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Workshop Overview

Connecting Palo Alto: Community Workshop #2
Palo Alto Art Center Auditorium
1313 Newell Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
September 16, 2017 10:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.

The City of Palo Alto (City) hosted a community workshop (Workshop) on Saturday, September 16, 2017, at the Palo Alto Art Center Auditorium (Art Center). The purpose of the Workshop was to review Connecting Palo Alto’s (Program) problem statement, goals and evaluation criteria, and start discussing design alternatives and constraints for grade crossings in Palo Alto.

The purpose of this Program is to assess potential solutions to grade crossing traffic, safety, and congestion issues with thorough consideration of public insight. The Program area encompasses pedestrian and vehicular infrastructure within a half-mile radius of the railroad corridor that bisects the City, in particular four major at-grade crossings: Palo Alto Avenue, Churchill Avenue, E. Meadow Drive, and Charleston Road. The Program’s implementation is spurred by the recent availability of Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) funding for grade crossing improvements in the region.

In order to notify local residents, City staff, interested organizations, and stakeholders about the upcoming Workshop, a flyer was shared online through the project website, NextDoor, the Palo Alto Daily News, and direct email to contacts who signed up to receive project updates. The flyer (Appendix A) contained a brief explanation about how the Program came to be; how the Workshop was structured; and, emphasized attendees’ key role in assessing the Program’s problem statement, goals, and evaluation criteria, and which design alternatives and constraints should be considered.

The Workshop began informally, as participants walked into the venue, signed in, made nametags, received handouts (agenda, presentations, surveys available on demand), and conversed amongst themselves. Attendees were invited to sit wherever they wanted and interact with the Project Team to ask questions and share comments about the Program. 98 attendees filled out the voluntary public sign-in sheets (Appendix B). Two presentations were given, with brief questions and answers throughout. Most people participated in two breakout exercises focused on discussing alternatives and constraints about grade separations. A real-time, online survey (MeetingSift) was implemented in three instances to gather feedback (Appendix C). However, multiple attendees were uncomfortable with the survey engine and requested physical copies, which were not accounted for in this report.

The 16 comments received during (6) and after (10) the Workshop matched the overall feedback received regarding the Workshop structure and content (Appendix D) and they were added to the project’s stakeholder database (http://bit.ly/2s6DH1e). Photos were taken throughout the Workshop to register the event (Appendix E), and all presentations and a video of the Workshop were shared with the public via the project website (http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto).
The following city officials and staff were in attendance: Tom DuBois, Council Member; Lydia Kou, City Council Member; Eric Filseth, City Council Member; Adrian Fine, City Council Member; Jim Keene, City Manager; Ed Shikada, Assistant City Manager; Claudia Keith, Chief Communications Officer, Rob DeGeus, Director of Community Services; and Hillary Gitelman, Director of Planning and Community Environment. Members of the Project Team in attendance included:

**City of Palo Alto**
Joshuah Mello, Chief Transportation Official
Philip Kamhi, Transportation Manager
Sylvia Star-Lack, Safe Routes to School Coordinator
Ruchika Aggarwal, Associate Engineer
Reanna Tong, Transportation Program Assistant

**Mott MacDonald**
Chris Metzger, Principal in Charge
Richard Davies, Circulation Study Project Manager
Ariel Morales, Project Coordinator & Design Project Manager
Olga Rodriguez, Project Engineer
Amy Henschke, Project Engineer

**Circlepoint**
Scott Steinwert, CEO
Maily Chu, Project Manager
Alex Casbara, Senior Associate Planner
Vitor Machado Lira, Project Associate
Mohamed Faal, Associate Planner

**Workshop Preparation**
In the months leading up to the Workshop, emails, website content, social media posts, and a questionnaire were used to increase public awareness about the upcoming engagement activities and other Program developments that took place since the first workshop on May 20.

Online updates via the project website (cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto), social media posts (on NextDoor), and online notices (circulated for ten days on the Palo Alto Daily News) were shared with members of the Palo Alto community to notify them about the Workshop. These notices informed the public about the Workshop schedule, namely the discussion about the project’s purpose, goals, and evaluation criteria, and attendees’ key role in shaping the future of the Rail Program and the corridor.
Breakout Sessions

For the first breakout session, Workshop participants were broken up into 4 groups of approximately 22 participants each. Groups were provided a large aerial map of downtown Palo Alto, a map of the rail corridor, a flip chart, and markers. Groups were then asked to share their thoughts, concerns, and opinions on a variety of different topics pertaining to the crossings. Topics included the feasibility of closing existing at-grade crossings, preferable locations for grade separations, the feasibility of constructing a trench, and the possibility of other alternatives discussed in the first presentation. This session lasted approximately 30 minutes, after which time participants were asked to respond to a few questions on MeetingSift, and then were served lunch.

For the second breakout session, eight stations were set up around the room, each pair focused on a different at-grade crossing (Palo Alto Avenue/Alma Street, Charleston Road, Meadow Drive, and Churchill Avenue). Workshop participants were asked to select one crossing of particular interest, and one additional crossing. At each station, facilitators reviewed each option for each crossing (including closing the crossing, raising the roadway over the tracks, lowering the roadway under the tracks, digging a trench/tunnel, or a hybrid). For each option, general feasibility was discussed, as well as benefits, constraints, and challenges. Attendees spent 30 minutes at their first station of choice, and 30 at the second. Afterward, a final MeetingSift Survey was implemented to gain additional feedback and insight.

Key Takeaways:

Palo Alto Avenue (Alma Street)

1- Close crossing: there was a mixed perception of feasibility for this alternative. On one hand, some people argued closing this crossing was not feasible due to ‘high likelihood’ traffic overflow to the surrounding streets. On the other hand, others said the exact opposite: ‘people already avoid this crossing’ and closing it would not significantly impact regional traffic.

2- Road over tracks: did not seem like a viable option, as most questioned the footprint of an elevated structure and its impact on nearby properties and nearby creek.

3- Road under tracks: this option was also not highly approved. People indicated the reconfiguration of access to adjacent properties and bike/pedestrian infrastructure was too burdensome.

4- Hybrid: this option was also contended, as some called for a shallow trench and an elevated road and a proportionate opposition mentioned this was not feasible because of the crossing’s proximity to the creek.

5- Trench/tunnel: a resounding topic across all discussions, trenching/tunneling was the preferred alternative for Palo Alto Ave. Points of consideration brought up were coordination with Menlo Park, making trench/tunnel go under University Ave, consider freight traffic into design, and the co-establishment of a trench/tunnel with a surface pathway for bikes/pedestrians.

6- General commentary: varied permutations of realignment of Alma were discussed, including alignment with Ravenswood, using Alma to cover trench/tunnel, realign to provide better East-West connectivity.
Churchill Avenue

1- **Close crossing:** much like the reactions to potentially closing Palo Alto Ave, people were not supportive of closing Churchill, in particular due to its likely impact to school traffic. However, some proposed that closing it for automobiles only could be a great benefit for safer bike/pedestrian crossings, especially since small children and parents would no longer be competing for space and need to be exposed to car traffic.

2- **Road over tracks:** in essence, unacceptable due to aesthetic and property impacts to valuable real estate nearby.

3- **Road under tracks:** although people were generally more prone to considering under passes over elevating the road above tracks, most were not supportive of this idea. Some argued for a separate bike/pedestrian access as for Cal Ave, but the opposition mentioned the inconvenience of gradient level and potential safety risk in pathways under the road.

4- **Hybrid:** not thoroughly considered. Most people were so pro-trench-tunneling that they quickly glanced over the flexibility of a hybrid design for a more concrete idea of where the train would be and how to repurpose the available surface space.

5- **Trench/tunnel:** most were in favor of this option. Trenching/tunneling was highlighted by commentators as more desirable than overpasses due to smaller property impact and due to the potential of using reclaimed surface area for improved bike/pedestrian infrastructure. Some people did want a clearer distinction between trenching and tunneling trade-offs in order to make a better judgement of which was better.

6- **General commentary:** multiple people emphasized the need to separate bike/pedestrian traffic from car traffic at this location regardless of whatever alternative was chosen. Funding came up as a major point of contention and the most noticeable points were about engaging local Silicon Valley moguls (Mark Zuckerberg mentioned by name) as the source of support the City should try to persuade. Collaboration with nearby cities was also mentioned by several participants.

Meadow Drive

1- **Close crossing:** this would only be desirable if bike/pedestrian only infrastructure was maintained/improved and thorough transit studies were done to make sure traffic overflow would not make traffic worse elsewhere and still allow for good East West connectivity, especially due to school zones.

2- **Road over tracks:** kids and parents need easy access across the corridor so elevating the roadway would make it harder. Footprint of an elevated roadway would drastically impact many buildings in the area and that is unacceptable.

3- **Road under tracks:** similar preference as road over tracks alternative. The inconvenience of altering property access and bike/pedestrian traffic to/from school is something to avoid.

4- **Hybrid:** maybe an interesting option but the perceived benefits of putting the train underground and doing away with traffic disruption altogether far outweigh the potential benefits of a hybrid alternative.
5- **Trench/tunnel:** as seen across all groups, this is the favorite alternative by far. The general perception is that this process would take fewer homes and make it easier for the city to reclaim surface property and repurpose it for better East-West connectivity.

6- **General commentary:** people have a general sense of what they want, less disruption of their daily lives due to train traffic. Hence, a tunnel/trench is the go to idea people cling to. However, at their own request, people want more realistic scenarios and information about specific locations across town in order to check other alternatives and make a well-planned decision. i.e. people wanted clarity on which designs would take up how much property, what turning lane and neighborhood access would be impacted by new crossing separations, how much a hybrid alternative would cost versus trenching portion of the track, etc. People also want to see a more joint approach for all crossings, especially Charleston due to its proximity and safety issues. Another comment that stood out was about relocating impacted residents who live between Charleston and Meadow: one resident mentioned that this area is the poorest in the City and if homes needed to be taken/impacted there, there would need to be significant compensation/other measures in place to assure people from this area could move elsewhere within City limits and not be pushed out, since living costs are so high in the region.

**Charleston Road**

1- **Close crossing:** closing the crossing would potentially have drastic impacts in already bad traffic. If needed, the bike/pedestrian crossing should remain.

2- **Road over tracks:** perceived as the most costly option. Aesthetics impact was a reason why people were discouraged from choosing this alternative.

3- **Road under tracks:** could be beneficial to separate auto/bike/ped traffic from trains. However, since trench/tunnel is taken as the de facto best/unavoidable option, it would not make sense to dig an underpass only to later on restructure it to have a tunnel go by.

4- **Hybrid:** flexible Band-Aid option to help with connectivity but trench/tunnel far surpasses its benefits as a long term solution to train and auto traffic increases.

5- **Trench/tunnel:** heavily favored alternative. People want a trench/tunnel to (at the very least) be built jointly with Meadow. Having train traffic underground would open up possibilities for bike/pedestrian traffic on the surface. The reservations about the alternative were the collaboration with neighboring cities, the differences between trenching and tunneling (which were not clear to all), the uncertainty of how many tracks/clearance would be needed to accommodate the new electrified Caltrain fleet, HSR (if it happens) and freight trains, and other constraints related to funding.

6- **General commentary:** multiple people argued that this project is stepping back in time without the need to do so, given that studies have already been done and information on the best alternatives already available. What people want, almost unanimously, is to move forward as soon as possible with a trenching/tunneling analysis to decide which crossings should be eliminated and moved underground, which neighboring communities/cities should be in the discussion, how funding would be gathered and allocated, and how construction would impact the city in the next few years.
Meeting participants were presented with the following problem statement:

“While enhanced rail transit service is important to the City of Palo Alto, the Caltrain corridor creates a physical and visual barrier to east/west connectivity within the City, and is also the source of safety concerns for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists, especially at existing at-grade crossings. The rail corridor also creates issues in surrounding neighborhoods, such as noise, vibration, traffic, and visual impacts. While the City of Palo Alto benefits from Caltrain service, and supports Caltrain modernization (including electrification), some of the issues experienced along the rail corridor will continue to get worse in the future with increases in Caltrain service, increases in regional traffic, and the probable addition of high speed rail.”

Participants were then asked to state whether they strongly agree, agree, were indifferent, disagree, or strongly disagree to the above statement.

The majority (78%) of survey participants responded that they either strongly agreed (36%) or agreed (42%) with the problem statement. 12% responded that they were indifferent, and 10% responded that they disagreed. 0% responded that they strongly disagreed with the problem statement (Chart 1).

![Chart 1. Please rate your response to the problem statement](chart1.png)

In sequence, survey participants were asked to rate their top 5 objectives for the success of the implemented alternative. The top three stated priorities were 1) improving safety along the corridor, 2) improving circulation for all modes, and 3) reducing traffic congestion. The choices deemed as the lowest three priorities included, 1) building off prior work, 2) implementation in a timely manner, and 3) supporting Caltrain improvements (Chart 2).
Survey participants were also asked to choose their top 5 evaluation criteria for the success of the implemented alternative. The most commonly chosen criterion was 1) facilitating all modes of transportation, followed by 2) safe and separate bike/ped routes, and 3) minimizing right-of-way acquisitions. The least chosen criteria included 1) minimizing visual change, 2) minimizing disruption/duration, and 3) supporting Caltrain service improvements (Chart 3).
Results from question 5 made clear that most participants (89%) were concerned with the future of the corridor. The remaining participants (11%) stated they were somewhat concerned (3%), not really concerned (4%), or stated that changes along the corridor would be beneficial (4%) (Chart 4).

Chart 4. Are you concerned with the future of the corridor?

Results from question 6 show that traffic overflow into main streets is perceived to be the biggest challenge caused by train traffic increase (32%). Traffic overflow into residential neighborhoods is identified as the second greatest challenge (24%), followed by safe crossings for bikes/pedestrians and train horn noise tied for third (20%). The least chosen answer contradicted assumptions in the question, as few stated more train traffic isn’t an issue for the corridor (4%) (Chart 5).

Chart 5. Which is the biggest challenge of train traffic increase?
Question 7 results show that most respondents are open to the idea of closing a grade crossing, as long as it is for automobiles only (31%). In contrast, the second most chosen answer to question 7 was no (26%). The least popular answer was closing 2 or more crossings (2%) (Chart6).

Most question 8 respondents (79%) support maintaining bike/ped access to closed at-grade crossings, strongly agreed (71%) and agreed (8%) (Chart7).
The majority of survey participants (59%) stated they do not have concerns about grade separations. Some participants (25%) needed more information to form an opinion on grade separations, and 16% identified they had some concerns about grade separations, namely traffic overflow into residential neighborhoods (10%) and separations should not be applied to all crossings (6%) (Chart 8).

The preferred answer option for question 10, which surpassed the second most attractive option by a factor of 3.5, was trenching/tunneling the railroad tracks under Alma St (Chart 9).
The preferred answer option for question 11, was trenching/tunneling the railroad tracks under Churchill Ave (23 responses), followed by closing it for automobiles only (12 respondents) (Chart 10).

Chart 10. Identify the crossing you’d like at Churchill Ave

The preferred answer option for question 12, was trenching/tunneling the railroad tracks under Meadow Dr, which was over seven times more prevalent among respondents than the second most chosen option (closing it for automobiles only) (Chart 11).

Chart 11. Identify the crossing you’d like at Meadow Dr
The preferred answer option for question 13, was trenching/tunneling the railroad tracks under Charleston Rd, which was over eleven times more prevalent among respondents than the closest alternatives (Chart 12).

![Chart 12. Identify the crossing you'd like at Charleston Rd](chart12)

Most survey respondents (74%) stated they found the workshop either very useful (19%) or useful (55%). 26% stated the workshop was not useful (Chart 13).

![Chart 13. Did you find today's workshop useful?](chart13)
86% of people who answered question 16 indicated they would participate in the next workshop. Only one respondent stated s/he would not (Chart 14).

Summary of Comments received during and after the Workshop
A total of 16 comments were received regarding the Workshop to date. 6 of these were submitted as comment forms at the Workshop and 10 were submitted afterwards through email and mail. Their subject matters are varied but include the following key themes:

General Feedback:
Most participants were eager to discuss alternatives in depth and move forward as soon as possible on implementing their design of choice, overwhelmingly identified as trench/tunnel. Most participants were satisfied with the workshop overall and their interactions with Project team members openness to their feedback. Workshop resources were well received, in particular the content of presentations, breakout session maps and cards. However, a few discussion groups did not use said resources fully and a handful of commentators mentioned that train traffic patterns and numbers they observed and read about on previous research reports were not addressed/featured accurately in the presentations. One person also shared complaints about the omission of some constraints and alternatives from the presentations, namely freight traffic and rail over the road. Multiple people commented that facilitators could have helped arrange the breakout sessions differently in order to allow people to hear one another better. Two participants voiced their concerns about the lack of demographic diversity in the room, emphasizing the need to include younger people who better represent the current make-up of the City and the future generation that will most likely be impacted by changes along the corridor.
Grade Crossing Solutions:

Most attendees reiterated the points they shared during the breakout sessions regarding what they thought the best alternatives were for the corridor. For the most part, people want to see a trench or tunnel implemented and flexible funding mechanisms in place to execute it swiftly and effectively.

All comments have been added to the project’s stakeholder database for future reference: http://bit.ly/2s6DH1e and will be taken into consideration by the Project Team when deciding which challenges and goals will shape the Rail Program.

Next Steps

The following are the anticipated next steps for Rail Program activities, as it relates to Community Engagement:

- Update website to reflect latest activities and milestones
- Create and distribute second questionnaire about crossing re-design alternatives
- Finalize and present Circulation, Trench and Finance Studies to Rail Committee
- Organize and host roundtables to build alternatives
- Finalize alternatives set for final decision - December town hall
Appendices
As part of the Palo Alto community, you have the opportunity to address long-standing challenges associated with the four grade crossings on the Caltrain rail corridor that runs through our City.

The Palo Alto Rail Program – what we’re now calling Connecting Palo Alto – is a community-based process designed to inform decisions affecting both aesthetics and mobility choices for the future.

Your participation is vital! Join us as we evaluate potential grade separations at Charleston Rd, Meadow Dr, Churchill Ave, and Palo Alto Ave (Alma St).

Saturday, Sep 16, 2017 10 a.m. - 2 p.m.
Palo Alto Art Center Auditorium
1313 Newell Road, Palo Alto
Parking spaces (94) and bike racks (6) are available on site
Parking spaces (82) are also available at the Rinconada Library
Public transit accessible via VTA bus line 35
Lunch will be provided

At Community Workshop #2, we’ll review the final problem statement, objectives and evaluation criteria for the project. We’ll also begin to develop alternatives for further study and identify what should be looked at for each crossing location.

We look forward to seeing you at Connecting Palo Alto Community Workshop #2

For more information, visit cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto or contact us with comments or questions at transportation@cityofpaloalto.org or (650) 329-2520.
Appendix B: Sign-In Sheets
CONNECTING PALO ALTO
DESIGNING OUR RAIL CORRIDOR FOR THE FUTURE

Community Workshop #2 | September 16, 2017 10 am - 2 pm | Palo Alto Art Center Auditorium, 1313 Newell Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Community Workshop #2 | September 16, 2017 10 am – 2 pm | Palo Alto Art Center Auditorium, 1313 Newell Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303
Survey 1: Problem Statement, Objectives, Evaluation Criteria

Q1 – Please read the Problem Statement below:

While enhanced rail transit service is important to the City of Palo Alto, the Caltrain corridor creates a physical and visual barrier to east/west connectivity within the City, and is also the source of safety concerns for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists, especially at existing at-grade crossings. The rail corridor also creates issues in surrounding neighborhoods, such as noise, vibration, traffic, and visual impacts. While the City of Palo Alto benefits from Caltrain service, and supports Caltrain modernization (including electrification), some of the issues experienced along the rail corridor will continue to get worse in the future with increases in Caltrain service, increases in regional traffic, and the probable addition of high speed rail.

Q2 – Rate your response to the Problem Statement:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Indifferent
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Q3 – Please identify the top 5 most important objectives

- Build off prior work
- Reduce traffic congestion
- Minimize right of way acquisitions
- Improve circulation for all modes
- Separate bikes/peds from autos
- Implement in a timely manner
- Reduce noise and visual effects
- Support Caltrain improvements
- Improve safety along the corridor

Q4 - Identify the top 5 most important evaluation criteria

- Facilitate all modes of transportation
- Minimize right of way acquisitions
- Maintain local access (i.e. schools, parks)
- Minimize visual change
- Reduce noise and vibration
- Funding feasibility
- Support Caltrain service improvements
- Safe and separate bike/ped routes
- Reduce delays for autos
- Minimize disruption/duration
Survey 2: Preferences and Priorities

Q5 – Are you concerned with the future of the corridor?
- Yes, very concerned
- Yes, but not that concerned
- No, not really
- No, changes will be beneficial

Q6 – Which is the biggest challenge of train traffic increase?
- Traffic overflow into my neighborhood
- Safe crossings for bikes/pedestrians
- Train horn noise will be unbearable
- Traffic overflow into main streets
- More train traffic isn’t an issue

Q7 - Are you open to the idea of closing ANY crossings?
- Yes, one crossing could be closed
- Yes, two or more
- Yes, but only for automobiles
- No, I am not open to this idea
- Maybe, I need more info

Q8 - If an at-grade crossing closes, should bike/ped access be maintained?
- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Indifferent
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Not sure, I need more info

Q9 - Do you have concerns about grade separations?
- Yes, traffic will flow to neighborhoods
- Yes, separate some, but not all
- Maybe, I need more info
- No, separate all crossings
### Survey 3: Priorities, Preferences & Workshop Feedback

#### Q10 – Identify the crossing you’d like at Alma Street
- Closed for all modes
- Closed for autos only
- Raise road over tracks
- Lower road under tracks
- Hybrid
- Trench/tunnel

#### Q11 – Identify the crossing you’d like at Churchill Ave
- Closed for all modes
- Closed for autos only
- Raise road over tracks
- Lower road under tracks
- Hybrid
- Trench/tunnel

#### Q12 – Identify the crossing you’d like at Meadow Drive
- Closed for all modes
- Closed for autos only
- Raise road over tracks
- Lower road under tracks
- Hybrid
- Trench/tunnel

#### Q13 – Identify the crossing you’d like at Charleston Road
- Closed for all modes
- Closed for autos only
- Raise road over tracks
- Lower road under tracks
- Hybrid
- Trench/tunnel

#### Q14 – Did you find today’s workshop useful?
- Yes, very useful
- Yes, somewhat useful
- Indifferent
- No, not quite
- No, I would prefer a different format

#### Q15 – Can we count on your participation in the next workshop?
1. Yes, count me in for future events
2. Yes, but schedule a different day/time
3. Maybe, on a different day/time
4. No, but please keep me posted
5. No
Community Workshop #2 | September 16, 2017 10 am – 2 pm | Palo Alto Art Center

COMMENT FORM

Comments:

I want to see a separate report for tunneling only. Tunneling and trenching are different things in a lot of ways.

Please continue on back if necessary.

Comment forms may be returned today or mailed/emailled to the addresses below:

Palo Alto City Hall
ATTN Transportation Division
250 Hamilton Avenue, Floor 5
Palo Alto, CA, 94301

Transportation@cityofpaloalto.org

For more information on the Palo Alto Rail Program, visit cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto, call (650) 329-2520, or e-mail transportation@cityofpaloalto.org
Community Workshop #2 | September 16, 2017 10 am – 2 pm | Palo Alto Art Center

COMMENT FORM

1. Meeting was disorganized

2. For existing over-run on RR tracks shift roadway centerline 30 ft.
   only a small of 1000' needs property takings

Please continue on back if necessary.

Comment forms may be returned today or mailed/emails to the addresses below:

Palo Alto City Hall
ATTN Transportation Division
250 Hamilton Avenue, Floor 5
Palo Alto, CA, 94301

Transportation@cityofpaloalto.org

For more information on the Palo Alto Rail Program, visit
cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto, call (650) 329-2520,
or e-mail transportation@cityofpaloalto.org
The pros & cons don't include how freight impacts the corridor. For example, elevating the train means the diesel freight trains would be raised. That increases noise & air pollution. Whereas electrified trains would be quieter. There are no plans to electrify freight.

Also, there is no discussion about regional coordination. For example, if all cities' corridors wide are grade separations, what if CA train?

Comment forms may be returned today or mailed/ emailed to the addresses below:

Palo Alto City Hall
ATTN Transportation Division
250 Hamilton Avenue, Floor 5
Palo Alto, CA, 94301

Transportation@cityofpaloalto.org

For more information on the Palo Alto Rail Program, visit cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto, call (650) 329-2520, or e-mail transportation@cityofpaloalto.org
Comments:

THE FIRST BREAKOUT WAS NOT HELPFUL BECAUSE I COULD NOT HEAR MOST OF THE SPEAKERS.

A BETTER PROCESS WOULD BE TO HAVE SMALLER GROUPS OF PALO ALTO RESIDENTS MEET WITH EXPERTS TO DISCUSS ALTERNATIVES.

Comment forms may be returned today or mailed/emails to the addresses below:

Palo Alto City Hall
ATTN Transportation Division
250 Hamilton Avenue, Floor 5
Palo Alto, CA, 94301

Transportation@cityofpaloalto.org

For more information on the Palo Alto Rail Program, visit cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto, call (650) 329-2520, or e-mail transportation@cityofpaloalto.org
Comments:

Why not trees on complete streets instead of traffic barriers? We could save money to put them in, then spend more to remove them if it ruins our streets and we need to stop this.

Please continue on back if necessary.

Comment forms may be returned today or mailed/mailed to the addresses below:

Palo Alto City Hall
ATTN Transportation Division
250 Hamilton Avenue, Floor 5
Palo Alto, CA, 94301

Transportation@cityofpaloalto.org

For more information on the Palo Alto Rail Program, visit cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto, call (650) 329-2520, or e-mail transportation@cityofpaloalto.org
Comments:

"Figure best solution first, then we'll figure out funding via vote, clarify entrepreneurship options."

Thank you.

Comment forms may be returned today or mailed/ emailed to the addresses below:

Palo Alto City Hall
ATTN Transportation Division
250 Hamilton Avenue, Floor 5
Palo Alto, CA, 94301

Transportation@cityofpaloalto.org

For more information on the Palo Alto Rail Program, visit cityofpaloalto.org/ConnectingPaloAlto, call (650) 329-2520, or e-mail transportation@cityofpaloalto.org
Appendix E: Photos Taken at the Workshop
Effects of Caltrain Modifications

Impact of changes to Caltrain operations (2020)

- 10% capacity reduction of roadways vs. 2017
- Vehicle delays increase by 11% for AM, 18% for PM
- Some traffic will likely re-route to existing grade separated crossings