Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP)  
Meeting #3 Summary

Meeting name: XCAP Meeting #3 (#2 was cancelled)

Subject: Connecting Palo Alto  
Palo Alto Grade Separation Study

Meeting date and time: August 21, 2019  
4:00pm-6:00pm

Location: Palo Alto City Hall  
Community Room  
250 Hamilton Ave, Palo Alto

Prepared by: Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies

Speaker Attendees:  
Ed Shikada, City Manager (PA)  
Chantal Gaines (PA)  
Etty Mercurio, Project Manager (AECOM)  
Millette Litzinger, Deputy Project Manager (AECOM)  
Peter DeStefano, Engineer (AECOM)  
Gary Black (Hexgon)  
Eileen Goodwin (Apex Strategies)

Project Team in Attendance:  
Meghan Horrigan-Taylor (PA)  
Philip Kamhi (PA)

CAP Member Attendees:  
Barbara Best  
Gregory Brail  
Phil Burton  
Tony Carrasco  
Inyoung Cho  
Megan Kanne  
Larry Klein  
Judy Kleinberg  
Pat Lau  
Adina Levin  
Nadia Naik  
William (Billy) Riggs  
David Shen

Not Able to Attend:  
Keith Regsdahl

Ref    Action
01    Staff to distribute XCAP agendas and packets as early as possible to allow for review time
02    XCAP member Phil Burton to provide the City with photos of Sacramento Project for distribution
03    Staff to coordinate with Chamber regarding upcoming Public Policy Forum
04    XCAP Member Tony Carrasco to provide staff with video link from former design study workshop
05    Staff to distribute the Southgate petition to XCAP
06    XCAP to respond back to staff regarding XCAP roster contact information by August 29th
07    XCAP to respond back to staff regarding new website design by August 29th
08    XCAP to respond back to staff with questions for the design workshop by August 29th
09    XCAP and Staff to use the term workshop not charette when describing upcoming meeting
10    Staff to try to develop a workshop format that could accommodate interested public as well as Council and XCAP members
11    Staff to look into recording and posting YouTube style videos regarding grade separation basics
12    Traffic materials should be conveyed in a systematic approach

Agenda

The Meeting agenda included:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Community Conversations
- Debrief of Council Actions related to Blue Ribbon Committee
- XCAP Homework (Design charrette questions, website)
- Work Plan Update
- Assessment of Traffic Analysis for Churchill Closure and Review of Embarcadero/Alma Options
- Measure B Update
- Summary of Action Items / Next Meeting
- Adjourn and Thank You

There is an audio tape of the meeting presentations and the PowerPoint is archived on the XCAP website. They are not re-summarized below.
Comments/Questions

Below is a summary of the comments and questions received and the responses provided. Action items from these comments/questions are summarized above.

Table 1. Summary of Comments/Questions and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment/Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introductions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Conversations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson Street has been a point of interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southgate neighborhood continues to be concerned about impacts of project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District staff met with City staff and AECOM team regarding project impacts on the bus yard, parking and circulation issues.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Scott Gilbree (MIT) has been consulted regarding design issues related to suicide prevention and there are no recommendations from him since there is no data currently available on the topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The BART examples that were used in previous presentations are not the best examples since they don't include the overhead catenary, other projects should be used as examples such as Sacramento LRT.</td>
<td>Photos of the Sacramento LRT can be found here: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The business community is worried about a recession and additional taxes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens to emails that go into the website email?</td>
<td>They are transmitted to Council when the Grade Separation topic is on the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment: The Southgate neighborhood presented their June/July survey findings to the XCAP members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment: The Southgate neighborhood presented their petition to the XCAP members. It was noted that the viaduct was not previously an option under consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was noted that a viaduct, if chosen, would need to be beautified through design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XCAP members clarified that the option of taking property at Churchill was off the table per Council vote prior to CAP and XCAP deliberation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debrief of Council Action related to Blue Ribbon Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No action was taken by Council. It will be back on the agenda at the September 9th meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since this was continued, will public comment be allowed on September 9th?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be a new staff report?</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The last we need is two groups discussing similar things? If we need more people at the table, why not add them to XCAP? It is the Council’s job to make the decisions, not community member-based groups who are not elected.</td>
<td>Comments noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment/Questions

I do not think we would want the XCAP to have to function under the Brown Act. I would not want to get in trouble for speaking with XCAP members off-line. I do not want other formalities. This group works well to be inclusive regarding the design issues.

I agree that the Blue Ribbon Group seems duplicative and un-necessary. Why start catching a whole new group of people up to speed. We will lose time. I also think the former elected officials do not have broad networks anymore, many of them have moved away and moved on from this type of work. The City should be looking to engage the younger demographic in the discussion like we have here. It’s the next generation that will be impacted. The business community should be collaborated with not side-lined.

I think the other committee is supposed to discuss broader City needs than just the grade separations. It is supposed to discuss financial topics.

I like the idea of the Blue Ribbon committee. I agree there shouldn’t be two committees.

Public Comment: The Staff memo to Council comes from staff. There shouldn’t be outside entities on the Blue Ribbon Committee such as SVLG since they can be influenced.

XCAP Homework

Action Items noted above.

Work Plan Update

The upcoming meeting should be called a workshop not a charrette

See action item above.

Can YouTube style videos be developed to help get people up to speed on this project?

We can look into that.

Will costs also be part of what is presented at the workshop? That seems important.

Yes.

What is the difference between a community meeting and this workshop?

This workshop’s audience is the Council and XCAP getting an opportunity for deep dive on various grade separation related topics. Community meetings are designed for the general public.

There have been previous charettes on this topic. There was a video.

See action item above. Links to previous charette videos:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xVz7YQ_Zto4
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=j6ZOhFkPjY8

Public Comment: It would be great to have the interested public that has been coming to these meetings See action item above.

Assessment of Traffic Analysis for Churchill Closure and Review of Embarcadero/Alma Options

Roadway should be designed to reduce speed. The area around El Camino Real, Page Mill and Oregon Expressway will be an area of pedestrian point of contention in the future. I would like to see queuing impacts not just LOS. I think there needs to be a systematic approach to this information. I think it needs to be pedestrian focused.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment/Questions</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree with the systematic approach. Town and Country area should be a deep</td>
<td>Yes, things would be different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dive area in workshop. Roundabout version too. Embarcadero rebuild is an</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity; we would be able to start from scratch.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a future “dead end” at Kingsley included in the design? What would it</td>
<td>It could be accommodated if in the future there were four lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look like?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the pedestrian light be moved?</td>
<td>No, eliminated. It would be replaced by the pedestrian overcrossing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students at the high school are unlikely to use that bridge. They will jay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No decisions have been made yet. Kinsley works now. Roundabout designers tell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me the left on Kinsley can be accommodated. Going around that block on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designs that are left is a fatal flaw. Keeping ramp in design solves that problem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the problem we are solving? I need to see the system when we are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussing these options. More context is necessary. Don’t take the property of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone in the business community without talking with them. We have a way in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palo Alto of calling something a pilot project but then it becomes permanent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I endorse the request for a pedestrian focused plan. Safety is a big concern.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment: Embarcadero is a parking lot. Was all future development and the</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUP considered and factored into this study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment: That block is my block. I am very worried about the 1100 block of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson particularly at 8:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment: Specific concerns regarding Charleston and Meadow. Pumping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stations require equipment and maintenance. The team should look at a siphon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>option.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure B Update**

No comments noted.

**Next Steps**

See above action items.
Petition to Palo Alto City Council re: Grade Separation Options for Churchill

A viaduct recently was added to the options for the Churchill Caltrain crossing, specifically: from City Council Staff Report dated 5/13/19: “3. Churchill Avenue | Viaduct [added this alternative of a viaduct in the Vicinity of Churchill]”

We strongly oppose consideration of a viaduct over the Churchill crossing as a means of grade separating Churchill, for the following reasons:

- A viaduct would have immense aesthetic impact in a beautiful residential neighborhood
- Viaducts are shown to invite crime and graffiti
- Viaducts enable train noise to travel further
- For residents on Mariposa with back yards against the train, the Caltrain right of way is very narrow in this area (50-60 feet), and a viaduct will result in a 36 foot tall presence right on property lines (20’ structure with 16’ train). Properties are small, so these trains will be just above useful yards and in some cases, above houses, causing loss of privacy, noise and value impairment. Furthermore, there is a safety factor, as derailments are a real risk - with Caltrain reporting a derailment in San Jose on 5/13/19, and a major derailment in 1953.
- For residents along Alma, the 36’ presence will be in front yards, as an obvious visual impairment, along with noise and privacy concerns. In the evenings the viaduct and trains will shadow homes.
- For residents who are not immediately adjacent to the tracks, but are close, a train on a viaduct has serious visual and noise implications.
- All are concerned about the negative consequences of putting the train high above ground on an immense structure through our neighborhood.

We strongly encourage City Council to reject options involving a viaduct over Churchill.

Signed:

Name: [Redacted] Address: [Redacted]

Name: Rachel Croft Address: [Redacted]

Name: Javier Gonzalez Address: [Redacted]

Name: Pete Harry Address: [Redacted]

Name: Stuart Sailer Address: [Redacted]

Name: AKASH PM Address: [Redacted]

Name: Olga Petrova Address: [Redacted]

Name: Cynthia Bright Address: [Redacted]

Name: Inyoung Cho Address: [Redacted]

Name: Grace Cook Address: [Redacted]

Name: Tracy Farrell Address: [Redacted]
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Signed:

Name: ANNE KROMER Address:  
Name: Jeannie Chin Address:  
Name: Pam McLean Address:  
Name: Yarun Ruan Address:  
Name: Rebecca Bronson Address:  
Name: Chris Everst Address:  
Name: Eduardo Deack Address:  
Name: Teri Stack Address:  
Name: Eil Woodley Address:  
Name: Chuck Krader Address:  
Name: BARR HAIRL Address:  

Signature:  
Signature:  
Signature:  
Signature:  
Signature:  
Signature:  
Signature:  
Signature:  
Signature:  
Signature:  
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Name: SUZANNE DECHER  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: BRIAN MARLES  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: Meir Sigal  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: Julia Murphy-Chung  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: Anishka Patel  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: SAM LADA  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: Cait Wimley  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: ANUPAM SHAHMA  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: Mary Sharma  
Address:  
Signature:  

Name: Ruth Hazard  
Address:  
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Name: Paul I-Huard  
Address:  
Signature:  
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Signature: [Handwritten signature]
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Signature: [Handwritten signature]

Name: [Handwritten signature]
Address: [Handwritten address]
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Signed: [signature]

Name: Salie Pearl

Name: [name]

Name: [name]

Name: [name]

Name: [name]

Name: [name]

Name: [name]

Name: [name]

Name: [name]

Name: [name]
favouring Churchill closure
against Churchill closing
unsure
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