



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 10044)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 2/14/2019

Summary Title: Approval of Minutes January 10, 2019 and November 8, 2018

Title: Approval of Excerpt Minutes of January 10, 2019 of the Joint Meeting of the Historic Resources Board and Architectural Review Board and Minutes of the November 8, 2018 Historic Resources Board Meeting

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Historic Resources Board (HRB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

Background

Attached are minutes for the following meeting(s):

- January 10, 2019 (Excerpt Minutes of HRB/ARB Portion of Meeting)
- November 8, 2018

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Draft minutes 1-10-19 Excerpt HRB-ARB (DOCX)
- Attachment B: HRB 11-8-18 draft minutes (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD and HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

DRAFT MINUTES: January 10, 2019

City Hall/City Council Chambers

250 Hamilton Avenue

8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Architectural Review Board: Chair Wynne Furth, Vice Chair Peter Baltay, Board Member Alexander Lew, Board Member David Hirsch

Historic Resources Board: Chair David Bower, Vice Chair Brandon Corey, Board Member Makinen, Board Member Martin Bernstein

Absent: Architectural Review Board: Board Member Osma Thompson

Historic Resources Board: Board Member Margaret Wimmer, Board Member Roger Kohler, Board Member Deborah Shepherd

Chair Furth: Welcome to a Special Meeting of the Architectural Review Board and the Historic Resources Board on January 10, 2019 for the City of Palo Alto. Would staff please call the roll.

[Roll Call]

Chair Furth: Okay, we have four out and three present, four present, okay, so each Board has a quorum.

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: Are there any oral communications? I see no one in the audience, so I believe the answer is no.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Any agenda changes, additions or deletions staff?

(Amy French, Chief Planning Official): None.

City Official Reports

1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2) Tentative Future Agenda items.

Chair Furth: We have a City Official Report, the transmission of the ARB meeting schedules, etc. I think we had a subcommittee to schedule for the 17th for the project at the intersection of, what is it, Charleston, no, Charleston and El Camino, or Meadow and El Camino. Across the street from the Goodwill. East Meadow. There's an actual address. Alex would you serve on that subcommittee with me?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: So, Board Member Lew and I will serve on that subcommittee.

(Amy French): Thank you, so noted.

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING: Historic Resources Board and Architectural Review Board Input on Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCP) Overhead Contact System Foundation & Pole Layouts Design for Installation Within Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) Right of Way in Palo Alto. Environmental Assessment: The JPB Certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) in January 2015, Following Publication of the Draft EIR in February 2014 for Public Comment. For More Information Contact the Chief Planning Official Amy French at amy.french@ityofpaloalto.org.**

Chair Furth: Our first action item is a public hearing between, involving the Historic Resources Board and the Architectural Review Board for consultation with the Peninsula, on the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project, known as the PCP, overhead contact system foundation and pole layouts designed for installation within the Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) right of way in Palo Alto. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for this project was certified in January 2015. Are there any comments before we begin? Board Member Bernstein.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair Furth. I received a ruling from the Fair Political Practice Commission, as I won property within five hundred feet of the railroad right of way, I won't be able to participate in this item. Thank you.

Chair Furth: We will miss you. So, we no longer have a quorum of the HRB, but we would ask them to sit with us and consult and deliberate with us, as we hear this report, those members who remain, in their individual capacities. Thank you. Staff?

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Thank you, good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. We visited with the HRB on November 8 and the ARB on November 15. The report captures the comments and questions of both Boards, with responses as received from the Project Team, who are here today - three members of the Caltrain's Electrification Project Team, and they will be giving a presentation. First, I'll just give a brief overview and that is, again, we are here for color selection specifically, and what happened at the ARB meeting in November was a continuation to receive actual color samples. The color samples have been presented at the front. They are powder-coated metal in four different colors. The color selection, they have requested that we submit our color selection as a City by tomorrow, January 11, so we would appreciate kind of final comments from both Boards, or members of the HRB and the collective ARB. The color can be the same everywhere, or there can be differences. We had, with the HRB, a suggestion that the Downtown Station or Palo Alto Station near University, have, and this is very bright yellow but I don't think that's the intent; the color sample there shows a warm color in an attempt to mimic the color at the station there. So, that was one item that the HRB suggested, was to be compatible with the station there. The Stanford Station here on the screen shows a green color. I believe the HRB suggested that the rest of the poles be green throughout the City, so here's an image showing that. And then the California Avenue Station here is showing a black color, I believe that's black and that is another possibility certainly among the, these are three of the four samples that you have. Moving on, the paralleling station there near the Park Plaza Project, 195 Page Mill, is another place that color choices are available for discussion, and I'll let the project team cover this. They have these slides as well in their presentation. One thing that came up was the letter, as mentioned, from Mr. Borock. We had presented this in November about the fact that pruning work had begun and that pruning work would resume and the team can say more about that, but this slide had been presented back in November, so we were aware that there was tree activity. And that concludes

staff's presentation. I'm going to switch this to the applicant's presentation. Are there questions of staff while we're uploading?

Chair Bower: In response to Herb Borock's email to the HRB and the ARB, I'd like to point out for anyone who actually watches this that the Caltrain MOD.org website has a place where you can sign up for weekly updates on where the construction is occurring. Correct me if I'm wrong, but I get those now and they're pretty thorough and you can keep track of where construction and what kind of construction is going on in the corridor, throughout the entire corridor by signing up for that.

Brent Tietjen, Government and Communications Relations Officer for Caltrain: Thanks for prefacing that Chair David, or Chair Bower, excuse me. Yes, you can sign up by calmod.org/get-involved. You can enter Palo Alto as your city of residence, and we do send weekly updates to all folks who interested about construction along the whole corridor, but we also send updates just to work that's happening in Palo Alto. If a new phase of work is starting, we send out an update to the City as well. So, thank you all again for having us here today. Myself, I'm Brent Tietjen, here with Lin Guan and Stacy Cocke from the Caltrain Electrification Project, here to give you an update on the pole color selection that was continued from the last ARB meeting in November. So, a quick reminder of what the Caltrain Electrification Project is, we are electrifying the 61 miles of track that JPB Caltrain owns from San Francisco to San Jose Tamien Station. The Electrification Project is really just an infrastructure project where we are electrifying the current tracks. We are installing concrete foundations in the ground, poles atop those foundations, and then connecting the poles to wires and the train, which will convert to electric from diesel. We are converting 75% of our fleet from diesel to electric. Our speed will remain the same at 79 miles per hours. The project, however, will allow us to increase from five train an hour currently to six trains an hour per direction. That will allow us to have more station stops, will reduce travel time or a mix of both. As part of the project, we are also committed to restoring both Atherton and Broadway service on the weekdays, and we will continue to have tenant service, ACE, capital corridor, Amtrak and freight operate on the corridor underneath the wires. A quick look at the schedule, this is a long time coming. Back in 1999 it was first introduced in this strategic plan for Caltrain. More than 20 years later we're under construction. Groundbreaking happened in 2017 with quite a bit of work happening last year in 2018, and continuing until 2021 for construction. And then there will be some testing between 2021 and 2022 and we hope to have passenger service in early 2022. So, there was a request last time for renderings of the stations with poles. We do have color samples that Amy provided and I have additional ones here. I'll bring one up for each different station. This will be Palo Alto Station. So, for Palo Alto station our architectural consultants suggested this warmer yellow/tan color to match the historic station at Palo Alto.

Chair Furth: I just note that in this light, it's a long way from yellow.

Mr. Tietjen: Yeah, these slides don't do it justice. I will also note that these chips are glossy; however, the poles will be matte, powder coat matte.

Chair Furth: You're proposing matte?

Mr. Tietjen: Yes, although all the poles along the corridor will be matte to reduce glare. I don't know if you want to take each station. I'll defer to the Chairs, if you want to take each station?

Chair Furth: I think if you'd tell us what the meaning of these various samples is, that would be helpful, and then we can have our discussion.

Mr. Tietjen: Sure. These were recommended by our architectural consultants. The first one was...

Chair Furth: The warmer one.

Mr. Tietjen: The warmer, the tan, which was the recommended color based on the matching of the station.

Chair Furth: Right, and these don't have names, these just have numbers. Is that right?

Mr. Tietjen: They should have names. They should have Palo Alto Station recommended.

Chair Furth: Oh, but the colors don't have names. We have to refer to it as FS349, 3649?

Mr. Tietjen: Correct. They don't have names. I think you can refer to them as the tan, gray and brown for these...

Chair Furth: So, you have three alternative proposed colors for the Palo Alto Stations?

Mr. Tietjen: Correct, yes. And the tan is recommended per our architectural consultant and historical consultant.

Chair Furth: And then the other selection that we had, the other group of, are these duplicates of the ones we had earlier, no?

Mr. Tietjen: So, you have two sets of each. This is just for Palo Alto Station.

Chair Furth: Not the green.

Mr. Tietjen: The green is not recommended for Palo Alto Station.

(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: ... downtown Palo Alto.

Mr. Tietjen: I wasn't sure if you wanted to talk about each station individually, and then...

Chair Furth: Why don't you give us the whole array, and then we'll deliberate.

Mr. Tietjen: I'll keep going then. So, yeah, these are just renderings of what Palo Alto Station would look like, the center poles, as well as side track poles at Palo Alto Station. This is a photo simulation looking from the west platform facing south. Again, these yellows aren't doing it justice, but the chips are much closer to reality. This is typical of what a center pole would look like, the center poles. Poles in general range from 30 to 45½ feet. Center poles are in the 35-foot range. And this is typical of the side pole on the platform. The side poles are the shorter ones, in the 30 to 35-foot range. This may be hard

(recording skipped)

Chair Furth: ...the minutes of our last meeting at this meeting, so I think we're pretty familiar with the (crosstalk) presentation.

Mr. Tietjen: Sure. So, this is just the designs for Palo Alto Station. You can see, it might be hard to see, but hopefully you can see on your screen, the stations are kind of hatched out here. So, this is the first set of the Palo Alto Station, and then this is the second. These small dots here are the poles. These will be center poles. These would be side poles, yeah, side poles here as well and the center pole. And this is just a summary of the color recommendations for all the stations, but I'll continue going through for the rest of the stations, and we are seeking the ARB, HRB recommendation on station area pole colors. That recommendation would go to the City and the City would have the final say. This is a rendering from Alma Street facing north of Stanford Station. The only color recommended for Stanford Station was the marine green. Again, typical side poles for Stanford Station and with the current design, they are only side poles at Stanford Station. I will note on all these designs, it is only 65% and it is subject to change as we move further along. Again, the only color recommended for Stanford Station was marine green. And then finally, the photo simulation of California Avenue Station. Mostly side poles at California Avenue

Station. Black was the recommended color with brown a second and green, marine green as third. And the black was recommended to match the current poles and shelters at that station. Again, typical side poles for the station areas and design for California Avenue Station with side poles being highlighted about every 150 feet. So, that is it for the station areas. We do have color selection for the PS-5 paralleling station. I can go into that as well...

Chair Furth: And what about the non-station poles?

Mr. Tietjen: Those will all be marine green per the MMRP, the Monitoring and Mitigation Reporting Plan.

Chair Furth: Well, we could change that. Okay, so to summarize, if it's okay with the Board Members, I think it would be good to talk about the poles first, and then the paralleling station. Does that make sense? I'm seeing nodes.

Mr. Tietjen: I'll provide another set of chips as well, for both California and Stanford Station.

Chair Furth: Great. So, marine green is the default color for poles in the City? This was described and defined in the Mitigation and Monitoring Report for the EIR.

Mr. Tietjen: That's correct.

Chair Furth: (crosstalk) You're also suggesting marine green for Stanford Station, which is sort of a wide place in the track, well not the track, the right of way. And black for California Avenue and what's the name of the color at, that you're recommending for the Palo Alto Station?

Mr. Tietjen: I would say a tan to match the Palo Alto Station.

Chair Furth: Okay. Who would like to begin? Alex. I was really impressed by Alex's detailed review last time.

Board Member Lew: Sure. I don't think I have any comments today. I think we covered everything last time, and I don't object to anything that's been presented today.

Chair Furth: So, you would second their recommendations as to color, or at least agree with them?

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I mean I think, based on my previous comments, I think I would prefer the gray at University Avenue and then the others are all fine, but I don't object to the tan at University Avenue Station and I think that's more of a call for the HRB.

Chair Furth: Do you want to call on your members, HRB members?

Chair Bower: Are there any HRB members that want to comment on this, Brandon or Michael? Brandon, go ahead.

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah, so just real quick, one question, the MMRP. So, is the pole for the City is the marine green? That's decided, there's no debate on that? Because, I don't know if that would impact this decision.

Mr. Tietjen: That's correct, yeah. That's per the MMRP for any visually sensitive area. That's correct.

Vice Chair Corey: Because at the last time we met at the HRB we had discussed it, and you know, then it was still up in the air and it wasn't clear if you were looking for our input or not.

Mr. Tietjen: I'm sorry that was unclear. We are not looking for input outside the station area. Those (crosstalk).

Chair Bower: The only comment I would make is that at our meeting, the HRB did feel strongly that the poles in front of the University Avenue Station match that station patina. You know, it's a subjective thing, color is a subjective thing, but the tan here or something like that will certainly be more compatible with the building than green or gray or brown, or any of the any colors here.

Vice Chair Corey: I would agree with that.

Chair Bower: And I don't think that would change if all the Board Members were here.

Mr. Tietjen: Yeah, and our historical consultant for this project went out to the stations and actually brought the chips and tried to match the stations closely.

Chair Bower: And our other comment, if I'm remembering correctly, is that all the rest of the poles could be green, just because they would be uniform throughout the City and most of the corridor through Palo Alto is lined with trees and the green would simply, again, be more compatible with that color scheme. I don't have an objection personally to the suggestions that your consultant has made here, but it seems to me it would be less expensive over a long-term maintenance consideration to have one color over as many poles as possible.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other comments? Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. I share with what Alex said earlier, I can make the findings to recommend a recommendation back to Caltrain. I'd like to reiterate that at least I feel that a single pole in the middle rather than a pair of them on the side is preferable throughout the City, given an aesthetic choice, that's an aesthetic choice that's preferable. Secondly, in my opinion any sort of a finish on these poles that does not need maintenance, either a galvanized or a weathering steel would be preferable in the long term. I remain concerned that these paints will wear and I doubt they will be maintained the way they would need to be. That said, I can support the project as presented. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Anybody else? So, I'm generally supportive. I'm glad that you have a color that you're happy with for, and the HRB is happy with for the Downtown Palo Alto Station. I was really struck by Alex's careful analysis of all the different categories of colors that are used at these stations for the buildings, for the light poles, for the railings, for the other things that happen. And Alex you feel that black is suitable for the Caltrain, the California Avenue Station, the proposed color?

Board Member Lew: Well, I think it's possible. The metal that's already out there and all the shelters is like a dark bronze anodized aluminum, but there is some black there, I think, I forgot what it is. There is an element there that is black, so I think it is workable. And I think the benches that are there are actually like this brown color, so there's actually a range of stuff that's out there, so generally darker would be better to help it blend in.

Chair Furth: I don't actually think, I very much support not changing colors for the Stanford Station. The Stanford Station is meaningful to Caltrain, but it's not particularly visible if you're not catching a game train. And so, I think it's good to just have it, those poles blend in. I'm fine with changing them for the Downtown Station, and I'm fine with changing them for Caltrain. I don't think, I think having a signal that you're at that station is fine, so I wouldn't object to the proposal. Yes, Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: I guess my thought here was, I don't know if you're going to do this, but are these going to be powder coated for longevity?

Mr. Tietjen: Yes, they will be powder coated.

Board Member Makinen: So, it's going to be like a permanent coating and low maintenance.

Mr. Tietjen: Yes. We have a ten-year life cycle for the paint.

Chair Furth: And when you spoke to us last time, we had a question about fencing, newly installed fencing with wire that is otherwise prohibited in the City, and you were going to get back to us with information on that?

Mr. Tietjen: Yes, that was installed at the request of the City for trespassing concerns.

Chair Furth: Okay, in that form.

Mr. Tietjen: Yes. The regular fence was installed per Caltrain standard. The additional three foot was installed in coordination with the City.

(inaudible)

Chair Furth: Right. All right. Any other questions before we go on on this. We did ask you for information about costs, but as I understand it, you are confident that matte finished color is your best bet in terms of maintenance, and we will hope that you are right. Any other questions? Well seeing none, shall we recommend approval? I don't know exactly what we're doing here. We're no longer doing courtesy consultations, because they revised the agreement between the City. It's now a real consultation, which means we tell you what we think and you do what you want. But, shall we advise the Calmod Project of Caltrain that we are supportive of their color recommendations for the poles?

Board Member Lew: Do you want to reference their chart?

(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: Sure, go for it. Why don't you make a motion? I can't read this.

MOTION

Board Member Lew: Okay. I think I will make a recommendation that we recommend Option 1 of the three options. So, that is Palo Alto Station which is color FS23522; the California Avenue Station is color FS27040, which is black; and the Stanford Stadium Station which is color FS14052, which is the marine green.

Chair Furth: Is there a second from the ARB Board Member?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that motion.

Chair Furth: Thank you for the discussion. All those in favor way aye. Any opposition?

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-0 WITH ONE ABSENT

Chair Furth: So, that is four votes in favor, one absent, Board Member Thompson, and consensus from the HRB, which has advised us particularly on the Palo Alto Station. Thank you. J

Chair Furth: Would the ARB like to continue with us for the discussion of the paralleling station?

Chair Bower: Oh, sure.

Chair Furth: Okay, great, paralleling station.

Mr. Tietjen: Before I jump into that, I did want to answer the question that we received via email. So, tree work has been about 35% complete in the City of Palo Alto, and the first pass of foundation potholings where you pothole for every utility, every foundation location, that should be done by the end

of this week. They will have to come back and do any resolutions if there are any other utilities, so they will do another pass at potholing, and utility potholing will continue from now until February.

Chair Furth: Thank you. And I was just looking at my notes. We also had a question about were there any new lighting projects, and I believe the answer we got was that you are substituting LED lamps where they exist, but other than that, there's no project online.

Mr. Tietjen: Correct. Yeah, we don't have any plans currently for Palo Alto Station, but we are updating our station lights.

Chair Furth: We're just asking, of course, because we're thinking about what goes with what.

Mr. Tietjen: Sure.

Chair Furth: Thank you. All right, the paralleling station.

Mr. Tietjen: I did want to show there are additional pole types in addition to the ones I showed for the details. There are some portholes which are a little bit wider for, a little bit for the wider tracks, and then some two-track cantilevered within the City of Palo Alto. And again, all poles outside of the station areas will be painted marine green in Palo Alto. So, there is a paralleling station being installed in Palo Alto. I'll show a diagram of the location in a moment. The paralleling station, there are ten tracks for Palo Alto facilities throughout the corridor. Those help provide and distribute power to the new electrified system. The paralleling station in particular does not get power from PG&E. It gets power from the overhead lines and then helps redistribute it throughout the corridor. The facility components are the transformer gantries, which are up to 50 feet, and the control house which we will look for your recommendation on color selection. These are unmanned, secured and lighted facilities. Paralleling station number five in Palo Alto will be located just south of Page Mill Road on Caltrain property. We have coordinated with the City on location during the EIR phase. Vegetation screening will be implemented at this location with review and input from the City staff, and the control house is to be selected by the City, the color be selected by the City with input from HRB and ARB. This is the location of the paralleling station number five. You can see Page Mill Road right here going up and down on the page. These are the components of the paralleling station, the two gantries on either side of the tracks, the control house which we will ask for your color recommendation, and then the transformer. This is an example of the paralleling station from Amtrak Northeast Corridor. You can see the components here in green, or the point in green, is the transformer, the gantries, both this one in the foreground and then this one in the background, these A-frame steel structures, and then the control house is the one on the right here. An example again of a transformer and then the control house in the background. And I do have color samples as well for the paralleling station control house, and I'll get up and pass these around.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Tietjen: And the colors highlighted in orange are the ones that are recommended per our architectural consultant.

Chair Bower: So, can you clarify, so (not understood) Canyon is the control house color?

Mr. Tietjen: Correct, yeah, it would be the control house.

Chair Bower: And then the juniper green is the gantry color?

Mr. Tietjen: These are all considerations for the control house color.

Chair Bower: Oh, just control house color?

Mr. Tietjen: Yes, correct. These are options for the control house color.

Chair Furth: And the gantry would be marine green?

(Lin Guan): No, I don't think so.

Mr. Tietjen: We don't believe so.

Chair Furth: What do you believe that it would be?

Mr. Tietjen: What was that?

Chair Furth: What do you believe it would be?

Mr. Tietjen: Just the galvanized steel.

Chair Furth: Galvanized steel?

Mr. Tietjen: Yes.

Chair Bower: I'll take a moment here to ask another question. So, is there a reason why we wouldn't, the gantries, those towers, would not match the rest of the towers in the corridor?

Stacy Cocke: It's just something that we had not included as the specifications in our contract. So, we had been focused on the poles and there wasn't a consideration to not include it. It just, for kind of standard material purchase of the gantries went with the galvanized steel, didn't specify a color.

Chair Bower: Can I ask a related question to this? On the corridor there are switching towers apparatus that crosses the tracks that tell the trains, they are red or green lights, so that they move forward or not. The one I'm thinking of is near Woodside Road for instance. And I'm wondering how that, how the height of that particular signaling tower compares to the gantry at this station. Do you know? Roughly, I mean I'm not – just trying to get a sense of what 45 feet is going to look like at that site. That's fairly large.

Lin Guan: I think overall the signal bridge that you're referring to, the one at Woodside Road, they're going to be about roughly the same, they're roughly the same height, potentially even a little bit taller. So, our rough estimate, probably about 40 foot or so, 40 to 45 foot, in terms of height.

Chair Bower: Okay, thank you.

Chair Furth: Any comments on the proposal for the paralleling station? We had a lot of comments last time, most of which I think were rejected. Any comments from anybody on this? Sure.

Chair Bower: I can't remember, Amy, what the HRB discussion was about this, but I think it was that they would just go away. I mean, so, you know, that the color not be white for instance. That it be an innocuous or blending color. That's a better way of describing it maybe. So, from my perspective any of these colors would be acceptable, but I don't have an opinion. I don't know if the other HRB members do.

Vice Chair Corey: That's what we discussed.

Chair Furth: Okay. And as I recall, one of the big issues was the location of this particular facility, and generally you're satisfied with the proposed location. One of the more ardent commentators was Board Member Thompson. Alex, David? David.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. Do you see the top of that facility when you're in the train? You do. So, what is the roofing material and what color would it be?

Lin Guan: To be honest, off the top of my head I do not know what the roofing material would be on top of the control houses, but that is something we could look into and get an answer back to you. I think it really will be the same, I think overall the control house is just a steel, just a single steel or whatever the material outside, the sheeting material is going to be for the entire house, but we can look into it. I'm not 100 percent sure.

Board Member Hirsch: So, do you have any thought as to how that would be painted? Is that discussed by your consultant for this?

Lin Guan: That's something we can double check. When I kind of just think about painting the house, I'm thinking about painting the outside, the four surrounding walls, but the top portion, it's a good question. I'll have to look into it.

Chair Furth: When are you planning to build these paralleling stations? What is your timeline?

Mr. Tietjen: So, three are currently under construction right now in South San Francisco and San Jose. We don't have the final schedule with PS-5 yet, but I think we would expect late this year or early next year.

Chair Furth: So, PS-5 is what you call ours?

Mr. Tietjen: Correct, yes, paralleling station number five.

Chair Furth: It's like public school. Okay, paralleling station five. All right, so last time we had questions about how visible this was going to be. Board Member Hirsch has pointed out, quite visible from the train. Remind me what the feeling was about, what the conclusion was with regard to planting around this? To what extent it's possible and to what extent you need to be so far away for safety reasons that it's going to be visible?

Mr. Tietjen: So, there will be vegetation around the paralleling station. We don't have the vegetation plan currently. It's not designed yet, but we will be working with the City on that. It will be surrounding the perimeter of the facility, and it's generally trees and vines, what has been used in other areas.

Chair Furth: Okay. So, the roof's also going to be visible from the housing nearby, is that correct, or am I seeing this wrong? Is that a blank wall?

(crosstalk)

(Boardmember X): It's a blank wall. There's not a single window.

Chair Furth: Right, I remember that.

Board Member Lew: Between the paralleling station and 195 Page Mill Road, there is a row of newly planted redwood trees.

Chair Furth: Right. That should do it. And then the next thing over is the train track and then there's landscaping and then there's Alma, is that right? So, there's quite a few opportunities for screening.

Mr. Tietjen: Correct, and the current thought is to do the screening around the perimeter of the facility with trees and vines.

Chair Furth: But if you needed to do some more, you could also do it on the other side of the right of way, right, on the edge of Alma?

Mr. Tietjen: Stacy.

Chair Furth: Is that correct City staff?

Ms. French: Yes. Part of that is City right of way, and we are always amenable to increase the vegetation in our right of way.

Chair Furth: All right. Board Member Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I think it comes down to the color and to me the juniper green or the beetle would be the two preferable choices. Slightly darker would go better with the live oak colors. And it's just really tough to put us in the spot in this light to make that call. I'd say that you guys, that your architects make that call. But I think a darker green is preferable.

Chair Furth: Okay. My view is that darker is better. My view is that it does matter how it looks from the top. These are fairly large structures. People will see them, and one of the problems and one of the big... It makes a big difference what you see when you look outside of a train window, and often you have no control of it. Often cities show their most dilapidated faces to a railroad right of way. That's less true now. And this is an opportunity for you to have something that looks trim and organized and well thought out all the way through. So, I think it does matter how it's going to look for the top, how the edges are finished. Does somebody want to make a motion? And I will say that these colors can't be read at all when you're sitting inside. You can get some idea of them at the window. Would somebody on the ARB make a motion, or we can have further discussion.

MOTION

Board Member Lew: I will make a recommendation that the paralleling station be either juniper green or the beetle clay green.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that motion, the recommendation. I'm sorry.

Chair Furth: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye. All opposed. Hearing none, that's unanimous from those of us who are here, ARB and HRB Members alike.

MOTION CARRIES 4-0 WITH ONE ABSENT.

Chair Furth: Is there anything else you would like from us?

Mr. Tietjen: No. Thank you again for allowing us to present today.

Chair Furth: Thank you for coming, and we know it's a complicated project and we know we don't necessarily make your life easier, but we hope we make the project better. Thank you. And we will say thank you to the HRB for coming and staff if you will keep an eye on the design of the paralleling station, we will not expect to see rooftop design unless you feel it's necessary, but if you would keep that in mind as you continue to work collaboratively, we'd appreciate it. Thank you.



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: November 8, 2018

City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower, Vice Chair Corey, Board Member Shepherd, Board Member Kohler, Board Member Makinen, Board Member Bernstein.

Absent: Board Member Wimmer

Chair Bower: I guess we'll open the meetings. Would you call roll?

Chair Bower: Okay, Agenda Changes, Additions, Deletions.

Ms. French: Don't forget oral communications first.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I was just waiting to get the card.

Ms. French: I have a card. Sorry, Council Member Liaison is here, for the record.

Chair Bower: Right, absolutely.

Oral Communications

Ms. French: So, I have a, yes, thank you. We have an oral communication speaker card, and you have items at Your Places.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Leland Francois. Nice to see you again.

Leland Francois: Good morning Chairman Bower and colleagues of the Palo Alto Historic Resource Board, Leland Francois. It's been several months, I guess. I'm not sure, maybe a little bit longer, but you continue to extend the meetings, but nonetheless, I'm glad to be here today on Thursday, the eighth of November. I forwarded to you a packet of information. I kind of figured I wouldn't be able to cover everything in the allotted two or three minutes. But I can highlight these, and I do have them itemized and numbered. There are a number of items, and on behalf of the Ravenswood History Survey, I usually refer to it as being the other side of town, if we go back in history with the name, East Palo Alto kind of evolved from over here to over there. So, it's still recognized as East Palo Alto. But nonetheless, to me it is the Historic Ravenswood California Community. I want to clarify what possibly may be some rumors online, offline, and the only way to do it, of course, is to come before you. Item number one describes the Ravenswood (not understood) products and the Free (not understood) Gardening Club. Every item within that packet, and it's three or four pages, are currently being fabricated by myself. There have been some interruptions or disruptions from the concept to the final product over the years, but I am honestly fabricating those in the backyard, makeshift, whatever, but they are going out. So, the word is that they are available to the public. They are excellent back-to-school items, teaching items. The Apple Store, the other Apple Store, these are just clichés that I assigned to them. The Pumpkin Factory, those are kind of names that the children can identify with. So, every item within that packet, like I say, is available. You can circulate it to the teachers or whatever. The second item I would like to call your attention to is the

Blue Baton Project. The Blue Baton is a United Nations project and the actual Blue Baton was derived from the 1968 Olympics, the athletes who ran the 4x4 100 relay in 1968. So, historically speaking, 1968 was a turning point for the African-American Community. So, I, on behalf of the UN, I actually got the official blue colors, painted a baton and called it the Blue Baton, simply denoting the fact that history is passed from one generation to another. So, the Blue Baton Project is active within the United Nations DARP Program. Item number three, the final summary of the, I'm trying to promote a regional conference of historians. The last time that we met was March the first in 2001 at the old EPA, East Palo Alto Historical and Agricultural Society Building, at 1955 University Avenue. This was in 2001. Here it is 2018, we have not had a regional conference of historians, and I do promote that, so I need some input back from that. Item number four, unfortunately, the City of East Palo Alto borrowed or mistakenly moved some historic material from the Historic Society, and I had to file a lawsuit. The lawsuit is four years old right now, Leland Francois versus the City of East Palo Alto. It's nothing new. My property still is in their possession. I would like it back and I'm using the California Courts to present my case and, hopefully, they will agree with me. And of course, the last item is with reference to the elections over the past couple of days. Every time there is an election, a regional election, a municipal election, things change, historically things change. Candidates come in with new agendas, and I want to make sure that my whole agenda is going to maintain a steadfastness regardless of the new administration in East Palo Alto. So, my contact telephone number is there, 650-461-0276 or 650-518-4029. Feel free to pass the word and contact me any time.

Chair Bower: Great. Thank you for sharing that with us today.

Mr. Francois: You're welcome.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: Okay. There are no changes of agenda, additions or deletions that I'm aware of, so I'll go to Item Number One, which is our meeting schedule. There are no agenda changes that I'm aware of.

Ms. French: No agenda changes, deletions.

City Official Reports

1. 2018 Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments.

Chair Bower: Item Number One which is our meeting schedule.

Ms. French: And then as far as the meeting schedule.

Chair Bower: So, only one scheduled, one available day, and that's the 13th of December?

Ms. French: Correct.

Chair Bower: Anything coming up? Anything in the pipeline?

Ms. French: Not at the moment.

Chair Bower: Not at the moment, okay. So, this may be our last meeting of the year.

Ms. French: This may be. We have an opportunity to meet again in a social aspect. If you would like, we can have a moment.

Chair Bower: Celebrate the year.

Ms. French: Celebrate the year comings and goings.

Study Session

Chair Bower: All right. So, let's move on to the Study Session, which would be – I don't know. What's in the Study Session?

Ms. French: None, no Study Session today.

Chair Bower: Nothing today, okay, that's what I thought.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING: Historic Resources Board Input on Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) Overhead Contact System Foundation & Pole Layouts Design for Installation Within Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board Right of Way in Palo Alto. Environmental Assessment: The JPB Certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) in January 2015, Following Publication of the Draft EIR in February 2014 for Public Comment.

Chair Bower: All right, let's move on the Action Item Number Two. Martin, did you have something you wanted to share with the Board?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes. Thank you, Chair Bower. So, I have received an FPPC Ruling that I won't be able to participate in this regarding any decisions the Board may make. I own property within 500 feet of the railroad right of way, so I received an FPPC Ruling that I won't be able to participate. However, they said because it is my personal residence, I am able to comment as a member of the general public, and I put a card in for speaking as a member of the general public. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thanks Martin. We'll hear from you later. Okay, staff report.

Ms. French: Yes. Good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official.

Chair Bower: Good morning.

Ms. French: I'm here today flying solo. We have a Joint Powers Board representative that is planning to come to the ARB Meeting next week, but being that this was pulled together on a rather rapid schedule, they were not able to make their calendars available for this morning, so I have prepared a PowerPoint this morning, and I will go through the project with you to the best of my abilities. I have Mike Nafziger here as well, from Public Works Engineering, and he has been longer in the know than myself. So, we'll start here. The Caltrain Electrification Project has been through years in the making. It's the Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project, is the formal title. It's the conversion from Caltrain diesel to electric-powered trains (they have a fancy name). Anyways, the overhead contact system design is for improvements only within the Caltrain right of way. So, they're not going onto City property, City jurisdiction property. So, basically, the City has no permitting authority whatsoever. So, this is just a courtesy review. We are getting your comments and those will be considered by the JPB staff as they move forward and finalize their plans. The plans are currently at 65 percent design, which is an engineering term meaning they're not quite done. The OCS improvements include overhead catenary wires, support poles, traction power facilities and other pertinences, and there is only one traction power facility in Palo Alto, and that's known as a paralleling station. The Caltrain staff plan to submit a design for the actual – it's a building - for the building in early 2019, and hopefully, there's an opportunity for input on that. But we do not have those designs at this time. We do have a proposed location that is subject to change. The EIR process: the final EIR was adopted or certified by the JPB in January 2015. They adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations and they adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. The final EIR disclosed permanent visual alterations and other impacts. The staff is

committed to consider the board input from the ARB and HRB on this design. The City's Rail Committee had discussed a draft agreement in September and that agreement is going to be going - it's an agreement between the Joint Powers Board and the City - and it's going to be going to City Council on November 27 (26). The foundation work for the poles is anticipated to begin in March of next year or thereafter, and there is some capacity for remedy if things are going badly, as far as mitigation measures, but it's the JPB staff that would have the authority to issue what they call a Statement of Objection. Okay. The EIR Statement of Overriding Consideration, it basically said there's significant and unavoidable impacts to trees, cultural resources, and permanent impacts on visual character. So, the Overriding Considerations are listed on the screen. Basically, improved Caltrain service to support a growing demand, electrification has best performance characteristics, and feasible alternatives. A lot of words here. Reduction of air pollution, reduction of green-house gas emissions in support of AB-32, reduction of vehicle miles traveled and support for transit-oriented development, and then consistent with future high-speed rail. Okay, so the permanent impacts on visual character are resulting from this paralleling station (which we haven't seen yet), the poles themselves, and the wires, the removal of vegetation and maintenance activities and over-bridge projection structures (but there's none of those in Palo Alto). After mitigation, the aesthetic impacts are still significant and unavoidable due to the tree removal and pruning, and then they say it's less than significant with respect to the other items. The historical resources in Palo Alto were covered in the staff report you received, if you have read through that. There are a number of them, and they are within the stretch between the northern border of Palo Alto starting with the El Palo Alto, moving on to the depot at University Avenue and then we have the two undercrossings; those are both historic. I might have gotten them all. Oh, well, Greenmeadow, you know a National Registered District, is referenced in the EIR because in the EIR they had proposed this paralleling station to be across from Greenmeadow there, and so the visual impact was a concern. They don't seem to be pursuing that option for the paralleling station. So, the focus there is near the Park Plaza development, a bit north, otherwise known as 195 Page Mill. So, just a few images, the San Francisquito Creek (that's the one I forgot to say). The San Francisquito Creek Bridge, so they're saying it won't be altered other than small clearance holes, cables suspended above and parallel to the existing line, and then the mitigation is no significant impact. They think it will still meet the criteria for listing, because it is listed on the California Register. So, here we have a nice old picture (and these are courtesy of the Palo Alto Historical Association) of the bridge, an older train and the El Palo Alto with just one stem. And here, I love this old photo, two of the trunks, before the split. So, El Palo Alto, it's a landmark tree, Landmark Number Two in California. It's also Palo Alto's Heritage Tree Number One, and it's about 26 feet from the Caltrain right-of-way, and branches and foliage are located within five feet of the right-of-way. It's about 110 feet tall and quite old, over 1,000 years old. So, the mitigation was that special care will be taken to minimize construction period affects on El Palo Alto, including minimization of any pruning. Pruning will be coordinated with Palo Alto arborist in advance. So, that coordination has begun. There is, you know, more than just pruning there. There is how close the foundation is to the tree roots, because those tree roots extend fairly far. Walter was not able to be here today, but he will likely be here for the ARB Meeting next week. The Palo Alto Depot, of course, Streamline Moderne, and the idea for mitigation there - or the adopted mitigation - was to use single poles in the center of the tracks with the cantilevers. And then they will record HABS level III as mitigation to document the four poles that are placed. So, that's the only place that single poles are proposed with the exception of one or two single poles. Sorry for the way this is reading here. The Historic underpasses, we have Embarcadero and University Avenue. Both are historic, listed, and the mitigation, the specific design commitments are that power cables shall be suspended parallel to and above the University Avenue overpass and the poles and configuration shall be set at the side of the track they power. No pole shall be set in the bridges themselves. There's a mitigation measure here about meeting the Secretary of Interior Standards, etc. And they are not going to attach things to the fabric of the bridges, underpasses themselves. So, here are images, these were in the staff report s well. These show the single pole design in the center of the tracks. So, this is what you would see at the Palo Alto University Depot. And then we have other designs. The majority of the right-of-way in Palo Alto is two poles, one on either side of the tracks, like this. And then we have other situations where there's a cantilevered pole that extends out. This is called the long-reach cantilever. There's some dimensions there, 30 feet from the cantilever, etc. Then there's the portal poles. These are just one stretch of the project, there's a bunch of these, four of them I think, these portal poles. So, they have this kind of band across. The JPB is interested in what you think about color

at the stations for the poles. So, the pole colors are here. I believe I put that into the staff report as well. I don't have any chips or samples. So, yeah, you are able to see those. Option one is (yeah, so we'll get back to this). The center pole feasibility is being looked at by Caltrain. As part of our discussion about this agreement they are looking at feasibility of having more single poles in the center, but for them, for Caltrain it's better to have the double poles because they minimize the risk of failure in case of knock down, so they prefer the double poles, whereas from aesthetics and tree preservation, the City would probably prefer the single pole. So, anyways, we're going to have a written explanation to share with the public as to why they can't do single poles wherever they can't do them. So, the other parts of the projects are the stringing wires, the paralleling station I mentioned, which we will see later in the new year, and this tree replacement. So, the trees other than El Palo Alto, they are going to replace them inside the right-of-way at a one-to-one ratio, whatever trees they pull down, protected or non-protected. So, again, they are going to be working with Urban Forester on that. And the goal of the tree plantings is to screen the residences and park users from the visual impacts of the new project. There's an ARB report coming out today. You can look online, I can send you the link. Its focus is aesthetics, while your report was focused on historic resources. So, there's this PARCS, sorry, the Palo Alto Rail Committee Study, there was a recommending study, recommended landscape improvements and addition of street trees and protecting these resources. They threw in there Hostess House too. I don't think anything is going over that far, which is the MacArthur Park Building. I think that's my last slide. There's more but I'm not ready to present any more at this time. So, would you like to ask questions?

Chair Bower: Yeah, let's, I have a couple of questions, but I'll encourage my colleagues to start. Debbie no questions? Brandon?

Vice Chair Corey: Do we have someone here who can answer any of the detail – are you here to answer any of the details about the...

Michael Nafziger, Public Works Engineering: Good morning. This is Mike Nafziger from Public Works Engineering. I could answer what questions, hopefully, you might have.

Vice Chair Corey: Okay, cool. A couple questions I had. Are the poles metal or wood or what are they?

Mr. Nafziger: Concrete.

Vice Chair Corey: They are concrete poles.

Mr. Nafziger: Precast concrete.

Vice Chair Corey: That's interesting. I just didn't know about the color. Just out of curiosity, maybe this isn't necessarily related, but poles seem about as modern as diesel. Is there a reason they don't have anything that's going along the tracks or underground?

Mr. Nafziger: I'm not sure of your question. Could you repeat that.

Vice Chair Corey: Power. Is it just because of cost?

Mr. Nafziger: I would have to ask Caltrain staff on that. I'm not sure. It's a design build. I believe they just modeled it after existing overhead systems.

Vice Chair Corey: Got it, okay. And then, yeah it has the heights here of all the poles. Do we know where any of the poles, you probably don't, where they line up with any of the existing poles that are – I know they're not one-to-one across the track.

Mr. Nafziger: No, we have not studied that.

Vice Chair Corey: Okay.

Chair Bower: Roger, any questions?

Board Member Kohler: No, not really.

Chair Bower: Michael.

Board Member Makinen: I just have a kind of a general question. It's, you know, this technology is kind of archaic. It's probably been around for 100 years, but has there ever been any thought about going with battery-powered lithium battery-powered trains? I mean, you've got a smile on your face, but look at U.S. subs in World War II were powered with batteries when they weren't above ground. So, the thought of battery technology that powers big engines, I think it would be a very elegant solution, if we had a lithium battery pack that could be used to power these trains. I don't know if they would get enough intensity or not, but it's a general question I had.

Mr. Nafziger: We're not aware of Caltrain's investigation of those technologies. This was their proposal for their project.

Ms. French: I have not studied the EIR to see if it was one of the alternatives, but that would be a place I would look if I was curious.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, I mean obviously people have used power to run submarines under water, which takes a huge amount of horsepower and it just seems like this is not a very elegant solution in 2018 to see go ahead for probably another 50 years, especially with the battery technology really coming on line.

Chair Bower: A couple of questions I have. I thought I saw single poles at the Alma Street crossing, where the bridge is, as well as at the University Avenue Station. Did I misread that? While you're looking, do poles look to be the standard all the way along the rest of the right-of-way?

(inaudible)

Chair Bower: I know the City is involved in figuring out how these crossings are going to be handled in the future. Is there, is Public Works talking with Caltrain about how that gets done or is this going to be built out and then retrofitted to whatever the solution to the crossings is? I mean, if we're starting in March, this project will be completely over before Palo Alto even decides what they're going to do with the under crossings.

Mr. Nafziger: With respect to the Alma crossing, there are single poles in that area that lead up to the bridge and El Palo Alto. With respect to the grade crossings, there has been discussions about the placement of poles in such a way that it does not preclude what options the City may choose to pursue with respect to grade crossing, whether it's above or below. So, the poles will be placed hopefully far enough away for whatever solution, it won't impact that.

Chair Bower: My concern, of course, is that any modification that has to be made later just is a double cost, so I'm hoping that there is sensitivity to how much, this is only a \$600 million project if I'm remembering the figure correctly, and wouldn't want to have to make it any more expensive. The question about the, in our materials, the City is asked, and this may not be a question you can answer, but the City has asked Caltrain to consider the high-speed rail implications in parallel with this project, and I don't know, do you have any idea where that stands?

Mr. Nafziger No I don't.

Chair Bower: Okay. The tree removal replacement is one-to-one. On a project that I did it was one to two, this residential project in Santa Clara County. Is one-to-one standard for Palo Alto? Is there a standard?

Ms. French: There has been a standard. I'm not sure if there's a new standard around at this point, but I had remembered a three-to-one for protected oaks and the like, redwoods, but I don't know what it is right now. We'll make sure that Walter is on hand for next weeks' ARB Meeting and hopefully we'll be able to put that into the presentation.

Chair Bower: I'm just wondering where the one-to-one came from. Was that the Caltrain's proposal?

Ms. French: This is one-to-one replacement throughout the corridor from San Francisco on down. It's not just in Palo Alto.

Chair Bower: I appreciate that putting trees in a rail corridor is not a simple experience, but just wondered what the standard was here, since we're being asked to look at this, I mean the City is.

Vice Chair Corey: I was going to ask, do we have any understanding of the impact along the rail? So, if you think about where Professorville extends, if all those trees, I mean I'm not sure how many trees there are, but if the trees are all cut down along the railway all across Alma Street, is there a change of view from any other historic resource? Because if they're effectively going to tear out all the trees and put one-to-one, which presumably can mean I have a 100-foot tree and I'll replace it with, you know, one I got at the nurse that's three feet tall. Do we have any idea what that impact could be? Because there's a lot of trees along a huge stretch.

Ms. French: Whatever impacts were declared and overridden with Overriding Considerations as far as impacts, I mean, that's one of the significant impacts that is not addressed in their Overriding Considerations. There's going to be visual impacts from loss of trees (crosstalk).

Vice Chair Corey: There's a difference, okay, right, right (crosstalk). But do we have any – I mean, I guess we could go out there, but do we know how many, would it affect any of them?

Ms. French: There might be disclosure, but again it's an EIR for the entire corridor from San Francisco down to San Jose or wherever it stops, so I don't think they got around to giving lots of pictures of our fair City. If it is, it's in the EIR that they prepared and adopted.

Vice Chair Corey: The EIR has the impact on the...

Ms. French: The EIR the JPB certified has notes what the impacts are and studied the impacts and has mitigation measures to address the impacts, so to the extent that somebody looked at it, it should be in the EIR. If they didn't look at it, but they were – it was part of that Overriding Considerations...

Vice Chair Corey: I guess what I'm asking more specifically though is, is there an impact to any historical properties versus just a general impact?

Ms. French: Like buildings?

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah, because everything along in the Professorville area.

Ms. French: No, because the project is only within JPB right-of-way. As far as, is there an impact from homes across Alma looking towards the tracks, that's not considered an impact I guess, because...

Chair Bower: I didn't see on the plans any notation of where trees would be removed. Of course, there's so much information, I'm sure it's there somewhere, I just don't know. There's no notation in the legend.

Mr. Nafziger: There is a separate tree mitigation and monitoring plan being developed.

Vice Chair Corey: So, they know, it's not ready.

Chair Bower: So, at this point that's the other 35 percent that's not completed of the design?

Mr. Nafziger: I believe it's underway. I'm not sure of the exact status, but it's been fairly well developed to date.

Chair Bower: And then, I guess, the follow-up question, trees, you know that's historic content here, do they have a proposed size for replacement trees. So, are they going to be 35, 48-inch box, 60-inch box?

Mr. Nafziger: I'm not aware but it's most likely identified in this plan, once it's finalized.

Chair Bower: Okay, thank you. Well, those are my questions. Any other questions?

Vice Chair Corey: I had one other technical question. On the 65 percent, are they going to start in March regardless of where they are and just, you know, shovels in the ground, or are they supposed to finish before they actually start the plan?

Mr. Nafziger: Do you mean developing to 100 percent plans?

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah. If the goal is to start in March, is that under the assumption that they're going to finish 100 percent, or are they just going to start in March regardless. I'm just thinking about, for instance, if they run into – so going back to the El Palo Alto tree, you know, if the roots extend out far enough, what are they going to do in that situation? Is there an option to cut it down? Or are they going to figure that out after they built everything, or are they going to try to figure that out before?

Mr. Nafziger: Well, the plans will, assuming normal construction practices, the plans will be seen 100 percent and then approval and then they would start the full construction. Is there a specific question?

Vice Chair Corey: Well, I guess I was just baffled if it's 65 percent complete, how do they think they will have it ready to start by March. That would be just so out of whack with reality, I was assuming maybe they were going to try to like kind of plan some of it and get approval, and then start digging.

Mr. Nafziger: They have not stated that, and we're not aware of their...

Vice Chair Corey: Okay, so it sounds like it's going to be a while. I mean, they don't even know what trees they're cutting out yet, and they're going to be done, the government in three months?

Chair Bower: Remember, they are the applicant and...

Vice Chair Corey: And the approver.

Chair Bower: ...and the authority to approve it. I mean, it's a totally in-house situation. I mean, Caltrain is a State agency.

Vice Chair Corey: But they still would have to then, that State agency still has to get it done in three months, right?

Chair Bower: Well, they might have it done, say in Brisbane – I mean, if they're going to start someplace, it's probably not starting in Palo Alto. I'm assuming, and it's just an assumption and a guess really, that they would start at one end or the other and basically work down. Do you know anything about that?

Ms. French: Well, I don't, but I'm surmising, just as everyone else that there might be something like, let's do all the tree removals in the month of March, you know. We don't know where the replacement trees are going, but let's start by removal of everything in the whole corridor. I'm saying that's a possibility.

Chair Bower: Yeah, okay. Roger?

Board Member Kohler: One little question about the trees, there is, on Alma there is a curve and then there is some space and then a fence. Does the railroad property go out to the curb of Alma or is it at the fence? I don't know if there is a way of knowing. I didn't see anything in here.

Ms. French: Do you have a set of plans there? Do you want to ask a specific sheet number we can look up together?

Board Member Kohler: Well, it's, look at the very last page, the last two pages. There's, it's hard to know what's happening along Alma is what I guess I'm saying. There's all these phone lines and there's – but it looks like to me that – I don't know. Is the dash line, the heavy, that's the edge of their property?

Ms. French: Yes, it appears that that is the edge of the property and it falls, and the curb line of Alma appears to be, and a few feet to the tune of maybe ten feet, between the curb and their property line on the last page of the...

Board Member Kohler: What do you mean ten feet? Ten feet where?

Ms. French: I'm looking at sheet, let's look on the same page, sheet 32, when I look at sheet 32, I see a heavy dash line and then I see a curb line above that and I see Alma Street.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, so my question is, there are some trees along that curb and they kind of overflow. I guess my fear is that all the trees and all the shrubs get eliminated and we have this bare, open railroad thing. It sounds pretty bad.

Mr. Nafziger: No, I don't believe that's the case. There's pruning and some removal, but it's not a complete clear cut.

Board Member Kohler: Okay, all right.

Chair Bower: So, I think one last question, the initial siding of this power traction station, is that the right term that you described, was going to be done in South Palo Alto near the Greenmeadow?

Ms. French: There are three options for the paralleling station in Palo Alto. I'm going to go back to the slide that had that. I think I have the slide here. Okay, maybe not. One was down across from Greenmeadow, one was next to Park Plaza, the 195 Page Mill, Hohbach's mixed-use project, and then there might have been another one. I can't remember where it was. But anyways, the one next to Park Plaza is the one they're focusing on, and they're talking about locating it farther north than that, a couple of hundred feet. Am I right Mike?

Mr. Nafziger: Yes.

Ms. French: Okay, confirmed. That's what they're focusing on now, and not the Greenmeadow cited one.

Chair Bower: And that's the size of a garage, a parking structure?

Ms. French: Well, when I read the EIR, it says 40 x 80 feet. It's a large building.

Chair Bower: Okay.

Ms. French: It has a roof on it, I'm told.

Chair Bower: So, I guess we'll come back to that in discussion. Council Member Holman, did you want to make any comments?

Council Member Holman: I do, and thank you for asking. I appreciate the questions, especially of the Chair and Vice Chair. I have some comments and I have a couple of suggestions. Comments are, well one is about San Francisquito Bridge is, I understand the bridge is 20 feet 3 inches high, but Caltrain requires 24 and a half feet, so I don't know if that's been resolved.

Mr. Nafziger: The wires will be going through the bridge. There's been no indication or discussion about modification to the bridge or any of the systems.

Council Member Holman: So, if the wires are going through the bridge, it seems like that would be a very direct impact (crosstalk), and I don't think that was analyzed. It certainly was not mentioned here.

Vice Chair Corey: Are you sure, because I thought it said it was running parallel to and above. It didn't actually say going...

Chair Bower: It can't be above. How would they connect?

Mr. Nafziger: Similar to the muni-buses in San Francisco, the trains need to maintain contact with the electrified wires to run. The bridge is not as tall as the poles through the rest of the line, so the poles on either side of the bridge, the Menlo Park side and the Palo Alto side need to be of reduced height and higher tension so they can get the wires underneath. The trestle of the bridge has crossmembers, so the wires will have to get below the crossmembers, yet still maintain contact with the train. So, it's not entirely clear from the plans, but that's how the operation would work.

Vice Chair Corey: I guess the worst case would be if they ended up putting like, if they needed to get the height, and I don't know if it's worse than putting holes through, but like some brackets sticking off of the bridge to maintain the height or something, right?

Mr. Nafziger: No, there's no proposal to modify the bridge or add any equipment to the bridge. The clearance will (crosstalk).

Vice Chair Corey: Just drill through it and run the wires through?

Mr. Nafziger: I don't believe they're drilling through it. (crosstalk) The trains need to maintain contact with the wires, so if they drilled holes through and ran wires through it, they would have interruption of that service. So, what we see from the plans is that the wires will be suspended underneath the crossmembers of the top of the bridge to maintain contact for the train.

Chair Bower: So when, Amy you were saying that the report suggests that the only alteration to that bridge is clearance holes? I heard that in a way, as a retired builder that what they would be doing is drilling holes and then attaching an isolator that would then support their wires. Is that a reasonable assumption?

Mr. Nafziger: We don't have that understanding, that level of detail of their design at this point. We do know that the wires will need to run underneath the crossmembers of the bridge so that the trains can maintain power through the bridge.

Chair Bower: Typically in Europe, which is the only experience I have with this kind of train system, those contact structures on top of the trains are actually sort of spring loaded and that they can move with the

wires as they go under or the wire increases in height, and I would assume it won't be any problem to do that here.

Mr. Nafziger: That's our assumption as well.

Chair Bower: Okay. Sorry to interrupt.

Council Member Holman: No, I appreciate your questioning. I guess, let me underlay my next comments by a suggestion which is, because this meeting is, no criticism here intended, because this meeting is not terribly well staffed, then I would suggest that the Chair of the HRB go to the ARB meeting and staff include the chair, if you're available to do that, as an active participant in that. Like maybe sitting at the staff table or something like that, so you're actually a resource and not just sitting with the public and listening in. If that can be accommodated?

Ms. French: Absolutely, I welcome and encourage and would love it if you or, the Chair (crosstalk) actually, you'll get to hear the presentation from the applicant, sorry, not the applicant, the 'project everything' (team).

Chair Bower: Yeah, I think that will work. I'll check and we'll talk after the meeting.

Vice Chair Corey: The project, everything.

Council Member Holman: Underlying that, glad and if you can check your schedule, that would be terrific, and thank you for, Ms. French, for being open to that. There are other things here having to do with El Palo Alto, speaking personally I've been concerned about the latitude and lenience that's being allowed for tree pruning at various projects I've seen around town. And so, I guess the more precise and more specific we can get about what exactly is going to be done with El Palo Alto ahead of time, and making sure that those do satisfy really stringent health considerations for El Palo Alto, and a question for, I guess Public Works would be, is Caltrain being required to put a bond up for El Palo Alto, and what would the value of that bond be, I mean how many millions of dollars? But the reason I say that is because I know with general construction projects around town, that, and I never think it's enough because I'm a tree fanatic, maybe, but sometimes or oftentimes applicants are required to put a bond, a two-year bond for certain dollar amounts for a project, if there is any damage to a given resource, a tree resource. So, it kind of heightens the awareness and I think a regard for and respect for and requirements of the jurisdiction over those trees. So, and my disappointment with and concern with bonds that the City does require about trees. It's like it lasts for two years. Well you don't know what the impact is to a large tree in two years. It's sometimes ten years. So, I don't know if the City has considered that. We don't get very much feedback from the Rail Committee at the full Council.

Vice Chair Corey: Not just the pruning either, Karen, but like if you, you know if they have to put these big poles up, those trees that have had roots there for a thousand years, you know, they have to adjust and try to compensate for that, and I question whether or not the builders will care.

Council Member Holman: Yeah, and I think if there's...

Vice Chair Corey: To you point.

Council Member Holman: I don't know if having – I'm just making up numbers here, let's say it's a \$20 million bond for ten years, and I'm just totally making up numbers here, does that heighten the awareness, because if you're not going to know the impact for ten years, does that mean the construction company is going to be looking and be more careful?

Vice Chair Corey: I would think that you're right. Yeah, hopefully.

Council Member Holman: You would hope that if there is a liability that continues forward – it's just a suggestion. I don't have the authority to do that, but it's something I wish and hope that the City would impose on Caltrain, if there's the authority to do that and I would think that there would be. And I agree with you, it's not just the pruning. Pruning is what's obvious, but it's also the damage to the roots, which is why we have bonds on construction projects. The comment about the – I'm commenting like an HRB member here, so I apologize for that, but it's kind of the only way to do this and the only opportunity to do this. The station, University Avenue station, it says that there won't be poles directly in front of the resource. That they will be single poles and they will be, there won't be any poles on the west side, but it doesn't mention east side, but poles on the east side would have just as significant an impact. Do you follow what I'm saying? Yeah, okay. I appreciated the comment about, I think it was the Chair who said this about the design, maybe it was the Vice Chair, the design of the poles themselves. Could there not be some consideration that they not be more contextual, and that's something that the ARB would probably be very interested in. And then the other question, which surely is being addressed somewhere, but these are fairly significant tall poles, is what is their stability in the case of an earthquake? Not only just because of life safety, but also in terms of cultural resources. So, you get it. I don't need to say more than that. Those were really the things I wanted to highlight. I think if the Chair could be an active participant in the ARB meeting and have some eyes on this, I think it would be, and ability to comment directly, I think that would be a huge asset for this Board, and for the public.

Chair Bower: I'd like to make some comments about your comments, but in the discussion session, if that's all right. No other questions for staff.

Vice Chair Corey: One other question. If, when they actually have plans, or more details for the bridge or anything around the tree, will this actually come back to us? Because it's like what happens many times here, we're kind of going to do this, and then we don't actually see, because I'm still not clear, I kind of visually am getting what they're going to do, but to the bridge, but does that mean they can just change that and put up whatever they want later, and they say oh, we went to the HRB and kind of vaguely told them and idea we had? Is there any opportunity or is that actually going to come back here when they have some real data, more than 65 percent? (crosstalk)

Ms. French: We can certainly request to see those. We will be, those plans will be shared with us, or whatever they call them, 85, 82, I don't know.

Vice Chair Corey: Maybe when they're 85 percent we'll them? (crosstalk) Try turning it off.

Mr. Nafziger: There we go. There is another level of page-turn review with City staff and Caltrain staff at the ready to issue for construction stage, so, essentially the 100 percent stage of drawings.

Chair Bower: That doesn't allow much input if you're getting it at the 100 percent complete time.

Vice Chair Corey: It's kind of insulting to come when they have a vague idea and then say we'll give it to you when there's 100 percent, and then they actually can say that they came to us when they really came to us with nothing more than an idea.

Chair Bower: Calm down.

Vice Chair Corey: I'm not angry, I'm just saying it's insulting, that's all.

Chair Bower: It's not required, so they've actually provided this opportunity without having to. I think it's a smart thing to do. I share your feelings about the completeness, so maybe we'll figure out a way to intervene or at least review prior to 100 percent.

Vice Chair Corey: That would be great.

Ms. French: Yeah, I think we are in an odd situation that finally the Environmental Impact Report was prepared saying there will be impacts and we're going to go ahead anyways and we don't even have the drawings that show exactly what the impacts are, but we know there are impacts and it's okay. So, it's kind of like that's where we are and we have to take, just take what we're given, which is we get a chance to comment when they allow us to.

Chair Bower: It's what I think was termed a complementary review, courtesy, that's it, sorry. I don't see Palo Alto on the plans anywhere, and do you have a sense of whether El Palo Alto is within their right-of-way or is it next to it, just where it is?

Mr. Nafziger: It is, as far as I understand, is not within the Caltrain right-of-way, but it's very close, it's 26 feet from the tracks.

Ms. French: 26 feet.

Chair Bower: 26 feet from the edge of their right-of-way?

Ms. French: The tree trunk is 26 feet from the edge of Caltrain right-of-way, and it says here the tree branches and foliage are five feet, within five feet of their right-of-way.

Chair Bower: Well, I think that's pretty reassuring because their work is essentially boring for concrete piers, and that, at 26 feet, that probably makes that tree root system safe, because that would be on the outer edges, I mean the root system. I only say that because I put a basement in in 1988 eight feet from a redwood tree before anybody was thinking about trees, and that tree is thriving and that, the arborist there said, well, he thought it would die, and it didn't. So, if you're careful and you're not polluting or damaging the root system in some way with chemicals or some other invasive stuff, I'm at least somewhat encouraged. I'm not an arborist, but having had that one experience which, of course, I didn't understand until after the project was well under way, that's why we now have tree (not understood). So, it's worth that consideration.

Vice Chair Corey: Redwoods grow in strange ways, so they can actually go a big distance in one direction or not. That's why a lot of them might live on cliffs. It really depends on the tree.

Chair Bower: Yeah, right. So, I think, unless there are other questions, I'd like to hear from the public and then we'll come back and have a discussion and make recommendations. So, Martin, you're our only speaker today, and speaking as a property owner, not as a Board Member.

Martin Bernstein: Thank you Chair Bower. So, I read the report and I thought it was a very well written report. I actually enjoyed reading it and all the diagrams. So, just to let the public know, as a Member of the HRB I received a ruling from the Federal, I'm sorry, from the California Fair Political Practice Commission, so I'm not allowed to participate in any of the decisions on this, because my personal residence is within 500 feet of the right-of-way. But as a member of the public I am able to speak as a member of the public with anything that's regarding my personal property. I just want to make the comment that I'm glad to see this electrification project move forward, because it will reduce the noise impact on my personal residence. I take the train often to San Francisco and these poles and the substructures are already installed in San Mateo County, so I find them actually pretty exciting to see that. It reminds me of all the travel I do in Europe. But that's the impact on my personal residence, just the less noise with the electric, so I'm glad to see the project move forward. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you Martin. Since there are no further public comment requests, I think I'd like to bring it back to the Board now and let's discuss recommendations that we want to make to, or responses to this report. I have one staff question. I could not read, because, I couldn't read how tall these towers are because they were shrunk to such a small, I can't read it. Do you have a sense of – the tower detail is not in the plans that I could find in our materials, unless I missed it.

Ms. French; Packet page 16, I had done my level best in writing this to look through the plans and see what was what. Packet page 16 (crosstalk) has a paragraph that says the different, the wide-phalange design ones are basically 32 feet tall where those occur. The wide-flanged 4-A, the ones with the long reach cantilevers are 45 feet tall. Most of them are 32 to 35 feet tall, and then you have the occasional 45 feet tall poles basically, or 38 feet in some cases.

Chair Bower: A question that maybe could be answered by our Public Works representative, at Homer and Alma there are two high power poles that were installed recently by the City, they are steel. Do you have any sense of what those, how tall those poles are?

Mr. Nafziger: I don't. I am vaguely aware of those poles in previous meetings with Utilities staff, but I do not know the height of those.

Ms. French: I should also state that - am I interrupting your thought, sorry.

Chair Bower: No, no.

Ms. French: I should also state on packet page 16, below all of those bullets that I combed through, the JPB representative said that there's going to be a 75 feet tall pole type that's going to go in six or seven locations. It's undetermined the timing of the utilities undergrounding. So, that's related to that, and so that's why we don't know where those would go. We don't have them in the plans. I don't know if those will show up in the 100 percent plans. Okay, so I guess that's when we'll know when we see those.

Chair Bower: So, I'm trying to find a building that would be comparable to say a 45-foot pole. Now, 805 Hight Street had a 55-foot height limit. Is that, you know, that's the development between Channing and Homer on High Street. I'm just wondering, is that the downtown height limit, 55 feet?

Ms. French: 50 feet is the City-wide height limit.

Chair Bower: I think that building is taller than the 50 feet.

Ms. French: There're a number of buildings taller than 50 feet.

Chair Bower: So, if that was just 50 feet, we're talking about poles that would be five feet shorter than those buildings, and those poles would overwhelm the Palo Alto Depot at University Avenue. I don't think that building's more than 25 feet tall, and it's just a guess. So, the reason I bring this up, Board Members, is that part of what Councilwoman Holman has asked us to do is make some statement about contextual or what I think the term we also could use is compatibility of these poles with Station - I can't imagine how they could use a pole that tall, why they need it. Anyway, so let's consider that. I have a list of...

Ms. French: Could I just, before you do that let me just resolve this. So, at the station, to have data, the plans indicate the TT-1 and the TT-4 poles, which are 32 feet tall for the TT-1 and 32 feet tall for the TT-4. So, I think at the Palo Alto Depot we're looking at 32-foot tall poles. So, hopefully that stays that way. I don't know why they would change it.

Chair Bower: Okay, so to start the conversation off, I have five areas of discussion. One is what kinds of attachments will be made to the historic bridge at San Francisquito Creek. The second one would be where that parallel traction station is going to be located, because of its size and I don't think it's going to be near any historic structures or properties, but we would like to know that. Certainly, all of the issues surrounding El Palo Alto Tree should be, I think, clearly discussed. All mitigation measures listed and I think in my experience, site observation of work around the tree would be more effective than a bond, because a bond is just money, and typically you can just build money into your project to pay the bond and then not have to worry about it. But, again, my experience, site observation meant a much more thorough review and really, protection of the tree. So, that's something I would like the Board to

consider. And then finally, the compatibility of the poles probably between San Francisquito Creek and just south of the Palo Alto University Avenue station ought to be the same, and more contextually appropriate or compatible. I had envisioned these poles as being steel, just for no reason at all, but concrete is a little, you know, seems to be a little harsh as a material, even painted. So, those are the five things that I would like the Board to consider. I welcome any other discussion, discussion of any other topic, but if we could focus on those, oh and the color. I'm sorry, it was on my list, but not as a bullet point. So, color would be the final one. So, a discussion, Board Members. Debbie.

Board Member Shepherd: So, as to color, the big chip is totally different than the little chip. I'm sure they're going to resolve that, but yellow doesn't, you know, the yellow obviously doesn't seem very natural. Is the paint infused in the concrete, so this isn't a maintenance issue? I don't know, I'm sure that somebody is going to address this. And other poles, there must be other poles that are contextual, so these don't stand out as much when we just want to make them go away visually as much as possible.

Chair Bower: So, just to answer your question about paint, the paint has been described to me as a temporary sealant.

Board Member Shepherd: Not very reassuring.

Chair Bower: So, there's never an end to the maintenance.

Board Member Shepherd: Okay, thank you.

Chair Bower: I don't know how we answer that, because they are asking us for colors.

Vice Chair Corey: My only question would be if they plan to maintain it or not.

Ms. French: This question will be referred to, and of course they can see this meeting on the media center, they being the JPB Team, and they perhaps will have some answers for next week's ARB Meeting and, David, if you can relay this back to the Board or however, we can do that.

Chair Bower: So, let's talk about color. Is there any, are there any strong, any feelings at all about the color by the Board Members? Let's start down with Michael for a change.

Board Member Makinen: I don't think really the color is that much of a relevant issue. It's a structure, you know.

Board Member Kohler: Is there a selected color already, I mean of the ones that are in the booklet here?

(crosstalk)

Board Member Kohler: Well, the black looks really good. Is this black or green?

Chair Bower: This is green.

Vice Chair Corey: They don't have a sample of the brown though. I mean, they have yellow, gray and black, and they have...

Chair Bower: The brown looks like green, yeah brown looks like black.

Vice Chair Corey: Oh, sorry. I thought it was the – okay, never mind. That's the brown.

Ms. French: On the screen we have, and this is packet page 74 as well, that shows at the Palo Alto Depot the poles, option one is the yellow-looking tan color. Option two is the gray and option three is the brown. And it says option one is to match the color of the structure, the Historic Railroad Station. Option

two is to match poles and option three is to match the furniture. Are we matching furniture, station or I don't know, that's what we got?

Vice Chair Corey: The benches, I think there's benches out there.

Chair Bower: Debbie, what color are you, or what's your feeling about colors?

Board Member Shepherd: Well, they call it yellow, but the big swatch looks like beige to me. It kind of looks like the color of the station, and it just seems the least assertive, but I don't know.

Chair Bower: It's tan. It looks like tan to me, as Roger and Michael are saying. I guess my feeling is that we ought to consider picking a color that's consistent along the entire corridor because I think that will eventually, my brain just loses the color, although it did see the color on those very tall power poles at Homer and Alma, and it's a green, a dark green color. Of course, that color has only been there for three or four years, and yesterday for some reason I saw it. My inclination is to either do the tan one or the green one, just because green is more like the trees, and there are a lot of trees that are along the corridor, but I do understand that..

Vice Chair Corey: There are now.

Chair Bower: Well, I think, I don't think they're all going away. On the other hand, the tan color at the Palo Alto University Avenue Station seems to make some sense. I don't get any sense at all of what color should be at California Avenue because I can't really think of what a color there, what colors are already there. There are many of them. So, those are my feelings about it.

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah, I'm with you, consistency.

Chair Bower: Yeah. And they're not talking about the colors of all the poles between the stations, so I would...

(inaudible)

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah, costs extra.

Chair Bower: Well, I would like them to all be the same color in the corridor.

Mr. Nafziger: I believe their proposal is to have colored poles only within a certain radius of each station.

Chair Bower: Okay, I think we can still make a recommendation that they all be the same color in Palo Alto for consistency sake.

Vice Chair Corey: Across everywhere, not just at the stations, yeah.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I think so. That would be my preference.

Vice Chair Corey: Mine too, but I don't know if they care.

Chair Bower: Well, we make a recommendation. That's all we can do.

Vice Chair Corey: I like your idea of green, because that's going to be the best probably if there's all the trees around there, right? Almost matching.

Board Member Kohler (inaudible)

Chair Bower: At the Palo Alto Station I can see green as being a significant contrast.

Vice Chair Corey: Use the tan at the Palo Alto Station.

Chair Bower: Councilwoman Holman.

Council Member Holman: I'm just nodding in acknowledgement.

Chair Bower: So, how we...

Council Member Holman: I will say one thing. So, because these swatches that are provided, there's no way to rely on them at all in terms of color. Board Member Shepherd brought out the difference even just within the packet. So, it's a stab in the dark literally. It's almost brown might be safer because there's likely to be less deviation, but green could be all over the map. So, unless they can be pinned down to matching some particular bin more 127 or something like that equivalent, I think green might be a little bit of a guess work.

Vice Chair Corey: It could be lime green.

Council Member Holman: You never know.

Ms. French: I might suggest next week, when we have the ARB, I can ask them if they have some actual color swatches to bring them to the ARB, and since there's five architects there, that might help things go well.

Vice Chair Corey: Like actually even a sample of the cement with the color would be...

Ms. French: Well, that's asking a lot.

Council Member Holman: Sample boards are typical for any applicant, as you all know, so it seems like Caltrain could perform up to that standard, I would hope that (crosstalk) and we are at their mercy here.

Chair Bower: So, let's have a sense, I'm not getting a sense of color from the Board, but not withstanding the fact that these are not maybe going to be the final colors, I think what we could do is make a recommendation of the tone range based on these swatches. So, I'm ambivalent about brown or green. Green somewhat appeals to me more when I look at the screen here.

Vice Chair Corey: I think your thought on the green matches more the trees makes sense, right? I mean, if you're going to go with one of these, because that's going to match the most, given that there will be trees in the area. But, if you had to pick one and you had to be consistent, so I'll still stick with that.

Chair Bower: Debbie.

Board Member Shepherd: The pole is analogous to a tree trunk...

Vice Chair Corey: You'd do brown?

Board Member Shepherd: ...but a tree trunk with no branches is a really hideous experience, so I guess I just struggle with going down that route at all. I just want it to be as neutral, and there must be expertise out there about what make something go away visually.

Ms. French: I might weigh in just for fun, as a Caltrain rider. I think when you arrive at a station maybe you've been seeing gray concrete and now you're at a station and it's, you know, subtly different than the gray and you say, oh, here we are. So, having the tan, if you want to call it tan, is subtle but a change, and now you're in the station. So, I think, I don't know why I'm weighing in, as a rider.

Chair Bower: All right. Well, so I think we're all over the place here. So, I would like to suggest that we adopt their option one for pole colors that's not consistent across the corridor, but I think a lighter color at the Downtown Station makes sense. Stanford, the green at that area, there are a lot of trees there. Maybe they're going to disappear. So, I don't know, should we vote on this?

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Bower: Yeah, right. All right, let's hold that thought.

Board Member Kohler: I suggest we vote, take a vote to vote.

Chair Bower: I would like to list the things that we're going to recommend and then let's do one vote, rather than vote on each one.

Vice Chair Corey: I love it.

Chair Bower: All right, so we'll hold color for the moment. I think it would be easy for us to, going back to my first point, that Historic Resources that should be untouched or touched as little as possible, and that the attachments to the bridge at San Francisquito Creek should follow Secretary of Interior Standards, which are basically you do as little as possible and if they have to be removed later, which they may be because we'll have Michael's battery-operated trains, then there will only be holes. So, I think that's a pretty easy one for us to suggest. And since I'm not seeing any hands, I'll consider that to be Item Number One. El Palo Alto tree trimming, I would like to recommend that that be, that any work around the tree be done with an arborist present period, and have an observer there. I'm not, I don't know that the bond issue is going to be effective or that they would do it at all, because that's just another cost, but I'm open to that suggestion. But at least that the tree, all the work when they're working there, they have to have an arborist on site.

(Female inaudible)

Mr. Nafziger: Yes, we've already discussed that with Caltrain and I believe that is our, that will happen, City of Palo Alto arborist, Urban Forestry Department.

Chair Bower: Okay. And then the, I guess there are four things, because color – so the fourth one was the poles at the Palo Alto Station, the University Avenue Station be more contextually appropriate or more compatible than the concrete that's there. That's not very many, but I think it would make a difference. And then the color. I would suggest color option one. So, those are the four things, right?

Vice Chair Corey: Option one on the Palo Alto...

Chair Bower: On their recommended ones. So, that's going to be three different colors.

(inaudible)

Chair Bower: It's the tan color for the University Station, it's I don't know what, the dark something color, it's filing cabinet black, wow.

Vice Chair Corey: That seems harsh.

Chair Bower: Really. So, maybe I would modify that to the brown 332 on page 81.

Ms. French: Sorry, did you say this is for the Cal Ave Station?

Chair Bower: Yeah, Cal Ave Station. And then the Stanford Stadium Station would be their green color. Maybe to make it simpler we just make it green, make it tan at the Palo Alto Station and green everywhere else. Sorry to prolong this. Is that acceptable, two colors?

Vice Chair Corey: I like it, and that's for me.

Chair Bower: So, Amy, green everywhere else, all along the corridor. So, basically the entire corridor would be green, the forest green or whatever this is, it's marine green, although it doesn't really look like that on the monitor. And then at the Palo Alto Station it would be the tan/yellow. I'd like to use the term tan and not use their yellow color. I don't really want it to be yellow. So, can you read those back Amy, just so we...

MOTION

Ms. French: So, as a group voting on these recommended motions; (1) the San Francisquito Creek bridge attachment should touch the resources as little as possible and follow the Secretary of Interior Standards, (2) the tree should have the Urban Forester review any work near the tree as an observer, Palo Alto's Urban Forester, and then (3) the poles at the Palo Alto Depot should be more contextually appropriate, and then at the Palo Alto Depot, use the lighter tan color or just the tan color at that station, option one similar, and then (4) use green on the poles elsewhere in Palo Alto.

Chair Bower: And the one, actually the one I had on my list, the fifth one was that (5) the parallel traction facility would be located in the California Avenue region, because I don't think we have any historic resources there. Not located in the south near Greenmeadow or in the north near the basically Embarcadero Road, University Avenue or the San Francisquito bridge. That's a big building. Okay, so...

Council Member Holman: Did you want to address the location of the poles near the University Station? They said not within 40 feet of the front on the west side, but they don't address the east side. Was that of a concern?

Chair Bower: I think the poles are single there, so they're spaced, they're actually located between the tracks, so I'm not quite sure what east and west would be, since there's only one pole.

Ms. French: Yeah, that might have been the mitigation measure from back in 2014, when they adopted this, but now we have rail plans that show single poles, so I think that was in case we were doing two poles.

Vice Chair Corey: Right.

Chair Bower: I just think Council Member Holman's remark about not placing the poles in the front of the building would also be an important – it seems to me those poles could be located...

Vice Chair Corey: I thought they were in the middle.

Chair Bower: No, the poles are actually not in front of the building, but they would be at either end of the building. (crosstalk) I can't tell from the plans where the building is.

Ms. French: So, let's look together. Sheet number 13, page number 13 of the set near the words "match line MT-1" that's where the single pole starts and that is, you can see the Palo Alto Station there just below the grid marks, which is I guess the paving on the platform. So, it is, there is a single pole across from the station building there, and the next pole occurs between the building and the kind of round-about where the buses come, so that one is not in front of the station. There is one in front of the station though, next to that match line.

Chair Bower: That's probably driven by spacing and I don't think we're going to get anything, they're not going to change that. So, I guess what we could say is, we would like to encourage the Caltrain authority to (6) position poles near this station in a way that minimizes poles in front of the building. So, one probably has to be there, but if they could figure out a way to have zero, then that would be better. Is that a reasonable request? I don't know whether they will do it, but let's add that to it.

Vice Chair Corey: We can add it.

Chair Bower: Yeah, let's...

(inaudible)

Vice Chair Corey: (6a) Ideally zero poles, but minimize it in front of the building, poles in front of the building.

Ms. French: Okay.

Chair Bower: Okay. So, with, there are four of us. Michael just left. I'm worried about getting a ticket, because at 10:00 my parking is up because I'm on the street. I could run out there.

Vice Chair Corey: Why don't we make it a motion?

Chair Bower: Well, I'm actually making this, four is enough. All right. So, with that, all in favor?

Vice Chair Corey: I'll second.

Chair Bower: I'm sorry, yeah, yeah. I made the motion, Brandon is seconding.

Vice Chair Corey: I will second.

Chair Bower: See, I'm getting rusty because it's been so long between meetings.

Vice Chair Corey: That's your problem.

Chair Bower: Among many other problems. All right, so Michael is back, good. So, I moved and Brandon seconded those five items as a motion, and so, if there is no other discussion, I'll call for a vote. All in favor. All opposed. None, good.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0, 2 ABSENT.

Chair Bower: I hope that's helpful. I will meet with you and discuss attending the meeting next week.

Approval of Minutes

3. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of October 11, 2018.

Chair Bower: Okay. Quickly we have minutes from October 11th. I was not there, so I can't address the accuracy of it, but I was not misquoted in these minutes. So, any – thank you Martin for returning. Any changes or additions to the minutes? Okay, not hearing any, do I have a motion to approve?

MOTION

Board Member Bernstein: I move to approve the minutes.

Chair Bower: Second?

Board Member Kohler: I second.

Chair Bower: Roger seconds. All right, all in favor? Opposed? Abstain?

Vice Chair Corey: I'll abstain.

Chair Bower: I'm abstaining. You're abstaining. I don't care. I'm just trying to clarify what you voted for. Are you abstaining?

Vice Chair Corey: I'm abstaining.

Chair Bower: Okay, two abstentions. Well, I wasn't there, so...

Board Member Kohler: What does that do?

Chair Bower: Nothing. My policy is that if I'm not there, I can't approve what's there, even though that's legal. So, it's a personal issue. All right.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4, 2 ABSTENTIONS, 1 ABSENT

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: So, the last item, Subcommittee Items.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: Board Member Questions, and then we're going to go to adjournment.

Ms. French: There are none.

Chair Bower: Okay, I will raise again the issue about the Mills Act files. Have you had any opportunity to find them?

Ms. French: No, I haven't, no.

Chair Bower: Can you try to find them?

Ms. French: I will try to put it on my task list again.

Chair Bower: Oh, you know, you only have a half-time job, I get it but – I bring this up because there is, as you know, an issue about a Mills Act contract with a homeowner that can't be resolved until we have a Mills Act, it shouldn't be resolved, maybe that's a better way of stating it, until we have a Mills Act Program. So, I'd like to move that forward. And we were pretty close to being able to make recommendations.

Ms. French: So, I mean, I understand and I will try to go through the records that are available. I don't know that somebody can't do a Mills Act without a Mills Act Program. I think because it's related to a, you know, the County and what they do at property tax...

Chair Bower: But Palo Alto shouldn't be granting a Mills Act (crosstalk).

Ms. French: Without a program, and we don't have an ordinance that refers to a program, but we do have a Mills Act property and, you know, how that happened...

Chair Bower: I understand. That's...

Ms. French: That was then.

Chair Bower: Right, but we ought to have a program, so I'm anxious to move this forward, especially since we don't have anything else to do at our meetings.

Ms. French: If there are no notes that exist, then I'll let you know, and if I find them, I will send them.

Chair Bower: Okay, because I can reach out to Emily.

Ms. French: Emily, yeah, I could do that too.

Chair Bower: I'm sure she has it. She took extensive notes. We were really close. All right, so that was my contribution. Debbie, did you want to – no, that's subcommittee. Board Member questions, comments, announcements? Debbie.

Board Member Shepherd: I just wanted to announce that the Director of the Palo Alto History Museum made me aware that there is an opening that Joe Samitian (phonetic) our supervisor is responsible for on the Santa Clara County Historical Heritage Commission. And they also take an interest in the Mills Act, I believe. I'm just learning what they do or don't do, but anyway, I just thought everyone should be aware of that. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Any other announcements? All right, if there are no other announcements or comments – oh, Karen.

Council Member Holman: So, if there is no meeting in December, this will be my last opportunity to be liaison from the Council to you all, especially given I'm termed off Council elected at the end of this year. So, it's been my pleasure to be here with Amy, hard-working Amy and you all to help review our Historic Resources and appreciate all your efforts and endeavors and your diligence and improving diligence in reviewing our projects. So, thank you very much. It's been my pleasure.

Chair Bower: And I will say that your contributions have been critical. Your perspective makes a huge difference, and you've highlighted things that we should have picked up but didn't, and so we'll miss you. Good luck with your new Board, and maybe we'll see you back here in four years.

Board Member Kohler: Is there a rule how far, if she wanted to come back, is that okay?

Ms. Amy: Well, she can certainly come to the podium any time she would like as a citizen of Palo Alto.

(inaudible)

Chair Bower: And Ms. Kniss, this is her second round on the Council, so, yeah you can come back.

Council Member Holman: I would not wait with baited breath for that. How many years have you been on the Commission?

Council Member Holman: Seventeen years at the dais, nine as Council Member and eight and a half as a planning commissioner. That's a long time, so I would not wait, like I say, with baited breath or a return.

Board Member Kohler: Speaking of that, I think, I just realized I've been on the Board 20 years. I mean, I have nothing else to do, so I come down here.

Chair Bower: Thank you Karen for your contribution, both as a Council Member and also as a Board participant. Hope to see you again.

Council Member Holman: I would say that either one of you all or work with somebody, because I know there are a couple of Council Members that are really interested in Historic Preservation, but there's not a level of expertise on the Council at this point in time, and I think it is critical and relevant, so it would be great if you all would work with Council Members, new and upcoming and existing, to help reinforce the importance and maybe some education around Historic Preservation too, since you all are the ones with the Secretary of Standards experience and staff does not have time to do that. So, I would encourage you to take that initiative.

Chair Bower: See, it's just another example of a good suggestion that I hadn't thought about.

Ms. French: So, before adjourning, just two things. One is, so the December 13th, I think I said there were no project items that were scheduled, but if you all are here and would like to have a meeting in this holiday season, then, and this would be when you're still a Council Member, we could arrange to have something that was, you know, more social in nature but keep an agenda. Maybe something in the back room that we adjourn to right away, Yeah, brunchy sort of. Okay, so let me know if you're not available or are available.

Chair Bower: Or have Robin reach out to all of us just to...

Ms. French: And the second thing was we have our City Clerk Staff, David Carnahan, with gifts and proclamations for your hard-won service, I guess.

Chair Bower: Should we do this as part of the meeting or do it after.

Ms. French: Well, we're still here so let's do it now.

Chair Bower: Okay, so we'll continue.

Ms. French: Here by proclaim.

Chair Bower: Right, so as a description, this is Board Recognition. Those of us who missed the Board Appreciation event, these are our certificates. You and Martin went.

Board Member Kohler: Martin and I attended and Martin gave a little nice speech to everyone there about how things should be working. You did a good job.

Chair Bower: Good. Well, thank you for standing in for the rest of us. All right, if there's nothing else, I'll adjourn the meeting.

Adjournment