. Have there been any...

Ms. Low: That will also be part of the draft tree plan when they assess that situation.

Chair DuBois: My last question is the comment about High Speed Rail and center poles. Do you have any additional detail on that?

Ms. Low: All of that I can package together in a response.

Chair DuBois: Ok, great. Is that it? Yeah, Adrian.

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Fine: Just one last thing that struck me. I use a lot of the stations; San Francisco, South San Francisco, San Carlos, Palo Alto, downtown, Cal. Ave. so all of these. It would be really helpful actually if you guys can leverage your stations to advertise to folks what you are going to do. I mean I get on at downtown or Cal. Ave each morning, there is nothing saying hey, there is electrification project happening. Cal Mod is great. Your guy's social media and communication is pretty good but you could just use the stations and let our residents know what's going to be happening there.

Ms. Low: Ok, that's great advice. We are also hoping to bring out samples of the bike racks and the seats to the stations but on-going station outreach would be good.

Chair DuBois: I know I've been focusing on the trees but we're highly supportive of electrification. We just would like to have it be done aesthetically pleasing as possible.

Ms. Low: Right and we thank everybody for all your support and all your efforts to help make this happen.

Mr. Keene: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question of Josh? We have a process between the different jurisdictions and essentially coming to an agreement or sign off or whatever on the electrification project. I mean, I am just curious where we are on that. Then secondly, don't mean to put you on the spot but the convenience of having you here so thank you for being here. There are a number of different issues or problem-solving that we're interested in doing as a City also on or near the Caltrain right-of-way. Just my sense from the City Manager sort of seat is – I may not have all the information but is a lot of decisions are just sort of held up or in limbo because of the electrification project and that deals with – Josh can speak to some of those things. Anyway, I just wanted – I thought the Committee could – ought to hear about this process.

Mr. Mello: Sure, so monthly there is a CSCG meeting at Caltrain headquarters and all the Staff from the various jurisdictions along the peninsula are invited to that meeting; we are attending regularly. One month is focused around the Cal Mod project and then the next month is focused around High Speed Rail. It's not a voting body or it's more of a kind of reviewing comment format but that's been very helpful to get details on the project and help coordinate with other jurisdictions. We've also convened kind of ad hoc meetings and invited folks from Peninsula Cities down to Palo

TRANSCRIPT

Alto City Hall to discuss specific particular items such as the reimbursement agreement from High Speed Rail that we were approached regarding last year. So, we have an ongoing coordination structure with our adjacent Cities, as well as the rest of the peninsula. We have been working on a comprehensive agreement with Caltrain for the piece up project and we're negotiating some points of interest in that agreement, which includes some of the things that Jim alluded to around our approval process or review process for design elements of the project. How involved our Architectural Review Board will be on those decisions. There are also a couple connectivity projects like some bikes paths and other minor improvements that we need corporation from Caltrain in order to complete. So, we are in the middle of negotiating the specifics of that agreement and we anticipate that that will come to Council in August or sometime after the summer. We've marked up a draft recently and sent it back to Caltrain but that's an ongoing negotiation that is occurring. They are attempting to execute these agreements with all of the Cities along the corridor.

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: On that point, either Josh or Lori, do you know where the other Cities are with respect to their execution of the corroboration agreements?

Ms. Low: I believe that 16 have already been executed.

Mr. Shikada: Ok, so we are one of the last, if not the last; that was my understanding. Also, for the Committees information from the utility perspective, we're also working through some of the logistics involved with the electrification project that affects our crossings electrical lines. There are clearance requirements and so, we've got a CIP project that is part of the proposed budget to relocated our crossing lines. So, there's – this is obviously, a significant construction project and as a result, as some of these design issues come into better focus, we will be bringing that back to the Council and the Committee for your information and action as needed.

Chair DuBois: I guess one of the last comments, we also have several places where we have dedicated park space running against the rail corridor and we should also look at those locations; again, for screening. Great, alright. I think that will conclude this item. Thank you for coming.

Ms. Low: Thank you.

NO ACTION TAKEN

TRANSCRIPT

3. Receive Oral Report on Rail Program Community Workshop Number 1 Held on May 20 and Discuss Next Steps.

Chair DuBois: The last one is a review of the community workshop.

Josh Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Great, thank you. I have a brief presentation on the workshop. We are going to come back to you with a more in-depth, written report on the results of the workshop but this was assembled relatively quickly after the workshop on May 20th. If you remember you – I think it was back in April, early April or late March that you gave us authorization to move forward with Stage 1 of the community outreach program for the Connecting Palo Alto Rail Program. In Stage 1, the first step was to convene this large community workshop. Some other minor work items under this stage are to start to identify the Technical Advisory Committee, which we discussed earlier in this meeting. The ultimate outcome of this stage is to refine the problem definition and develop some evaluation criteria to help us measure success as we move forward with the Context Sensitive Solutions alternative analysis and the identification of a preferred alternative. I want to thank all of you. Many of you were able to come out on May 20th, for our Connecting Palo Alto Community Workshop one. It was at Mitchell Park, it was a four-hour event starting at 10 AM on a Saturday and running until 2 PM that afternoon. On the ramp up to the workshop, we mailed out over 15,000 postcards to any resident or business within a half-mile of the rail corridor. We created a project website, which is the City website forward slash Connecting Palo Alto. We did regular posts on social media and several posts on next door in the proceeding weeks. We also received some coverage in Palo Alto Weekly and some other online news media, including Patch. One of the other things that we did in the ramp up to the workshop was to conduct stakeholder interviews. The project team invited selected individuals to Palo Alto City Hall in the downtown library and we conducted one-hour interviews with the stakeholders to solicit feedback from them on the process. As well as some of the problems and their ideas for evaluation criteria. The agenda for the workshop was primarily for the morning was focused around discussing existing conditions. Then we broke for lunch and it was a working lunch that was provided as part of the workshop. The PM work – PM sessions were mainly focused around identification of the current problems along the rail corridor. Then starting to discuss how we would define success ultimately, as we move forward into the alternatives identification process. We were very surprised by the attendance. We had one hundred and thirty attendees. We have assumed anywhere from one hundred to two hundred so we were impressed that many folks were able to spend four hours with us on a Saturday. Again,

TRANSCRIPT

thank you all again for attending. We had four elected officials in attendance, as well as Staff from various City departments and the project consultant team. We received 40 comments to date as of the preparation of this presentation. A lot of those were forms submitted at the workshop and then, we were very grateful to receive comments via email from people who were not able to attend the workshop as well. So, we made it very clear that we were still looking for their input, even if they weren't able to make it out on May 20th. Some of the tools we used, we did – I mentioned the stakeholder interviews. They were done prior to the workshop and we were actually able to shape some of the workshop agenda based on the feedback that we got in the stakeholder interviews. One key point that came up in multiple interviews was that we weren't talking enough about the previous work that had been done and folks felt like they dedicated a lot of time to the – particularly the corridor – the rail corridor study that was done in 2014. We were able to carry that forward to the workshop and make sure that we address that. We're going to continue to highlight that study and pulling things from that study that we think are applicable to this Context Sensitive Solution alternative analysis process. At the workshop, we used an innovative real-time polling tool called Meeting Sift and I'll talk a little bit about the results. That's a way to kind of break the ice with folks at workshops and get them – wake them up a little bit and get them involved. They can also see the opinions of others in the room and it helps to share information. We had two breakout sessions that were facilitated by Staff at each of the tables. Then post workshop, we posted all the materials on the website. We also have a link to the video so the entire workshop was video and audio recorded. There's now a link to that audio and video recording on the project website, which again is the City's website slash Connecting Palo Alto. Some of the results from the Meeting Sift surveys, we asked people which grade crossing they live closest too and it was fairly evenly split, except for not a lot of folks lived near the Palo Alto Avenue crossing and that's understandable. It's at the far northern end of the City. I think as we move through this process, that's the one that we're going to have to actively solicit opinions on. Not a lot of people have an opinion on that crossing and not a lot are familiar with – as familiar with it as they are with the other grade crossings.

Chair DuBois: Can you explain, what are the numbers in the pie chart?

Mr. Mello: Those are the number of people.

Chair DuBois: Counts?

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Mello: Yes.

Chair DuBois: So, out of a 130 people, we had like less than half that use this?

Mr. Mello: It's a pretty quick survey so it – is that percentages, Michelle or is that numbers?

Michele DiFrancia: (Inaudible)

Mr. Mello: I think it's numbers. It's a pretty quick survey and not everybody had smartphones and we had (crosstalk)...

James Keene, City Manager: Slow on the draw.

Mr. Mello: Yeah, so if you're slow on the draw or if you don't have an opinion, you know we're going to close the survey pretty quickly. We also handed out paper copies of the survey. We didn't want to leave people who were not technologically savvy who are unable to participate so we had a paper version that we looked at after the workshop. Question 2, not surprisingly, we asked which grades – existing grade separation do you use the most and Oregon Express Way was number one. It's dead center in the middle of Palo Alto. It's served by an expressway that moves fairly quickly and reliably so it's not surprising that a lot of people gravitate towards Oregon Expressway when they want to cross the rail corridor. Then I was little surprised that San Antonio Avenue was as high – San Antonio Road. It's at the far southern end of the City. People may be using that to access shopping and other destinations across the rail corridor. Question three, how close do you live to the nearest grade crossing? Not surprisingly, most of the people at the workshop lived fairly close; less than a mile from the rail corridor and the grade crossings. We had six people who lived more than a mile from the crossing. Question 4, rank the six following concerns regarding grade crossings. Traffic disruption was number one, followed closely by safety and bicycle and pedestrian access. Surprisingly, bicycle and pedestrian access seemed to come up a lot more frequently than we expected at the workshop. At the sessions in the afternoon when we started talking about problems and measures of success. Lower down on this list, this not by any means a scientific survey, noise, community connectivity and visual impacts. Then finally we asked – this is very important, we wanted to gauge whether the workshop was a success if we advertised it correctly if people enjoyed the format and we'll use these results to shape future

TRANSCRIPT

community workshops and to shape out outreach procedures ramping up to the workshops. So, we asked, did you find today's workshop useful? An overwhelming majority found it useful; either very useful or somewhat useful. That's a positive sign for us. I think we were able to keep people relatively engaged. I think if we stretched longer than four hours, we might have started to lose interest. I do think it was important to mix it up and have activities, break up some of the presentations and have a working lunch in the middle. Then we asked if people would participate in the next workshop? Again, an overwhelming number of people says yes. We also asked if people would prefer a different day of the week or a different time and nobody answered affirmatively to that response.

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: I think it's worth noting that this was done at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Mello: Yes.

Mr. Shikada: (Inaudible)

Mr. Mello: It is. (Crosstalk) We also asked the best way just to keep you engaged in Connecting Palo Alto. Most people prefer email updates or email newsletters, as well as a website. Not very many people want phone calls, which is not surprising. Question 4, how often would you like to be contacted with updates? A lot of people said monthly, some said bi-weekly. I thought, going into it, the majority would say only at key milestones but it seems like people do want to be kept abreast on a more regular basis. Then, in the afternoon, we had some breakout sessions. We asked people what are the current problems around the existing grade crossings and we had different topics, bikes, pedestrians, automobiles, noise, safety, visual esthetics and other. This is a table that shows – we asked people to place dots on a matrix that had the grade crossings along the top and then different issues along the left side – the left axis. Some of these results are a little bit surprising but bikes and peds ranked very high at Churchill Avenue and Meadow, which is not surprising. Automobile seemed to rank higher at Charleston Road, which is a little bit interesting to us. It is a key corridor that travels across the entire width of the City so I think motorists see it as a very important connection; more so than Churchill and Meadow. Meadow, of course, connects directly to several schools, as does Churchill Avenue so I think the bike/ped focus on those is pretty consistent with what we've thought going in. Safety also ranked very high across the board. It did not rank high for the existing grade separations. We also asked people of their opinion on the existing grade separations so Oregon Express Way, University Avenue, San

TRANSCRIPT

Antonio Road. For those, bikes/peds also ranked high, as well as automobile circulation. The second breakout session focused on defining success so at the end of the day when we complete this project, how do we know that we've succeeded? We asked people to try to think a little bit long term and outside of the traditional way that they may think about these and not focus on issues and solutions. Instead, talk about how we would measure success and how would we define it ultimately. Some of the results are -- from this workshop, are in the area of bicycle and pedestrians. People thought full separation from other modes would be a measure of success for bicyclists and pedestrians. More intuitive and legible layout and organization of facilities so easier to follow bicycle and pedestrian routes across the rail corridor. For automobiles, people wanted to reduce queuing. Particularly in turning lanes. Noise concerns; eliminate horn noise. Then around safety, student safety should be prioritized. Especially during the morning and afternoon peaks and then many people wanted to see a reduction in unsafe driver behavior. So, people entering the gate area when the gates are down, trying to beat the gates, and running red lights at some of the intersections. Then, finally visual and aesthetics. The visual design of all grade crossings should address the feeling of poor connectivity. Then people don't want the grade separations to create additional physiologic barriers between the community, which the rail corridor already does in many places. Post workshop, we're going to compile a comprehensive report that will be delivered to the Rail Committee. We've already updated the website with all of the meeting materials and the link to the video and audio recording. We have a couple of additional stakeholder interviews to conduct so at the stakeholder interviews, before the workshop, we asked as one of the final questions was are there any other people you think we should interview? So, we're moving forward with additional interviews based on that. Then finally, we have a couple of items that we can to get you direction on and there's a table that I handed out. Did you guys get this table here? I can grab some more. There are quite a few other decisions that we're going to need the Rail Committee to focus on but today, these are the two key ones that we think came out of the workshop and the stakeholder interviews. If we don't make a decision on these, it could affect the timetable of the project and affect our ability to complete this work in a timely fashion. Yes, I have one now. The first kind of decision point today is the timeline for this entire project. Originally when we scoped the project, you can see that under Staff recommended column, we assumed that the CSS alternative analysis phase would take 9-months. So, starting in May, that would bring us to February of 2018 and that's currently the goal that we're working towards. Then we would begin the CEQA (inaudible) preliminary design process. That would take an additional 12-months, which means we would have an

TRANSCRIPT

environmental document and preliminary designs by February of 2019. We are, for all intents and purposes, planning to meet this deadline. However, at the – during the stakeholder interviews, at a couple of previous Rail Committee meetings, as well as some of the folks at the workshop, there was some concern about whether this was an artificially imposed deadline. If it was realistic to think that we could complete the alternatives analysis process in 12 – in 9-months. You'll see there is an alternative proposal that would be to establish a 12-month schedule for the Context Sensitive Solution analysis. That would put us to May 2018 and then the CEQA (inaudible) preliminary design would be completed in May of 2019. This would delay the process by 3-months and it could – this is not for sure by any means but it could potentially lead to additional delays in securing Measure B funding depending on how the cash flow works out from the VTA perspective. Where the other communities are positioned in regard to where we are positioned schedule wise. So, we are not saying that's an affirmative impact but it could potentially be one impact of pushing the schedule out 3-months.

Mr. Keene: Hey, Josh?

Mr. Mello: Yes.

Mr. Keene: Could you – I forgot to bring this up when we were going over this. Could you talk about what happens when we get to the end of this CEQA [Enepa] preliminary design process? So, we have that but I mean, I think one of the things that we're really pointing towards is for the City Council to adopt the preferred alternatives. What would typically be the time frame between the completion of this preliminary design and that action being able to take place?

Mr. Mello: The – at the end of this CSS alternatives analysis process, we would bring a preferred alternative forward to City Council and City Council would adopt that preferred alternative. Kind of concurring with the end of that work, we would begin the environmental process and the preliminary design would be used to inform the environmental document. Ultimately, at the end of the completion of the environmental document, Council would have to certify the EIR if it turns out to be an EIR, which is probably pretty likely. Then we would hope to move immediately into final design and the Measure B funding will actually be available for planning and design work so ideally, we would be able to axis some Measure B funding and move directly into the final design for one or several grade crossings.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Keene: Just to clarify then, the completion dates on the CSS alternative analysis presumes then that that's when the Council identifies for the community what the preferred alternative is.

Mr. Mello: Yes, that is correct.

Mr. Keene: Right now, the schedule assumes that they would do that pretty quickly, once we got to say February or May 2018.

Mr. Mello: Yeah, I think we've assumed that by the end of this year, we would have a feel for what our preferred alternative is but it would take a couple months to bring it to Council.

Mr. Keene: Right, thank you.

Mr. Mello: Then the second key decision point today is whether to form a Citizens Advisory Committee or not. We talked earlier about the Technical Advisory Committee that we've started to convene. A Citizen Advisory Committee would be an additional Committee that would be formed to help facilitate this process. Our Staff recommendation today is to continue forward on the path that we've established to date. Which is the key decisions for the CSS alternative analysis would be vetted at the community workshops. The community workshops would essentially function as a citizen sounding board for key decisions through the process. After those decisions are vetted at community workshops, they would be brought to the Rail Committee, which would make a recommendation to City Council. One thing that we think would be helpful would be for the Rail Committee to regularly invite key stakeholders so if there are citizens who are highly active and want to participate in the process, the Rail Committee could establish a framework where these citizens are brought to the Rail Committee to help facilitate some of the discussions and the decision-making process. The alternative in this – under the alternative column, would be for the CAC to appoint – sorry, the City Council to appoint a CAC and the CAC would make recommendations to the Rail Committee. Then the Rail Committee would make recommendations to the City Council. The impacts of convening a CAC would likely be a \$50,000 hit to the project budget. We did not anticipate convening two Committees under this scope of work so, in the scope of work, we have to convene a Rail Technical Group but we did not include convening a Citizen Advisory Group. We are estimating that it would be an additional \$50,000 to facilitate the Citizen Advisory Group meetings, the process, prepare materials for them, and all the other work associated with

TRANSCRIPT

that. As well as additional Staff costs and Staff time. The second impact is that it would likely delay the CSS alternative analysis process by up to 3-months. In all likelihood, we would not be able to seat a Citizen Advisory Committee until August at the earliest and that would push our schedule back pretty substantially. It could be longer than 3-months, depending on how quickly the appointment process worked. So, those are the two key decisions and we are looking for direction on these today from you if possible.

Mr. Keene: Thank you. Could I just add something, Mr. Chair? Josh, I actually think the delay with the CAC would be minimum of 3-months, is what our thinking is. I mean that's the going through the process, seat and appoint. Then the management of that process, I mean that could easily increase the period of time that we're involved in. I just want to say two things before you guys get into your discussion. I think it's appropriate since the NBA finals are on right now, I do think the clock management is important in this process and we need to be paying attention to that because it really does factor into actually, building the improvements that we want and dealing with the cash flows. The fact that the rest of the world – I mean, we're in the dynamic environment where other players are moving ahead and we're not doing this in isolation. I just think we need to think about that. Then secondly, I would just say that our thought was really, that the most important thing for the Rail Committee to do is to make this – I mean, ultimately make this recommendation to the City Council on what the grade separation design, strategy, and all of those things are. Why wouldn't the Rail Committee really take on the task of, in a sense, the CAC and be able to invite and engage with the public but really put that burden back on the Committee as a way to manage as crisply as possible the decision-making process. That was our thinking. The last thing that I would just say is I know that Dick is probably going to speak here but I'm not –we're not opposed to advisory committees honestly, at all. I just would say that one of the sayings is that one of the things that managers always do is reorganize is because it's the only thing the can do. Sometimes, they default to appointing a Citizens Advisory Committee is sometime in that same vein. It's like, we don't know what else to do so let's go ahead and do that. I do think that since time is also a key factor and yet we want – you don't want – we want as much engagement as possible, you want buy-in and you want the benefit of the great thinking in our community. I really think you should think really long and hard about the Rail Committee really playing a – maybe even a little different role than Committees typically do. Thanks.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: Ok, so some members of the public. The first speaker is Herb Borock, the second speaker is Nadia Naik.

Herb Borock: It seems that from attending these meetings and trying to listen to what Committee members and Staff were saying, is that you've already made a decision to do some kind of grade separation project and you want to do it in a hurry because there is some money available from the County Measure B money. This does require environmental review and its probably part of the environmental review as a mitigation for the two main projects that have been going on, which is first Caltrain and then High Speed Rail. Now, you passed up on the opportunity of getting Caltrain to be paying for these grade separations as part of their electrification project because you seem to think that electrifying Caltrain, rather than having some other way of modifying it, was so important to do. That you essentially said it's a great project and we don't have to be worried about those things. Now in terms of High Speed Rail, it's important while you are spending time on what is the right process to do it, to find out what High Speed Rail is thinking about. KCRA.com had an article 5-days ago online in which it said that High Speed Rail wants to see twelve trains running each hour along the routes in the Bay Area to Southern California. Now, those twelve trains, it doesn't say whether they are all going to go between San Francisco and San Jose or whether those trains are only going to go as far as San Jose. If they are coming up this corridor, Jeff [Morally] said that we don't anticipate essentially having that many trains but that's the capacity we're building too and service will depend upon demand and it could be every 15-minutes having a train. The point is, is that to try and do this separately and before the High Speed Rail EIR process goes through for the San Francisco to San Jose section doesn't make sense because you don't know what you're designing for and you don't have a way to get High Speed Rail to pay for it. Thank you.

Nadia Naik: Hi. Nadia Naik. I'm sure it will be no surprise that I would say that I am in column B of looking at having a Citizen Advisory Committee or actually, let's not call it that. I just think there needs to be a better conversation. I think we're getting caught up in terminology. Here's – let me play this out for you in super-fast mode. So, Rail Committee is now this super empowered Committee. You guys get to make all the decisions, you work with Staff, you're super-fast, you get to do some check-ins with CARD, you do some check-ins with Friends of Caltrain, that's fine. I know already because several Council Members have talked to me about it, nobody wants to be the Council Member on Council that says we're going to raise or lower the road and take homes. So, there goes that alternative. Then you've got the crew that says tunnels are very expensive. We can't afford a trench so

TRANSCRIPT

guess where that leaves us? That leaves us with an elevated rail. So, you're having this conversation about Catenary Poles and this other stuff and you are just going to find yourselves in the same spots. Now, you speed through everything, you've got (inaudible) this conclusion and you are going to be voting on something and you're just going to go back to 20014 were everybody flips out again. I think it's interesting that you've got – Josh was sort of surprised by the number of people that came; I wasn't surprised. In fact, if you listen really closely to what you heard, you heard that they are talking about bike safety, people. They want things to feel intuitive. They are looking at physiological boundaries. They are asking to be communicated with bi-weekly or monthly. I mean I get that this is a hyper-engaged group that spent 4-hours on a Saturday talking about rail but it's not unlike what we heard before. I see this very much like the library campaign. You can go out into a library campaign, it will fail. If you spend the time with the community, you might end up with something that they can back. Odds are, Palo Alto is going to have to put money into this project and the odds are that in order to bring those people along, you are going to have to bring in the masses. This is not about checking in with the most annoying residents that have some opinions on this. You are going to have to bring a lot of people along and community vetting at these meetings is tough. You saw that it took 49-minutes because I measured before the first person stood up and said, I have a problem with that data. What does that number mean? If you think that every time you are going to be able to come back with your thing and show it to people and expect that they are going to get it all. A lot of the CSS process is the physiological process of people mourning the loss of alternatives that they can't have. That we can't afford, they are not technically feasible or that are just not going to work for expediency or money. You have to walk them through and I get that it's painful and I know for you guys that do this all the time, it's like nails on a chalkboard but honestly, it's a big deal. This is one of the biggest things that's going to happen from an infrastructure standpoint. This timeline, I mean yeah, the numbers are off. You're talking about potentially four grade seps. I don't think you are going to be able to build four grade seps at the same time but if you did a great process, you might actually do what San Francisco did, which basically they said we're doing a Transbay terminal. We don't know when the money is coming but we're building it. What you want is to have the community process where you are able to lock into the Comp. Plan. Yes, we are going to have future grade seps and yes, we're going to do them this way and we went through this whole process and we've decided what they are and we'll figure out how to fund it over time. You got to bring the people through the process. You can't – 4-hours at this meeting, essentially, we repeated what the Rail Committee report did in 2014. They all said yeah, we

TRANSCRIPT

need grade seps. Yeah, we care about the community. Yeah, we need permeability across the membrane of the rail lines. I get that these stakeholder groups and whatever can be cumbersome; all of that stuff but it's messy and you are going to have to. I don't think you can get through this without that. Thank you.

Chair DuBois: Great, thank you. Alright, (inaudible)

Mayor Scharff: So, a couple things, I actually have to say that I thought the surveys on this were really helpful. I'm impressed with how many people actually attended this; one hundred...

Mr. Mello: One hundred and thirty.

Mayor Scharff: I mean and they all seemed really engaged. I was really amazed when I look at this and it says 95 percent of them say count me into future – yeah, sure. Ninety-five say could me in for future events, zero percent basically said that no, they are not interested and that actually no one else said that they wanted a different day of the week. I thought that was really interesting and only five percent – that's two people basically, I think, right? Maybe a little less but they said that they didn't want – they weren't going to come again but they wanted to be kept posted. I thought to get a hundred and thirty-two people fully engaged like that, was great. So, when we are talking about going out to the community and we talk about involving the greatest number of people. I get the sense that this group is going to stick with these workshops and so what we are really doing is having a Citizens Advisory Committee with everybody who wants to participate; which seems to be one hundred and thirty people. You can't have a small – I mean, a citizens advisory group would actually be less – what's the word? Would be less inclusive, less involving of the community than doing this because you'll have a less number of people. I think out original fear that some people were going to show up and then not go to the next one and that – this survey seems to indicate the opposite is going to happen. That they are going to be engaged, that they are going to go to them as long as – most people are going to continue to show up. It's going to be a continuous group and it's going to be a large group which is what you want in the community. I don't think we need the Citizens Advisory Committee. I think this works really well and we should go with this process. I do think that if we were to stop and form a Citizens Advisory Committee, it would slow the entire process down and in some ways, it would be betraying all the people – the 130 people who aren't on the – those people who don't get on the Citizens Advisory Committee would then feel like they're not as

TRANSCRIPT

involved and they would want to be. This would undercut the process of these community meetings that we are having so I actually think it would be a negative in terms of bringing people along in the community. I am also concerned that – I think the City Manager is right. That if we form a Citizens Advisory Committee, it's at least a 6-months delay and then I believe the Committee, as most of these Committees do, will want more time. So, there is the time in seating them, there's the time that they will want more time to continue the process and I think it will just take – drag on and on. Now, the difference – so, I am not going to support a Citizens Advisory Committee. On the delay process of 9-months versus 12-months, I guess I didn't hear a reason of why – what would we gain from the other 3-months and what that would add to the process? I mean my belief, at the moment, is that I am open to it and that we should stick with the 9-months and that I don't think I have ever been through a process that doesn't get delayed. We will say 9-months and it will be 12-months but if we say 12-months, it will be 15 or 16-months. If we say 15 or 16-months, it will be 19-months because these things always have a way of – there is always an extra meeting that we decide that we need. There's always more information, there's always several more meetings that need to take place and so, I would stick with this unless Staff says no. I am going to differ to you guys. If you think an extra 3-months gets us something by saying it on the front end, I am open to it but on the whole, I think we should stick with it.

Mr. Mello: So, the 9-month period is what we thought – that is as aggressive as we felt comfortable being, given the work that needs to occur; the analysis and the decision points. Any shorter than that and I don't think we'd be able to complete...(crosstalk)

Mayor Scharff: I wasn't (inaudible).

Mr. Mello: So, that's where the 9-months came from. An additional 3-months, one of the whole points of a community engagement process is to allow the most number of people to find out about the project and voice their opinion on the project and ensure that we aren't missing out on opportunities to garner input from the public. The additional 3-months would give users more time to get the word out but I think, our approach would be fairly aggressive community engagement; as you saw, with one hundred and thirty people that turned out on Saturday. I think we'd have to be careful if we were going to stick with the 9-month schedule, to make sure that we get the word out at a level that would hopefully exceed what we would do if we had the 12-month schedule and still have as many people involved in just a shorter time frame.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: Josh, not to put you on the spot but I thought – I wasn't quite clear. I'm more than open to a 12-month process if you think that's better. I think we are going to end up there anyway, frankly. I'm concerned though that if we start off with a 12-month process, we will end up with a 15-month process. I mean I guess I am asking, if you want to go forward today with a 12-month process, I think you should say so if you think it's preferable. If you think it's better to say let's look at 9-months and let's revise it as we go through, that's another alternative. If you say let's -- 9-months is adequate, which is not really what I heard you say. I guess I want you to be...

Mr. Mello: We are recommending sticking with the 9-month schedule. However, during some of the stakeholder interviews and at the workshop, there were some concerns expressed that felt rushed and this was by community stakeholders. I think sticking with the 9-months schedule might lead to some comments that we're artificially rushing the process but I think 9-months is – to start at 9-months is a realistic schedule. I think it anticipates the work that we need to do. I do think that we may end up having an extra meeting in there – an extra meeting or two so we may end up exactly as you said; stretching it out to twelve. I think our goal should be the 9-month timeframe.

Mr. Keene: Could I – no, I'll wait. If – I agree with virtually everything that Nadia said. That this is one of the most important decisions that this Council is going to make or the – and the community is going to make and that it's going to take a lot of engagement. I just – I don't want us to sound like -- on the Staff side, we're saying we're against a Citizens Advisory Committee. What we are suggesting is that there are many, many channels and approaches to use for citizen engagement. That – I've been doing this for 30-years and one getting clear about what the goals of engagement are. I mean there is everything from informing to actual decision making and a whole continuum there. Getting clear about what we want to do and even a large Advisory Committee isn't reprehensive of the entire community; no matter what we think. Particularly when you are ultimately --I agree-- thinking about how you may get eventual political buy-in on say some sort of funding measure that the City may have to put in. I think there's a lot of thought that needs to take place. Then lastly, the only place that I disagree with what Nadia was saying, I think a little bit, is whatever happens still has to come back to the City Council. So, it has to be palatable and expectable, ultimately to the Council and it does not just default in a very controversial decision that an advisory group is able to perfectly craft that so that that's going to work. Now, that being said, I want to reemphasize that our

TRANSCRIPT

recommendation anticipates that there would be a super charge role for the Rail Committee and we should look and investigate admiration ways of engagement. Just as one example, we've got a great resource right over at Stanford at the Center for Deliberate Democracy named James [Fishkin]. They do a weekend workshop, it's intense and involves over one hundred people. It's all based on deliberative polling, which deals with the fact that many people poll – I mean, many polls are by uninformed folks on really what the facts and the choices are. There are some very, very interesting work that they have done over there. Where actually, in a course of a weekend, you can often move positions, 25-points in polling with a kind of point, accouter point export discussion work group thing. That's very different than what we even did at the first workshop, which was mostly sort of informing or re-informing folks. Which is – it was a necessary first step since there had been a big gap between – since we'd been out with the public. I mean, I think that there are ten different ways that we need to be thinking about the engagement process, rather than just delegating it in a sense to a Citizens Advisory Committee. That even as good as they are on controversial decisions, they still become insiders in a sense to the process. They are no longer outsiders and what we want to do is think about how we continually engage as wide a swath of people. I think that means that we've got to do some real strategic thinking at the Rail Committee in whatever we do. If you decided that you want – I think there are a lot of variations of what could be – how you could have ongoing participation versus episodic by key stakeholders. Anyway, I'm just worried we'll default to what we have typically done, that's all.

Chair DuBois: Yeah?

Council Member Fine: Thank you. So, actually, I just want to start talking about the session. Thank you very much for hosting it and I think it was helpful to kind of explain to folks what's going on. There were a lot of interested parties and that was nice to see. Just a few comments about that workshop before we get to kind of these alternatives here. A few things struck me so one, it is something that I think Nadia mentioned, is this physiological factor. There's a lot of emotions around this and I think that there's actually a good story to be woven for Palo Alto about reconnecting our community and east/west connections. There is something there that we could emphasize more and I think it's really helpful. It's also – the reason this is such a major decision is that we're going to be doing this massive project and really changing the face of Palo Alto so that's a big physiological issue too. Something else that struck me from the session is that – I wasn't expecting this. I was kind of expecting to go in and have everybody think

TRANSCRIPT

that all – each of the crossing should be perfect. They should be completely separated and all the modes separated and we just kind of chunk through and do this massive project on each one. It was really interesting to me that I thought the public kind of got the nuance of each one. That – I spoke to a few people and they said, why don't we just close Churchill, right? Just make it for bikes and peds. Then other folks were saying oh, Charleston is much more car-oriented. Maybe we don't focus on the bike and ped there as much. That was really interesting to me to see that the public even recognizes that there are going to be different solutions at each of these different sites. On the alternatives here, I think we have kind of two parallel issues. One is that we, as a Council and a community, do want to make a choice on our preferred alternatives. So, we can actually get in the pipeline and get some Measure B funding and actually, we can solve this problem. The other factor is that we want community buy-in for it and we want to make sure that people are prepared and informed. I think Jim's question is really good, is what are we looking for in our engagement? Is it informing folks? Is it getting their opinions and is the ongoing sessions good enough for that? Something that I keep on coming back to is the PTC. We have this Planning and Transportation Commission and that might be another good sounding Board to include here. I think if Staff is recommending 9-months, I'm ok with that. I am a little weary on the CAC but I want to hear from the rest of my colleagues; beyond the Mayor. Those are just some of my thoughts for now. Then – the only other thing, I guess is as we're doing this and let's say in the best-case scenario, we have a preferred alternative that this Committee takes to Council in 9-months. So, next February or so and we're going to Council and we're saying we like these ones. Is there any finance and funding leg work that we can do in the interim? Even if we don't know what those preferred alternatives are, can we begin putting together what our plan might be and it kind of harks to the library bond measure a bit? In that maybe the ground work is on the funding side as well, as it is on the alternative side. Those are just some of my thoughts for the moment but I am interested in hearing from other Council Members on the CAC here. Just a reminder, we did just close down one CAC on Monday night.

Chair DuBois: Ok, thanks. Eric?

Council Member Filseth: Yeah. You have a point, now we have space for a CAC now that – no, I'm just kidding. You know, I mean maybe this is overly simplistic thinking but it seems to me that what we have before us – I mean, it's complicated in some ways but it's not complicated in others. I mean the first question is do we really need to do this? Assuming the answer is yes, then I think as we roll our sleeves up and get into this, we're going to find

TRANSCRIPT

that – or actually, there is actually not a huge number of options. I think it's going to boil down to a very small number of likely options. Maybe even just two and if it comes to two, it's going to be one that's really painful and one that's really expensive and that's what we are going to have to choose between as a City. The question is – that's going to be – that's going to take some soul searching by the community on how we do that, right? Is a CAC – I mean, if it comes down to that kind of a choice, is the CAC the best way to help the community understand that and resolve it? Maybe it is and maybe it isn't but you know, it's a different problem than the Comp. Plan, for example, that we were just talking about. I mean, I don't know how it's going to play out but you know, here's an example. If we are faced with a choice like that, which I think is pretty likely. I think we all think that it's pretty likely and we choose a painful option, it's because we couldn't afford the less painful one. We couldn't find the money. Is CAC really going to have a lot of value in persuading the community that we really couldn't find the money? Is that a function of what a CAC is supposed to do? I wonder so I think that's the thought process that we kind of need to go through on whether we want to do a CAC or what's the best way that – assuming that we are headed to that choice, what's the best way, as we as a community, can make? A bi-modal decision where the alternatives are fairly clearly defined like that. That's – maybe it's more than two or maybe it's three or something like that but I think that's the kind of way we ought to think about this. It's not sort of a complicated thing.

Chair DuBois: I guess I wanted to talk about the workshop first. I think we had five elected officials there, for parts of the day, and then four. Just a quick note, I think I was the only one that stayed or maybe Lydia stayed for the afternoon breakout sessions.

Council Member Filseth: You where the 2 percent that didn't want to (crosstalk).

Chair DuBois: I would hope that as part of the Committee, that at future workshops we can all stay there all day. I think it's important and educational for us, as well as it's good to see what the community is saying. People did ask for frequent communication. I think 75 percent wanted it monthly or more frequently and right now the schedule has a workshop every couple of months so I think that's important to think about. The importance of data correctness came up pretty early. In the morning, there was some data shown and I think we had an issue with delays on the rail being shown as zero seconds because of Alma being there and the delays are for Alma and not the rail. People in the audience picked up on that right

TRANSCRIPT

away. I think we have an educated community and we need to be really careful about the information that we present at these workshops. I really don't think we should use the sift data for much more than waking the audience up. Again, less than half the people respond. It's hard to tell what this data really means. I mean if the Stanford kind of thing is more comprehensive, including the people that show up, I think that's good but this is some subset of a subset. It's hard to tell what it really means. The other concern that I have was that the workshop focused a lot on existing conditions and I heard a lot of the discussion in the afternoon. Rail people were really talking about existing conditions and I think we are planning for future conditions. I don't think the one hundred and thirty people really, fully, appreciated that. They were thinking about what they see today, not the twenty or twenty-four trains an hour and so I think that's pretty important. I think about did this workshop accomplish its goal? You know it's not clear to me. Again, it's – I don't think we clearly defined the goal as getting the process started. I do think we got community engagement, which is good. There were a lot of questions at the end of the day from the participants about continued engagement and how that was going to happen. My sense is that workshops are great for information sharing but not decision making. I think people that go there, at the end of the day, they gave input but they don't really feel like they've personally – a decision has been made. Going forward, again, I thought this first workshop we were trying to define the problem that we are trying to solve and what's the goal. I'm not sure we got that, a clear answer on that but maybe that will come in the detailed report from Staff. For me, I think we're not just trying to share information but we're trying to determine the best alternative. I really don't think any of us know what that alternative is. I don't think it's as simple as Council Member Filseth is saying. I think one of the things coming out of the workshop was that there can be different solutions for the different separations. People seem very open to a variety of things and so if the goal is really to determine the best alternative that captures all these multifaceted factors to increase connectivity while minimizing these impacts. If whether it's homes or construction impacts or whatever it is and is fundable. I think either the workshop or stakeholder group is going to have to consider feasibility. It's going to have to come in pretty quickly. Kind of moving on to kind of the time line and the scenarios. I feel like I am coming at this maybe 180 degrees from where the Mayor is but I think we're agreeing on the high-level stuff and I agree with what the City Manager said about clock management. I continue to think that the workshop process is, in the end, going to take longer. That I think that there's very real risk that we will go through the 9-months and not have community buy-in and end up either restarting the process or extend the process; similar to the Comp.

TRANSCRIPT

Plan. Then find ourselves in kind of a morass and I don't think that 3-months, even if it's a little bit longer, is not much of a delay at all; \$50,000 dollars is minimal and that we really should think of more of a stakeholder process and I don't think it's the traditional CAC process. I mean none of these options are really a CSS process with an empowered stakeholders group. I think we really need to think about trying the full CSS process with an empowered stakeholder group where the technical stakeholder would provide information and advise that group but the stakeholder group would actually make the recommendation so I think they should make them to Council. They can certainly tell us but I actually don't think it's a CSS process for the Rail Committee to determine the alternatives. I don't think we should be taking all this community input and then coming up with our own solutions. It's going to be big enough that I think the full Council is going to want to be involved. The other thing that I would say is that when you look at a workshop process and you talk about one hundred and thirty people kinds of being a CAC. Again, I don't think people really – there is no way to make decisions with one hundred and thirty people. So, we'll have a lot of opinions but I don't think we will be able to get the best solution, get the best ideas in a way that everybody has input and some of the really important ideas don't get lost in the noise of one hundred and thirty people. Stakeholders can represent groups of people; it can be informal or formal. I think that we can encourage – we can continue to have community engagement with workshops. We can encourage people who are really interested who maybe don't get on the stakeholder group to align with a stakeholder and they can have meetings outside the process and have their voice heard that way. I kind of strongly feel that we should really try the full CSS process here and not a typical CAC. I think we brought it up a couple times but can we use the Measure B money for the stuff that we are doing now? You're saying that we can use it for design but can we use it for this planning and community outreach process, do we know?

Mr. Mello: I – before I get to the answer to that question, I have a couple comments that I should have made earlier. Just in the interest of clarification, I wouldn't want to assume that the format that we used for the first workshop would be the format that we would use if the workshops were going to be a decision-making forum. I think we will have to think long and hard about how we most effectively use the workshops to make decisions. The community workshop one was not intended as a decision-making forum and there are Context Sensitive Solution processes which have used the community forum format. Not all CSS processes include a standing – appointed Committee. Our goal would be to use these community workshops in the most effective manner possible to make decisions and we would work

TRANSCRIPT

with CARD and PPS and some of the other interested parties to help craft the agendas for those workshops. Also, the methods that would be used to make those decisions at the forums and it may be that we can't just do them monthly; we need to get more intensive. Maybe the forums need to be organized around the different grade crossings or – I do agree that managing one hundred and thirty people could be very difficult in getting them to collectively make a decision. It could be a heavy lift but I think there are ways that we can look to structure the workshops that would make that easier and it wouldn't necessarily look like the one that we had on May 20th. In regard to access Measure B funding for planning and environmental work and another project – pre-construction work. VTA has said that they are willing to fund some of those activities but the cash isn't going to start flowing until probably October. I don't necessarily know that they are going to have the – all the planning money that we would need available in the first 2-year program of funds. Certainly, we will look at ways to access that but I wouldn't want to delay our work waiting for the VTA money to come forward.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I mean can it retroactively fund work (inaudible)?

Mr. Keene: That would be pretty unlikely. I think it would be for new contracts and new work but we can certainly ask.

Chair DuBois: Ok. Yeah, so I've been reading up on CSS and if you have examples of CSS without standing Committee, I would love to see them. I really think that we should stop calling this the CSS approach if we're – from what I have seen, there are a fairly defined methodology and we're not following it right now. We can call it community outreach, we can call it something else but let's not kind of misuse the term. I do – again, I just want to say that if the Rail Committee chooses the option, then that's pretty far from CSS. Council has approved the CSS process so if we are going to switch, I really think we need to go back to Council. I likely – I think at the end of the day, we're going to end up probably going to the community twice for on the ballot. I think we're probably going to have a vote on the preferred scenarios and then we're probably going to have to vote on funding mechanisms. Again, if we think of it that way, that might impact the way we think about organizing this decision-making process and the community engagement process. I have a Motion that I will throughout. I'd loved to debate a little bit but I would recommend to Council that we reaffirm our commitment to CSS and engage in a full process with an empowered stakeholder group tasked to define the preferred alternative for grade separations. Alright?

TRANSCRIPT

Council Member Filseth: I'll second that.

MOTION: Chair DuBois moved, seconded by Council Member Filseth to recommend to the City Council to reaffirm the commitment to Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) and engage in a full process with an empowered stakeholder group tasked to define the preferred alternative for grade separations.

Chair DuBois: Ok, thank you. I think I have spoken to it. Again, I really think the stakeholder group should be the ones actually empowered to come back with an alternative and that's a little bit different than I think anything that we've been talking about here. Eric?

Council Member Filseth: I suspect the stakeholder group is going to have to come back with more than one alternative and much of their work is going to be crafting the details of one of those alternatives, more than the other one.

Mayor Scharff: I think the stakeholder group is the wrong way to go. I think with the Staff recommendation is the right way to go. I think involving the PTC is actually a really good idea. I think that (inaudible) going to work if we go (inaudible) the stakeholder group right now. I think it would be to insider (inaudible) as the City Manager said. I think people are going to need to be involved and moved through this process. (Inaudible) need to bring people in as we go through the process, which the community meetings will do. As people start realizing the impacts on their homes and their lives, then they are going to wake up and want to be more involved. I think we're going to grow from 130 people at these meetings to 200 people; 300 people possibly. That's a good thing because I think otherwise you'll have a small stakeholder group, which will be viewed as insiders. People are going to then – I don't think you are going to gain anything. I do that Council Member Fine's suggestion of having discussions in this and input from the Planning and Transportation Commission is actually really helpful. That's another forum where people can go through, it's another set of eyes, it's another group who frankly, is the group that we've empowered in many ways to do planning and transportation. They are a stakeholder group in their own way in many ways. They represent segments of the community, recent Council appointed them. I think that I would actually make an alternative motion that we go with the Staff recommendation, plus that we also send this to the PTC for them to have discussions and make recommendations and go through the process. Then that we empower Staff, at their discretion, to

TRANSCRIPT

increase the time line from 9-months to 12-months, as they see fit and as (inaudible).

SUBSTITUTE MOTION: Mayor Scharff moved, seconded by Council Member Fine to recommend to the City Council to:

- a. Receive an oral Staff Report on the results of Community Workshop #1 which was held on May 20, 2017 and provide input regarding the Workshop and next steps;
- b. Send the Community Rail Comments to the Planning and Transportation Commission for discussion and recommendation to the City Council; and
- c. Empower Staff to increase the timeline from 9 months to 12 months, if needed.

Council Member Fine: (Inaudible). I'll second that. So, you are saying PTC, Staff (inaudible)...

Mayor Scharff: No, Staff can go up to 3-months more if they look at the schedule and revise it as they see fit.

Mr. Mello: Just a point of clarification, would the PTC involvement run parallel to the Committee and then it would go to Council?

Mayor Scharff: Yes. Well, actually, they would run parallel but I think they – to the extent that they have (inaudible) that they should check in with the Rail Committee and it should be Rail Committee – it should be PTC, Rail Committee and then Council.

Mr. Keene: I'll differ to Council Member Filseth and I then I would like to make an (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Chair DuBois: Well, I don't know if you want to speak to your second.

Council Member Fine: Yeah, so I think the Mayor put it well that we already do have a body – a stakeholder body that does deal with these things; Planning and Transportation Commission. I know a number of Commissioners have been asking for a big task to do, whether it's on

TRANSCRIPT

something on housing or transportation and I think this could be a good opportunity. I also agree with the Mayor that if we do go and set up another body, it will delay this in terms of seating it and in terms of actually executing it. If we all remember that the previous CAC for the Comp. Plan, which ultimately is a different project and different task, the Council chose to go back and appoint more members and then some members dropped out and then things changed. That can be a bit of a show that we don't want. Our goal is to get a preferred alternative and Council Member DuBois, I think you are absolutely right. We do want a Context Sensitive Solution but we also have to make it jive with the Palo Alto process. Our problem is not that we don't have enough process, I think that's barely our problem so I would encourage my fellow Council Members to support something where we are using an existing body within the City; the PTC. We're giving Staff the option to go an extra 3-months. Josh, as you mentioned, it would give you a bit more ability to engage folks and inform people and that may be helpful. I think we do want to be aggressive but we don't want to come across as being aggressive so if the 3-months gives you a little flexibility – so, that's why I am supporting this.

Council Member Filseth: If we go with the substitute motion, does that preclude us forming a Stakeholder Committee later on if we decide that it's necessary, just because of the timing involved?

Mr. Keene: If a – could I speak to that because I'm feeling a little paranoid or defensive here. From my point of view – from the Staff's point of view, it's a false choice, I think, to be talking about three or four community workshops versus a CAC. I think it's much more multi textures and approaches, some of which we don't even know what they are yet. Even if we were to say we're going to do CSS, I guarantee you along the way we would say that we've got to make some adaptation here and pivot. We have an engaged stakeholder group, actually, they don't seem to be engaged enough so we want to do – we're going to have to do that because this is – I mean, I don't think that this is much about what is the best technical solution. I go back to Council Member Filseth's points. I do think that there are some relatively simple aspects to this that ultimately be – deals with what is technically possible with what is -- politically isn't the right word but feasible, expectable, in such a way that the community can say not only do we expect that. We want that enough that we are willing to pay 'x' amount for. In one sense, I do think the conversation says that some of these conversations need to unfold in parallel. It's not like we can just do everything sequentially and say ok, here's a technical and then go oh, let's take it to the funding folks. Oh, that doesn't work, I mean it's going to have

TRANSCRIPT

to unfold. I actually would just like to say this. I think that this is one of the defining decisions for this community that the Council ultimately has to make. I think it's way more important than the Comp. Plan, to be honest with you. I mean the truth is if we didn't adopt a Comp. Plan, we have an existing Comp. Plan and I'm sorry but it's really pretty good. The truth is, we're not pulling out the Comp. Plan every week and comparing it to a decision that we're going to make but this decision really is going to set the design, the livability, everything of this community for the next 100-years. I think it needs – the Council needs to acknowledge that this is a leadership responsibility of the Council that – I noticed the idea of problem definition in any engagement process and doing that is really important but I think the bigger issue is how do we get some basic clarity and be able to start communicating clearly enough about what the relative choices are. So, that the engagement process does grab people. It's not – the problem that I see with the CAC, I just worry – our typically CAC -- I've only been with two here, the Comp. Plan and the infrastructure – the [IBRC] and then folks talk about the SOFA II plan but even the most supportive advocates for that say it was too long. We could have managed that time better. That ongoing groups default to folks who have the time, whatever the interest, to be able to hang in there for a long period of time. That basically excludes everybody else in the City who are too busy to be able to participate. The bigger issue is, how does the Council get enough stakeholder community perspective involvement in addition to what the technical solutions are that – you've got that. I would imagine we're going to have to have some stakeholder groups appointed that in some way inform our process. Ultimately, how is it that the community as a whole is going to be able to – the Council going to be able to say the community is going to support us on the ultimate decision that we made. I think that's going to call – that's going to require a continual design and I definitely do not want anybody to think that we just think three more big community workshops are all we have to do.

Chair DuBois: I just want to say that these options are not mutually exclusive. I think the PTC – I was assuming we were continuing workshops in my motion. I mean, I think the real question is it is there a stakeholder group or not? I think we do workshops, we send it to the PTC but the Comp. Plan tried the workshop only approach and it failed. It added about 2-years to the schedule. I just feel like we are going down that road again and what the City Manager just said, we'll probably need a stakeholder group. If we are going to need one, I think we need to set it up now so that they are educated. They are up to speed and they are engaged in the process. I really don't see us waiting for 6-months and then forming a stakeholder group. I mean I don't think that's going to happen.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Keene: I was – I just want to say that to be honest with you, I do appreciate that Chair DuBois has been reading CSS a lot. I would be hard pressed to think that if we asked the Council to answer twenty questions about CSS, whether or not we could get clarity about that. I think one of the challenges that we have is defining exactly what it is you are trying to do and then design the tool to meet what that is.

Council Member Fine: That was the point that I was going to get at. When Council Member Filseth earlier mentioned that he thinks were going to have to go the ballot twice on this. Was that you?

Chair DuBois: I did.

Council Member Fine: Tom, you did? Thank you. That struck me for a moment that each of those might require their own stakeholder group. Are we being...

Mr. Keene: Let me check on this (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Council Member Fine: I guess there is something here that when we reach some of those decision points that Jim is alluding too. We may need to appoint stakeholder groups, whether it's for a bond measure or for specific decision point. At the current time, we already do have this CSS process, which we laid out and I think it was this Committee which supported it. It's going through early next year and I think, as Josh mentioned, we will be refining the workshops to see if there are decision points in them. If we do want those groups voting on preferred alternatives to give us feedback, that may be a great solution. In the meantime, I still believe the PTC is a standing body that has expertise in this area and would be a sounding Board for community input. I would be happy for the PTC to vote on alternatives and give – make recommendations to this Committee and we make recommendations to Council. In the future, I may be open to starting another stakeholder group if it's necessary for a specific decision point.

Chair DuBois: Again, I think we should stop calling it CSS if – we should come up with a new name.

Council Member Fine: I mean, I'm not so worried about the semantics there.

Chair DuBois: Alright, so let's vote on the alternative Motion – Substitute Motion. All those in favor? Against? Ok, that passes on a 3-1.

TRANSCRIPT

SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED: 3-1 DuBois no.

Chair DuBois: Again, since Council has already directed CSS, I think this needs to go to Council with a recommendation of the Rail Committee.

Mayor Scharff: Tom, I think we believe that this is CSS. I mean I know you are saying that it's not but we believe it is. That doesn't mean that it doesn't go to Council but I'm – you keep saying it and I just want to tell you that I think we're doing CSS.

Chair DuBois: Again, I don't think it's really an opinion. I think it's fact based at this point.

Council Member Filseth: Is the specific item that goes to Council that whether to form a Stakeholder Committee at this time or CAC at this time or not? I just want to clarify my understanding. The specific item that is going to go to Council, is whether or not to form a CAC at this time? Is that it?

Chair DuBois: No, I think it's – the motion that we just passed, which is to use the Staff recommended process, plus the PTC, and the bit about increasing the timelines as needed. That happens naturally anyways but yeah.

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: I think it's what we just voted on right? That we're not...

Mayor Scharff: Right, but you could narrow – if you agreed with the other portions of it that would be – then we would have consensus among the four of us. (Inaudible) Sorry, I said it's really up to you how you want to do it but we could narrow it to the point of disagreement to whether or not to have a CAC. Then that's what we put on – the rest we would put on consent and say, that's what we agree – we recommend we do that and people can pull that if they want to have the whole wide-ranging discussion or we could limit the discussion purely to whether or not we have a CAC.

Chair DuBois: Yeah...

Mayor Scharff: It's really up to you.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: I think it was the whole...

Mayor Scharff: You want to do the whole discussion? Ok.

Chair DuBois: Alright.

Council Member Fine: Just one (inaudible).

Mayor Scharff: Unless our Charter allows us to but I don't remember what are charter allows.

Council Member Fine: One comment is that we did recommend that some this work go to the PTC. It would be helpful if Staff at some point would give us what that schedule looks like and what decision points PTC will make in sync with our workshops and this Committee.

Mr. Keene: A couple of things. Not to slow things down but I think getting to the Council before the break is going to be difficult, given everything that we've got. Secondly, I would just express some concern that – I think that we have – I think we – as Council Member Fine said, I mean a lot of this is semantics, I actually do think and sort of sorting out semantics actually takes some thinking, like on the Staff side. To even write a Staff report that I think is really reflective so we don't necessarily set up a false point, counter point. I mean, I would hate to see we just go and then we have a default decision that's just – let's say made up on a having a CAC, without the right context. I'm sort of playing off on Context Sensitive Solutions but understanding what we're trying to do. This is a really big decision for the process that we're going to use and I think that articulating that – I mean, regardless of what you would have done here today, I felt that we needed to go back as Staff and begin to do some deeper work about how to explain what we're – what in general we're trying to do. This is almost like a campaign platform language to just sort of try to articulate what we're doing. I'm just worried about us having a discussion that we're not fully ready to have flushed out enough for the Council. I mean, we come back in August and I could see it because just to even say that one side saying this is Context Sensitive Solutions and this isn't. Well, let's -- I'd rather us be able to articulate that a little bit better for the whole Council; this is this and what that is and some of our work and thinking. I don't think we could do that – it's really by April 27th, which means it's got to be out a week before. That's two weeks from now or whatever, which is pretty tough.

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: I don't see us doing that. The way I see what we (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Mr. Keene: One week, sorry. One week.

Mayor Scharff: I'm going to speak as the Mayor now. What I see that we've just done is Staff will continue to move forward in the direction that they have been moving. We haven't changed any of that because we can't so they will go ahead. There's been no decision, in fact, there's been a three to one recommendation against doing a CAC. So, Staff will continue to move forward and we'll probably bring this to Council right after the break about whether or not they want to basically put in a CAC and whether or not they want to do anything else and change in the process. At this point, the process will move forward the way (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I think much more than semantics. Again, I was advocating for an empowered stakeholder group.

Mr. Keene: But I don't know what that means, Tom. I mean...

Chair DuBois: What's that?

Mr. Keene: I don't know what that means and I don't mean that in a – I'm not arguing. To have a clear definition of what that means, I think would be helpful. I'm not sure that – or even the Committee's making decisions yes or no based upon knowing what that means. That's what I meant, I felt like the Staff report that we bring back...

Chair DuBois: Well, the Staff recommendation was kind of the series of workshops without any CAC, right?

Mr. Keene: That says CSS – I agree but it says Rail Committee – it also says the Rail Committee makes and invites key stakeholders. I mean that could be expensive. I mean, I'm not saying -- you guys could end up meeting every week. I mean honestly, and I just think that you need to give us a little time to do a really comprehensive enough Staff report so that the whole Council can make the decisions about the direction that we're going.

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible)

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: I do think that Council has been very clear in the past about wanting a CSS process and again, everything I see says that you would have a dedicated group that would be getting information and making decisions along the way. So, if we are not doing that then I mean, I think it should come back in August.

Mr. Keene: Yeah, we will. We'll come back in August, right? I mean that's we'll target.

Mayor Scharff: I just want to make sure that what we are doing right now doesn't slow the process down and I don't think it should.

Mr. Mello: I think we'd like to come back with not only the CSS plan but also the draft problem statement and the evaluation criteria. That way we don't slow down the process, we can do it all at once.

Mayor Scharff: I think you are totally empowered to all of that.

Interagency Communications

Chair DuBois: Alright, so we move onto interagency communications. Yeah, so we actually have a public speaker – oh, for future agendas. For first on interagency communications, I have several things. I don't know if you guys have anything or I'll just jump in.

Mayor Scharff: Jump in.

Chair DuBois: The Union Pacific letter that we voted on at I think our last rail meeting, the LPMG Group has decided that the City is going to submit individual letters and those need to get in fairly quickly. I think we have a draft letter and I think we already voted to recommend that Council have the Mayor submit that letter. I don't know that it came to Council yet but if we have that come to Council, that letter should go in, in the next week or two.

Mayor Scharff: Which letter?

Chair DuBois: This is to Union Pacific to allow different grade inclines.

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: (Inaudible)

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: I mean, I'm not sure that needs – look, if you think it needs to go to Council. I don't think it needs to go to Council.

Chair DuBois: Ok.

Mayor Scharff: I think we've had a pretty clear policy on Council that we all support that. I mean...

Chair DuBois: At our last meeting, we had a Motion and we all voted for it to get that letter in.

Mayor Scharff: Right.

Chair DuBois: To send that to Council. (Crosstalk)

Mayor Scharff: (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: Yeah, so it needs...

Mayor Scharff: Not to send it to Council but to get it signed and out. No?

Chair DuBois: No, we did say...

Mayor Scharff: You said to go to Council? Oh, ok.

Chair DuBois: Yeah, I think it can be on Consent but we should get the letter out.

Mayor Scharff: Alright, put it on Consent then. I agree.

Chair DuBois: Then we had the two public speakers. I wonder if we should ask Staff to write a letter capturing our comments for the VTA guidelines on the Measure B funds. Also, ask Staff to write a letter for Palo Alto input on the Caltrain business plan. Both those things are happening in the summer here.

Council Member Fine: Just a comment, that I was thinking – was it Nadia who brought up how the VTA funding is now cheapest option and that may not be in our best interest. I agree that we probably should get some clarity there but it does also seem like VTA is changing that guideline (inaudible) that we see here.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: So, I am suggesting a letter from the City of Palo Alto saying...

Council Member Fine: Yeah, but I mean do we know what are preference is there? I mean, our preference is do we get all the money? Is that what we want to go say to VTA or?

Chair DuBois: I think the preference we would get money for Palo Alto preferred solution and we would be responsible for seeking additional funds so we should be limited to the lowest cost solution measured by dollars.

Council Member Fine: Yeah, so I mean, is it stronger if we go write VTA with Mountain View and Sunnyvale also? I'm just not sure what the (inaudible) would be and what exactly we are asking VTA in partnership with our next-door Cities. Then your question about the business plan. I would also love some input there because I just don't feel ready at the moment to (inaudible)(crosstalk).

Chair DuBois: I just said the idea would be for Staff to come back...

Council Member Fine: Come back to us?

Chair DuBois: ... to us with a letter.

Council Member Fine: Yeah, I'd be interested in that. I'd support that.

Chair DuBois: Do we need to make a Motion on that? Jim, Josh?

Josh Mello, Chief Transportation Official: In regard to the VTA and grade separation program guidelines, originally if you remember, they included language about keeping the rail corridor at grade and pursuing the most cost-effective solutions. We successful advocated, along with other communities and stakeholders, for VTA to remove the language around keeping the railroad at grade. We would be going back with additional comments now, asking them to also remove the language about funding cost effective solutions. I don't know how effective that advocacy would be because they've already backed off the language around keeping the rail corridor at grade. I'm not clear what the substitute language would be and what we would request to be put into the guidelines.

TRANSCRIPT

Mr. Shikada: We're double checking on the status of the letter regarding the UP (Inaudible). We can follow up on that certainly. The letter, we actually thought we had a draft and it's in the works.

Chair DuBois: I sent a draft and I can resend it if you don't have it.

Mr. Shikada: Ok, so we'll double check but I actually don't think a Motion is necessary on that. We can follow up.

Chair DuBois: I think we have a public speaker on this. Nadia?

Nadia Naik: So, just going into the agency communication, I wanted to comment on what Josh said. In general, I think it would make sense for Mountain View and also for Sunnyvale, that VTA should not be looking at what is the cheapest alternative. It's not – I don't think it's necessarily a contentious point, I think it's just something that needs to be rewritten. So, I think there – it may not have to be a formal letter. I would encourage it to really come from the TAC stuff but I think you guys could probably set some policy around look, we're just trying to get whatever our fair share is and there's no – when they say cheaper than, cheaper than what? Cheaper than the next person alternative to whatever else is available in our own City and who does the analysis on that? I think it's doable. I may not have to be just a City letter but it's certainly – you guys could decide that your general policy would be to direct Staff to continue to work that through the TAC and just make the point that the language of the cheapest alternative doesn't need to be that. I – from my Friends of Caltrain hat on, I know that is something that the other Cities are already supportive of as well because it does nobody any good basically.

Chair DuBois: Basically, we would be asking the City preferred alternative. Just kind of local control.

Council Member Fine: And our fair share.

Chair DuBois: So, are you comfortable with that, Josh?

Mr. Mello: We can certainly ask for that but again, we've already gotten them to retract language one so we would be going back a second time and asking for a (crosstalk) additional retraction.

TRANSCRIPT

Chair DuBois: (Inaudible)

Mr. Mello: No, it was in the original language, which mentioned keeping the railroad crossing at grade and funding cost-effective. So, they removed the at grade language and kept the cost effective.

Council Member Filseth: Does it say cost effective or lowest cost?

Mr. Mello: Cost effective.

Chair DuBois: Then the last one...

Mr. Shikada: What does that mean? (Inaudible)

Chair DuBois: So, the point about the Caltrain business plan about kind of Palo Alto's – as a – what do we want to see in that business plan? Is that also something that Staff has some ideas on that we should advocate for?

Mr. Shikada: I haven't been tracking that but certainly we – it sounds like an activity that the City of Palo Alto would want to have a voice on and so I think we can follow up with Caltrain to find out what's happening with that. Certainly, both their expectations on opportunities to weigh in but also our perspective on their opportunities. We'll definitely want to, I think push and be very actively involve.

Chair DuBois: Ok.

Next Steps and Future Agendas

Chair DuBois: Alright, let's move onto future agendas. We also have a public speaker on future agendas.

Nadia Naik: Sorry guys. The Caltrain meeting about the business plan is July 6th so you guys will need to have a meeting soon. I am sorry that Jim left but piggybacking on what he said, if you guys are going into hyper mode of Rail Committee really being the place where this stuff gets decided, I would point to the sift data that says that people want to be communicated with at least bi-weekly or monthly. Which means that you guys have now found yourselves up for a lot more Rail Committee meetings. I don't see how you are going to have monthly Rail Committee meetings if you are going to

TRANSCRIPT

move at the clipped pace that you intending to move at and be able to move this stuff forward. I would suggest that you guys make a Motion of doing what we had to back in the hay day of the Rail Committee, where we either weekly or bi-weekly meetings; basically starting as soon as possible. Thanks.

Chair DuBois: Did Staff have anything on future agendas?

Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager: Only to (inaudible)

Mayor Scharff: I would like to say at some point for us to go through the work – summarize the work that was done previously. I know you brought to Council what some grade separation stuff would look like, what the rail corridor studies that – I do think that we should at least have that discussion at the Rail Committee. I think to bring us – everybody up to speed about the stuff that you presented to Council in the past. It doesn't have to be as in detailed or whatever but I do think we have to at least have that background.

Josh Mello, Chief Transportation Official: Two kind of near term items that we are looking to bring forward are a summary of previous work that was done. As well as a schedule of where the other communities along the peninsula are and where we fall on that schedule. Then we will also have to reopen the discussion on the circulation study and what we're calling the scenarios and the scenarios would be looking at things at a very high level like closing Churchill Avenue. Keep Palo Alto Avenue at grade but making it a quiet zone. These are not alternatives, these are a very high level – what would circulation look like under different scenarios and that will feed into the CSS process. So, those are some near-term things that will be coming forward.

Chair DuBois: So, where is the past work on the Agenda scheduled?

Mr. Mello: That's something that we initiated after the community workshop based on the stakeholder interviews so it's not shown on that.

Chair DuBois: Not shown on here. We have one meeting in two weeks, which is June 28th. Do we want to consider, after the break starting in August, meeting bi-week – bi – twice a month?

TRANSCRIPT

Mayor Scharff: I think we should talk to Staff about that. I don't think we should make the decision now.

Chair DuBois: Well, so we – how about we ask Staff to look at that. So, between now and August, maybe looking at updating the schedule with more frequent rail meetings. Especially if we are going to move into decision making.

Mayor Scharff: Yep, no I agree with you.

Chair DuBois: Alright, any other comments or questions? Alright, the meeting's adjourned. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 10:32 A.M.