

Expanded Community Advisory Panel (XCAP)

June 17, 2020, 3:00 PM

Summary – Regular Meeting (virtual, through Zoom)

1. Welcome and Roll Call

Present: Gregory Brail, Phil Burton, Tony Carrasco, Inyoung Cho, Larry Klein, Nadia Naik, David Shen, Cari Templeton, Keith Reckdahl (arrived late)

Absent: Adina Levin

2. Oral Communications

Eduardo Llach requested making the challenges to the Churchill underpass front and center under the engineering challenges on page 4 of the Palo Alto Rail fact sheet. These would be Caltrain right-of-way required, acquisition of house and school property. He agreed that the Oregon, Embarcadero mitigation and the Churchill closing is the best alternative considering costs, disruptions, construction, safety and traffic improvements across the city.

Kathryn Jordan emphasized her group opposed any recommendation to close Churchill Avenue. This recommendation does not comport with the adopted City Council criteria such as, east/west connectivity - facilitating movement across the corridor for all modes of transportation; traffic congestion – reducing delay and congestion for automobile traffic at rail crossings; rail operations - potential need for a four-track section, passing tracks; cost – financing the project with feasible funding sources; local access – maintaining or improving access to neighborhoods, parks, schools along the corridor while reducing regional traffic on neighborhood streets.

Terry Lack noted she does want Churchill to be closed because of expense and safety. No one wants a park on Churchill. She expressed displeasure with taking parts of people's home or creating Churchill as an unsafe street. The right-of-way is a big issue as well as the mitigations.

Susan Newman voiced concern about the narrowing of representation on the XCAP. Given the loss of so many members since the beginning of the process, lack of representation is a big topic. Her group did not feel their concerns were being adequately represented. She is also concerned about the competitive evaluation of alternatives as the method of arriving at a recommendation. It would be better for the community if the issues uncovered were looked at more holistically, such as the linking of modifications to Embarcadero with Churchill closure.

Yokum Taku lives on the 100 block of Kellogg. He is opposed to the partial underpass proposal. He would appreciate better outreach, especially to people on Kellogg Avenue. He also would like the team to think carefully about cost benefit on the proposals. He noted in the City Council criteria, one relates to right-of-way acquisition. Of the three proposals, the Kellogg underpass required \$26 to \$32 million

of outlays to acquire private right-of-ways. He also indicated the fact sheet was incorrect in that it doesn't indicate that the people at the front part of Kellogg lose parking spaces and problems with the traffic flow. That is indicated in the fact sheet for Churchill closure, option 1 with the tunnel.

Ken Joye is the Chair of Palo Alto's Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee. He indicated all solutions being considered should not impose contortions upon pedestrians or cyclists. There was a message in the packet received on June 16 which suggested reducing a two-way bike/ped undercrossing for Meadow and Charleston to twelve feet. That is inadequate. The 3D renderings for Meadow don't appear to reflect everything discussed in past meetings, particularly an AECOM presentation on May 20 which showed the acquisition of an apartment building at the corner of Meadow and Alma, but that building appears in the renderings.

Penny Elson agreed with Ken Joye. She felt the XCAP was not there for either Charleston or Meadow and the partial underpass concept still needs some work. She couldn't find information about the design constraints at these two intersections. She would like to understand the current height of the sewer. She also asked if it was correct that Caltrain would be proceeding with their own grade separation process soon, and if that is true, would it make sense for this Group to pause its process and do some work internally. What does the City know about Caltrain's intent regarding that?

Annot Bullin voiced his disappointment with the progress on the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure. Currently the bicycle routes on Churchill, Meadow, Charleston and Embarcadero were reasonably good. The whole design has been focused on level of service for cars. Starting July 1 LOS is bound as a threshold of significance for performing transportation analysis by the State of California. In his opinion, some of the poor design choices as the Kellogg underpass which is very narrow, the California Tunnel 2.0, he would like an underpass to Churchill and Meadow, Charleston and Park all have serious connectivity issues.

Roland commented somebody mentioned passing tracks and these will be necessary but there is nothing to say these passing tracks should be in Palo Alto. The high-speed rail authority does not have the exclusive right for environmental clearance between San Jose and San Francisco. Next, there is nothing that stops Caltrain from operating a real high-speed train between San Francisco and (not understood) much closer than they are currently paying for their EMUs. The entire issue of Caltrain governance is under review currently, and his group is going to make it as a condition of putting a one-eighth of a cent sales tax on (not understood).

David Kennedy stated the renderings that were attached to this agenda showed there are still some counter-intuitive traffic patterns being proposed. Sometimes it's good to pause, step back and ask if this is really moving in the direction to serve generations into the future.

Yoriko Kishimoto commented that closing Churchill is a step towards Palo Alto becoming more of a city based on expressways and less walkable. She agreed the Group is not ready to make recommendations, especially with all the recent changes

with Caltrain and telecommuting. She would like to see a “what we learned” document instead of a set of final decisions for these intersections.

3. Action/Discussion: Receive update from AECOM Meadow/Charleston and Churchill on layouts, renderings and fact sheets.

Peter DeStefano from AECOM noted the first thing they did was make general revisions to the three alternatives, Churchill, Meadow and Charleston. The changes on the plan view are in magenta. On the renderings the ped/bike paths are shown in green. On the plan view the striping on the twenty-foot wide ped/bike path shows the directional traffic. On the Churchill updates, there are changes to the striping on northbound Alma. The two northbound lanes will be continuous on Alma and there will be a merge from the left that comes from a third lane coming from westbound Churchill. Also, the ped/bike bridge over Churchill was added which can be accessed from Mariposa. On Charleston a crosswalk was added just west of the roundabout, and an optional design is a switchback ramp. Due to time constraints the renderings were not updated on Meadow so there is an inconsistency of what is seen on the plan view and the renderings. The first update on Meadow is the addition of a ped/bike bridge over Meadow on the left side of the tracks. A twenty-foot wide path was extended down to Second Street. To incorporate this change, Meadow was realigned slightly to the north. There is acquisition of a property with this change. There is a ped/bike bridge to provide the north/south connectivity along Alma and a parallel ped/bike path that descends down into the underpass. Going north on Alma you can either go across Meadow on the bridge or make a right and go on Meadow towards Emerson. In terms of profile, there was not much change. There are still limits just west of Emerson, just west of Park. The on and off ramps to Olive Street only get shifted a little to the north.

Chair Naik asked about the turn lane on Meadow and asked why it was still sunk in.

Mr. DeStefano didn't see a benefit for keeping that lane at grade, especially for ped/bike traffic going on Alma, there is no conflict with traffic. There is a bridge that goes over.

XCAP Member Brail noted when looking at the Churchill aerial view, as a pedestrian wanting to cross Alma, is the only option to go over to Kellogg and take the underpass there? Is there any way to cross Alma and the tracks at Churchill?

Mr. DeStefano replied there is no other option. There has been discussion of possibly doing a separate project for another crossing.

XCAP Member Brail commented when looking at the 3D rendering of Charleston, the overhead view of the traffic circle, it looks like when cars are in the circle, they need to decide whether they are continuing on Charleston or getting off to be in the correct lane when exiting the circle. He asked if the striping and distancing were fairly aligned with what will have to be built in order to meet all the regulations?

Mr. DeStefano answered yes, and the rendering didn't show the signage. When cars enter the roundabout, they will have to move over one lane to the left to get into the underpass.

XCAP Member Carrasco agreed with several speaker that the Group is not there yet. The bones are there but some criteria are lacking. He asked if, now that all the information is known, could there be something different that would make pedestrians and bikes more comfortable, can things be made better?

Mr. DeStefano replied compared to the hybrid, these are much better for ped and bike access with the underpass underneath Alma. There has been ongoing polishing of these options, but there are no ideas that are completely different.

XCAP Member Cho referenced Meadow, there is a house that would need to be acquired and would there be an impact to the house next to that to get in and out of the driveway?

Mr. DeStefano replied there is a slight elevation change with a modification to that driveway.

XCAP Member Cho asked if the bike underpass at Charleston was the only way? Can you go down on the east side and come up on the west side of the tracks?

Mr. DeStefano commented that could be revised. This layout could be done differently.

Mr. Kamhi noted they talked about several different options. It could go parallel to the path; it could be four different switchbacks rather than the one. It is easier for bikes and pedestrians if there are less switchbacks.

XCAP Member Cho thought in the Churchill underpass there was one going down on one side and coming out at the other side of the tracks.

Chair Naik clarified this was for the pedestrians walking on Alma and staying on grade. If they wanted to go underneath, the long path is how they get there. It is meeting up with the underpass going east/west underneath the tracks.

XCAP Member Reckdahl noted looking at Meadow, this is an improvement but not there yet. Right now, a bridge was put in to connect north and south and that is a sharp corner. Could that be an arc instead of a right turn?

Mr. DeStefano responded for this one it is harder to round off the inside corner. What can potentially be done is make the path a little wider since that is an acquisition of a property anyway there is space to work with. There could be an improvement made there.

XCAP Member Reckdahl did not like the turning capabilities at Meadow. Asked about was adding a third lane going under Alma.

Mr. DeStefano noted they looked at that and it would be challenging geometrically. There would have to be a shift to the north. The geometry of the intersections would get out of whack. Storage capacity would have to be provided for the left turn movements sitting at the light. Mr. Black noted at least 150 feet would be needed and that would push the intersection out towards Emerson and the bridge gets longer.

XCAP Member Reckdahl asked if a roundabout could be put there.

Mr. DeStefano reiterated they were trying to get that to fit the turn and accommodate as many turning movements as possible but that would be too challenging here.

XCAP Member Reckdahl questioned doing something like Charleston did and have a roundabout further up near Bryant. That would allow people west of the tracks to cross under, go around the roundabout and head north. That would be more direct than having to go all the way down to Charleston.

Mr. DeStefano responded Mr. Black would probably say it would be a better option to have the traffic being diverted. They were trying to avoid the roundabout for this option because Meadow is much narrower than Charleston.

XCAP Member Reckdahl asked how many turning movements were supported at Meadow right now?

Mr. DeStefano replied three of the eight. In southbound Alma you can make a right or left onto Meadow, from westbound Meadow to northbound Alma. The ped/bike path is on the south side, and there is no movement that could be provided to the south. The ped/bike path is cutting off that connection.

XCAP Member Reckdahl inquired about the U-turn further north, at the first intersection, the light at Alma Plaza.

Mr. DeStefano answered that would be taking up too much space. It wouldn't be just a simple left turn pocket U-turn. Just the turning movement for a design vehicle would swing way out into the Caltrain right-of-way and then you would have the issue of traffic trying to get off onto Meadow and traffic trying to make the U-turn to get back onto Alma.

XCAP Member Reckdahl noted the southbound traffic would be stopped when making that U-turn, so the vehicle making the U-turn would have a monopoly on the southbound lanes. There is a signal there right now.

Mr. DeStefano indicated he could look at the turning path. He thought it would swing into the Caltrain right-of-way there. He also reiterated before he laid this out, he spoke with Mr. Black about this and he said with the improvements at Charleston, this would work.

Chair Naik commented if the turn lane was kept at grade, then further back there was a single-lane roundabout, then you would be able to have the movement talked about. With the turn lane at grade, you have the ability for folks to now go southbound onto Alma.

XCAP Member Reckdahl remarked one of the problems with the left turn, from eastbound Meadow to northbound Alma is problematic because you would need a long left-turn lane, but the traffic flows on Meadow are fairly small. Why is a dedicated left-turn lane needed?

Mr. DeStefano noted he asked Mr. Black that question, and he didn't think it would be a safe condition. It was based on the approaching volumes; how long people would have to wait on average to make the left from the single lane.

XCAP Member Shen stated his comment was about the Churchill drawing, and he asked what the width of the ped/bike underpass at Kellogg was. He is concerned about that.

Mr. DeStefano answered ten feet. It was not made wider because they were trying to avoid modifying the curb on each side of Kellogg. If it was wider, the curb and gutter would have to be shifted out which would mean removing the planter strip between the sidewalk and curb and that would remove the parking there. He remarked that was one of the reasons the tunnel underneath the tracks at Alma was widened to 20 feet, but there are more restrictions at Kellogg. Widening the underpass at Kellogg could be an optional modification to this design.

XCAP Member Shen asked about flaring out wider under the tracks, because theoretically the space is there, to make the turn a little easier to either side.

Mr. DeStefano remarked from the center of the track to the wall is about as close as they can get. Caltrain wants X number of feet of horizontal clearance to an obstruction, and the head wall is that obstruction. The head wall is too close to the tracks. This whole alternative has the concern of potential Caltrain right-of-way permission issues.

XCAP Member Burton felt more work was needed at Meadow. He is concerned about the turning movements. He has a sense of urgency about construction costs and inflation. Now, with all the issues around COVID and he voiced concern about the timing of taking a major issue like this to the public. He also thought the presidential campaign will be fairly contentious and which may take people's attention away from other issues. Reluctantly, he wondered if this should slow down for the next few months, until there is a clearer post-pandemic picture. He also felt Caltrain will come back in a reconfigured form. They have already increased their service schedules. He was surprised to see there is another XCAP meeting scheduled for next week.

Chair Naik clarified the next meeting is July 1 and after that there will be weekly meetings.

XCAP Member Brail remarked he hoped no one interpreted all of the attention to these plans to mean this is what will be done. This is one of the alternatives. He didn't feel there would be a solution that, for instance, allowed all eight turning movements at both intersections, clear pedestrian and bicycle crossing for everybody. In a previous meeting, an AECOM engineer said he thought the hybrid designed was the best that could be designed. Is this very close to what this solution will look like, unless something drastic is done?

Mr. DeStefano replied in a perfect world all turning movements would be accommodated, grade steps at every intersection and no property taken, but there are many constraints on each side of the tracks to be dealt with. The hybrid is a traditional alternative.

XCAP Member Carrasco replied he will assume for now that there will be shoofly tracks for each one of the alternatives. With that, the track height is flexible. For every one-third of height gotten on the tracks, twenty feet of slope is saved at 5 percent. He shared that it seemed like train passengers were really happy, cars are happy. Now it is important to pause and look at bikes and pedestrians as a priority and layer that on top of the criteria on the geometry of the road and the train.

XCAP Member Klein agreed with trying to tweak the proposals, but some things can't be polished. He is hearing the underlying frustration that there is no perfect or near-perfect solution. He didn't agree with XCAP Member Burton's opinion. After the City Council hears the XCAP recommendations and makes their decision, the City will then go into a negotiation process with the other players in this game. Have a specific set of recommendations for Churchill, Meadow, Charleston, etc. will enable the City to be more of a player in those negotiations. This has to move forward and August 31 would be a good goal to place the City in a good position to negotiate with the other parties.

XCAP Member Burton explained he wasn't proposing doing nothing, just to think very carefully in terms of building community consensus for what could be a tax measure.

XCAP Member Klein reported in all the cost estimates that AECOM has done there is a factor for inflation. Currently this is a period of deflation. It is important to be prepared when the time comes.

Chair Naik referenced Charleston, the drawing shows the bike/ped path sort of just ending and there was talk about it potentially going all the way down to Carlsen Court and that wasn't shown on the drawings. She would like to see that entire bike/ped path. Also, she agreed with what was said about the 90 degree turns for the bikes over Park Boulevard and that is a big problem. Safe left turns onto Ruthelima need to be figured out, how to get a dedicated left-turn lane for left turns onto Ruthelima. Can Charleston be one lane in each direction at that point, instead of two?

Mr. DeStefano thought the intent was just to match the existing striping.

Chair Naik clarified people coming out of Ruthelima need to be able to make a safe left turn, but there are two lanes of traffic coming one way and two lanes going the other.

Mr. DeStefano indicated they could check the line of sight there.

Chair Naik continued, there is the same situation for folks coming out from under the tracks and trying to make a left onto Ruthelima.

Mr. DeStefano didn't think that is an issue but he would check with Mr. Black.

Chair Naik moved on to the bikes having to make hard 90 degree turns on the foot bridge that is over Park to keep everyone at grade is still a big challenge. There probably needs to be an extension of the bike/ped path going on the east side all the way down to JLS. Nothing is shown beyond that. There is something in the bike plan that called for an improvement on Meadow and Bryant, a beacon or signal and there is a question of how all that gets incorporated into these designs of a bike/ped path.

There is no connection from Park Boulevard south of Meadow to the bike path. Can the bike tunnel height be lowered to make that possible?

Mr. DeStefano replied there will be a stairway that connects some parts so pedestrians can get down into the path. A bicyclist would have to go on a sidewalk he showed.

Chair Naik noted the Bay Bridge has all the pedestrians on one side and the bikes on the other side.

Mr. DeStefano remarked there are several different ways to do it.

Elliot Wong presented the new fact sheet information for Meadow/Charleston and Churchill. The format used was that used for every other alternative and implements the design considerations. The renderings have not been updated because the current budget did not allow for the redo or rework within the animations. The consensus with the City was to update the plans for now. If there are any future budget increases then any simulation updates can be considered. He addressed the comment of very little mention of the Kellogg undercrossing within the Churchill alternatives and explained that was because the focus was on the (inaudible) side of things because Kellogg had already been covered. He also noted that real estate within Meadow and Charleston in terms of space and how detailed they can get, only the overviews are shown. There is not enough space within the actual 11 x 17 size. An insert can be added to show more real estate and more information.

XCAP Member Shen commented that the 3D renderings did not represent the latest.

Mr. Wong answered only for Meadow. Charleston and Churchill should be up to date.

XCAP Member Shen asked if there was some way to label the picture to indicate that?

Mr. Kamhi agreed and noted that was something that was talked about in particular for the town halls, providing a note about what has changed from the renderings.

Mr. Wong responded that could be done. Talking about the real estate within the two 11 x 17, in order to include more detail, more of an explanation of what has been updated, an extra insert should be added.

Mr. Kamhi answered he thought something like a listing of the things not included in the rendering, but which are included in plan view.

Chair Naik commented it was important to communicate whatever needed to be communicated and not be limited to what fits on a specific paper size, especially since the town hall has moved to a virtual town hall.

Mr. Kamhi indicated for the town hall, a paper beforehand could be done to introduce the issues, noting this is an iterative process so the challenge is at some point this will have to be put down as a rendering which is about a week's worth of staff's work. The town halls might lead to an iteration that improves this further. It is much easier to update the overhead exhibit than the actual renderings.

XCAP Member Shen asked if it was possible to put versioning like a footnote on the bottom, to know which is being looked at.

Mr. Kamhi noted that was done by date on the bottom.

XCAP Member Shen asked if Meadow/Charleston pass could be hanged to passes, to clarify that there are two separate underpasses that are being combined onto one sheet? Or possibly split them into the Meadow Underpass and the Charleston Underpass.

Mr. Wong replied that can be changed. They were trying to be consistent. The hybrid option for Meadow and Charleston is technically two hybrids.

XCAP Member Shen inquired if that also applied to costs. Both projects would total \$350 to \$450. Regarding neighborhood consideration, he asked if Eminent domain is considered a neighborhood consideration? It is not mentioned on the fact sheet but is mentioned with the City Council adopted criteria.

Mr. Wong replied that could definitely be added on as another bullet.

XCAP Member Shen stated the fact sheets say "what is an underpass?" He expected an overview of what an underpass was. It would be more accurate to say "about the underpass". The same for "what is a partial underpass?" These address specific underpasses, not a general underpass. For Churchill, regarding facilitating movements and the City Council criteria, in Meadow/Charleston it says in all directions but resulting in a longer route. There is a qualification in one place but not in another. He asked if there was a statement on safety.

XCAP Member Brail commented safety is important but he was not sure how to quantify safety on this. At some point safety of biked and peds and safety of cars should be quantified. The Council criteria said "provide clear safe routes that are separated from vehicles". There is a safety impact.

XCAP Member Shen indicated for Churchill property impacts maybe should be mentioned under neighborhood considerations. An engineering challenge to put in both is the fact that it is unknown if Caltrain right-of-way will be allowed to use.

XCAP Member Brail remarked some renderings showed large trees, and if those trees needed to be removed during construction, he suggested being more realistic in the renderings, not showing those trees. He also commented it was not clear from the fact sheet, especially for the Meadow/Charleston underpass, it says verbally what turning movements are and are not allowed and wondered if there may be a way to represent these turning movements visually for these two alternatives. It is good to get the same information out, both verbally and graphically. To that end, there is a lot of concern from some members of the public about property acquisitions. The Meadow/Charleston in particular involve property acquisitions, but the property impacts are not clear on the fact sheet or the diagrams seen today. Is there a way to graphically represent the property impacts?

XCAP Member Reckdahl noted when he looked especially at the Meadow side, he considered Meadow to still be a work in progress. The ped/bike connections are not ready. Releasing this implies a level of completeness that is not there, having fact sheets for something that the whole XCAP has some concerns about the connections. He noted XCAP Member Shen was asking about curving the tunnel at Kellogg. He asked if the Embarcadero bike path through Main will be at the current grade?

Mr. DeStefano answered yes.

XCAP Member Reckdahl inquired if depressing the whole Embarcadero bike path would allow the corners to be made much gentler.

Mr. DeStefano replied it is definitely doable. The whole Embarcadero bike path could come down to match the elevation of the tunnel.

XCAP Member Reckdahl asked if the brown tunnel had to be parallel as it went under there. Could the portion that goes under the tracks be made wider.

Mr. Wong remarked the longer span you make the tracks go through, the deeper the destruction will be.

XCAP Member Reckdahl thought of keeping it parallel under Alma and once near the train tracks, have it curve outward and effectively fork in two. You would then have two curved paths, one going north, one going south and have support under that.

Mr. DeStefano commented what would make that challenging is that you can't drop in a precast box structure. It would get tricky for construction and would require further investigation.

XCAP Member Templeton remarked that she noticed on the fact sheets sometimes the orientation on the plan view was different than the plan views that have been discussed. Streets are rotated 90 degrees on the diagrams.

Mr. DeStefano agreed that for someone not familiar with the project that is somewhat disorienting. They will try to make it more consistent.

Chair Naik noted on the first page there are trees shown in the Caltrain right-of-way in one picture and those trees probably won't be there. There isn't any verbiage in the description of the Meadow, Charleston underpasses as to the potential benefits. There is no explanation that the bikes and pedestrians no longer have any interface with Alma and that makes it perhaps a better type of crossing. It also doesn't explain the fact that waiting for the train doesn't happen anymore, so traffic can flow at a more regular pace.

Mr. Wong asked if she meant specifically calling out the streets. Right now, the pedestrians and cyclists are completely separated from train and vehicular traffic. He can look into adding that information.

Chair Naik advised when discussing property impacts and what it does getting people very alarmed, but any graphics need to explain there are certain property impacts.

That is a concern but needs to be described. She noted on page 2, the Council Criteria, the last one "construction will require extended lane reductions at Alma Street, closure of all intersection roads during construction is expected." The length of time of the closure is not noted. There was a discussion with the team about the designs as presented uses the very conservative assumption that shoofly tracks will be needed. If and when more in-depth discussions with Caltrain occur there would be a potential to discuss other alternate engineering methods. Using other engineering methods, you might be able to not have closures for that long. It also depends on what type of construction method.

Mr. Wong voiced if alternative methods are used, there is a length of Meadow and Charleston or any cross street that would need to be excavated. During that time, there wouldn't be any through movement.

Chair Naik shared on Churchill, she didn't think the images used matched the updated renderings for Churchill. One doesn't show the bike/ped bridge on the west side of the tracks.

Mr. Wong reiterated, it did show the bridge but it was very hard to see.

Chair Naik referred to the bottom right picture, on Mariposa the sidewalk color looks like wall color so it looked like there was a wall there. Better clarification was needed for that.

Mr. DeStefano acknowledged that and could fix it.

Chair Naik indicated on page 4, where it mentioned the Kellogg bike path, she would like to see something that indicated how wide Kellogg Avenue is. She would also like to have addressed concerns from those neighbors about where to put the garbage cans. She is still uncomfortable with the levels of refinement on some of the new alternatives.

Mr. DeStefano understands the concerns. Because of the decisions needed, XCAP wants as much information as possible with better refinement of alternatives. He explained these were taken into further detail than what is typical at the planning phase.

Public Comment

Ken Joye noted on the fact sheet and the aerial view of Churchill that the class 1 bike path on the south side of the PALY football field is not depicted. On Meadow, the new bridges depicted don't seem to have a profile that showed how it affected the minimum vertical clearance for the bike/ped two-way path. On Charleston, a rendering showed the bike path had crosswalks at the roundabout, but the width of the bike path is not clear where it reaches the crosswalks.

Zahed Khan (phonetic) asked if there is an underpass option for Kellogg and another one for Churchill?

Amber Lau (phonetic) remarked the 100 block of Kellogg is really affected and they didn't get much communication about this. This also affected the 200 block of Kellogg as well.

Roland commented when talking about tunnels several months ago one was designed specifically to be built entirely within the Caltrain right-of-way and eliminate any property acquisitions. This can be seen at the San Francisco County Transit Authority website, the Pennsylvania Avenue RFP.

David Kennedy suggested stepping back and looking at the issue of property acquisitions. Also, he hoped the predictive traffic studies looked at the implications of some of the options.

Karen Kalinsky (phonetic) spoke to the possibility of a smaller roundabout on Meadow to help with the problem of limited turning movements between Meadow and Alma. Cyclists would have to merge with cars into a single lane for a smaller roundabout and that is unsafe.

Michael Wesser (phonetic) talked about the roundabout Charleston roundabout. The 3D renderings didn't clearly show the impact the roundabout would have on the Mumford and Charleston intersection houses. He asked Ely needed to be closed for a right turn going northbound on Alma?

Drew referred to the Kellogg bike path under to PALY, from Middle Avenue and Menlo Park, talking to the engineers about the size of the box. Instead of changing everything under the tracks, just change the last box, flared or wider span.

Elizabeth Alexis remarked on Meadow she strongly urged pulling the sheets on this because they are misleading. This causes opposition before it is developed and counterproductive. There is work needed in the City regarding bikes and requirements and this process has highlighted that.

Kushid Ghandi (phonetic) would like to know what the elevations and grades are on the bike/ped bridges. Lower grades would make it easier for children and the older generation. She is unhappy about only three out of eight turning motions at Meadow. She suggested at least a left-turn pocket on East Meadow to go down and make a quick turn to go northbound on Alma.

Susan Newman remarked there is a lot of discussion about Charleston and Meadow and possibly Churchill partial underpass, trying to achieve a total separation of bikes and peds from car traffic, rather than looking at how the process of riding along or the same level of cars can be good. She didn't like tunnels.

Chair Naik addressed some of the questions. One regarding the height of bridges, the bike/ped structures, especially around Park are on-grade structures and possibly these could be labeled as such. There is a document that showed the bike-ped elevation but it is not part of the fact sheet. Regarding Kellogg, there are three alternatives being considered for Churchill, a viaduct, a closure of Churchill which would have a bike/ped crossing at Churchill with two options. One is a middle of the street similar to what is being looked at for Kellogg and one where you cross the

street and go down a ramp on the west side. A third option is the partial underpass where the bike/ped tunnel would be on Kellogg. The boundary of the bike tunnel emerging is still Emerson Street. Chair Naik noted part of what is guiding whatever continued work XCAP can do is a contract amendment that is going to City Council.

4. XCAP Member Updates and Working Groups Update

Chair Naik related that potentially moving the timeline for the XCAP report to October 1 was looked at. To achieve that would require meetings every week and having three-hour meetings. Updated fact sheets and updated matrix, along with the update to the noise and vibration report are scheduled to come forward. It was confirmed that Caltrain can come on July 8. Members will be notified once the July 1 and July 8 meetings are confirmed.

XCAP Member Brail noted not all neighbors live next to the tracks and it is hard to get them engaged. He has also advised that Pat Lau has left the committee but she left an excellent report on rail corridor safety measures, which will be incorporated possibly as an appendix. There is a lot of conversation about vehicle movement but safety is a major reason why this process needs to be kept going, so when there is a possibility of getting funding, it can be done because the safety issues don't go away.

Chair Naik also remarked that before she left, XCAP Member Kanne also left a lengthy section to be included in the report.

XCAP Member Cho indicated she had not yet started on her report but intended to do so. She remarked her neighborhood is excited about the poles going up but have deep concerns about the underpass and how it's going to impact them.

XCAP Member Reckdahl shared that he wondered when this will be built and the changes between then and now, so he questioned how much polishing this needs. Ms. Kishimoto mentioned about making this a "what we learned" document, which is probably more appropriate than a full-fledged recommendation because things change and this group's recommendation might be aged by the time this is built. Keeping the big picture and documenting the tradeoffs, what more analysis would be needed for certain options and what might the shortcomings be.

Mr. Kamhi advised XCAP Member Reckdahl's remarks were very worthwhile considerations, especially in light of some of the potential challenges that Caltrain is faced with.

5. Staff Updates

Mr. Kamhi related that he had a meeting today to work on developing the town halls with AECOM. It was exciting to see some of the things that can be done more in depth than previously seen. It is very unlikely this will occur in July, and it was somewhat suggested that this might be delayed until mid-August. The marketing team suggested going with town halls initiating in mid-August.

XCAP Member Klein remarked if the town halls are pushed back to August that was fine. He also advised that when Chair Naik said XCAP would be meeting every week, she didn't mean every week between now and whatever the final date. It was just during the decision-making process.

Chair Naik indicated the calendar dates were July 1, 8 and 15th. The only break would be between deliberating Churchill and then switching to Meadow/Charleston. The only other break would be during the town halls, but now they're not happening until August. She was unsure if the Group be deliberating before or after the town halls

XCAP Member Klein believed the commitment was that it would be very bad politically for the Group to make decisions before the town halls, so that is delaying the whole schedule. He asked staff to reconsider putting the town halls back that far, because that would delay the schedule. Also, a concern about delaying the report further into the fall is that there will be anywhere from one to four new Council members, and new ones will have to get up to speed which will delay things further into 2021

XCAP Member Brail commented some of the new Council Members may be from XCAP which would be more complicated.

XCAP Member Klein advised that no Council Member may serve on an advisory committee to the Council.

Chair Naik reiterated her main fear is that this has been going on for a long time and it sounds like it will go slower than originally thought. She is sensitive to XCAPers personal schedules and commitment to go past August if that is how this trends. There are also concerns this will go into an election season as well COVID concerns. She is interested in hearing from Caltrain because the indications were that they were going to be starting their grade study process and it is unknown how that will interface with this Group and that is why she has agendized them for a future meeting. Addressing the potential for having a summary report instead of a recommendation report, this could be completed sooner and could address the question about getting this done before town halls and not wait until August. That could put a stopping point on what is being done and not bleed into the political issues. Also, getting some of the designs to a level where they could be made public would probably cost a lot more money.

XCAP Member Klein continued that he thought the idea of coming up with a list of what XCAP's thoughts were without making a recommendation is a bad idea. It seemed to him that when ten or twelve people have spent so much time on a project, the community deserved to hear what XCAP thought the best alternatives were. The Council can then do as it wishes. Also, a summary report does not help the City in negotiating with any of the other agencies and is not helpful to the community.

XCAP Member Carrasco agreed with a general review and findings, then reporting back on what XCAP learned and where it intended to go. He also agreed with getting this done fast in order to negotiate with Caltrain because that is needed in order to satisfy some of the alternatives that are being looked at.

Mr. Kamhi remarked there were a lot of options for the final result. It could be very focused or just say under certain circumstances with the information available, this is an alternative with certain criteria that is recommended. Choices could be ranked. Potentially there could be a very clear alternative that could be recommended. The issues that are going on at Caltrain will probably become more focused with more information coming from Caltrain at the July 8 meeting. Caltrain is in a financial situation and the outcome is not known, but it will likely have at least some kind of short-term impacts to Caltrain's service. This might speed up the electrification process, however, this is a 100-year process, and there might be a blip on the radar where Caltrain reduces or completely suspends service due to financial impacts. That doesn't necessarily mean that this process shouldn't keep moving forward. This project does need to get to a point to start looking for other funding. Caltrain will not have other funding to help out, and will probably be asking for funding to move the process forward.

Chair Naik reiterated she is looking forward to what Caltrain has to say. She remarked on the number of things learned about bikes, pedestrians, utilities and water and all the things that need to be considered when looking at this. Thinking about Caltrain and the 41 remaining grade separations, a lot of what they need to consider when looking at their corridor-wide study is how to engage with cities and the important things to understand before getting into these discussions. The kind of work XCAP has done will be very useful. She is concerned that in order to move to any next phase, Caltrain would need money to be able to do that and Palo Alto may not be in a position to do that. The human element is most important to her. She is concerned about burning out the XCAP group and the thought of going on for another six months at any kind of rate. If there is a risk of losing more XCAP Members and not having any report at all, she would rather have at least a summary report and no final recommendation versus driving forward and the Group collapses and loss of members becomes an issue. She is also thinking about the residents in the community and she wouldn't want to make any recommendations given the level of uncertainty on so many levels. She doesn't think the bike and ped designs are ready, but she is hesitant to spend a lot more money on them, because they may not get any better. She feels this should be agendaized for the next meeting, because it is not worth continuing on updating fact sheets and matrices for town hall meetings if the Group will not all be around long enough to get to those meetings.

XCAP Member Klein clarified that committee members collectively have learned a great deal about this. One way to make sure that knowledge is passed on is to have it attached to recommendations. A report that says no recommendations is a prescription for being ignored. That way will not pass on this information the committee worked so hard to obtain.

Chair Naik indicated there can be recommendations but they might be recommendations even to Council to say, we had to stop because we have been doing this for too long and there are too many questions. If and when you pick this up, these are the areas that need help; understanding where the criteria didn't match or wasn't clear enough or conflicted with the Comprehensive Plan for example.

Mr. Kamhi related that it would be a shame for XCAP not to produce something because if this Group decided it was going to hibernate, it would not get back together again. Something should be produced by XCAP and the Group is really close to that. Also, the next phase of this will likely be working with Caltrain to develop their corridor-wide plans or program. They really want to work with the cities on this, so all the work this group has done is really important.

XCAP Member Burton asked to be signed up for the work with Caltrain. He suggested there may be a compromise possible between Chair Naik's viewpoint and XCAP Member Klein's.

XCAP Member Carrasco referred to the section between the Meadow Park border and Embarcadero, would the Group follow what Caltrain wants to do, or have some input? How does their study fold into this study?

Mr. Kamhi explained Caltrain's study is for the corridor. Some of that will get into things that would potentially be outcomes of the next phase of the project development. Mountain View is moving into their design phase, which is the phase that would follow this. Caltrain will not prevent Palo Alto from moving forward, but they will be working on their plan for the entire corridor, which could incorporate what their different allowances are for different things. It could resolve some of the issues. It could take a lot of this work already done and apply it to their analysis. They are just barely getting started.

XCAP Member Carrasco asked if XCAP had any opinion on the section about the corridor. Is an opinion needed along with Churchill, Embarcadero, Meadow and Charleston?

Mr. Kamhi believed Palo Alto Avenue would have to come at a later phase. That will be tied to the downtown plan.

Chair Naik advised what she understood from listening to the meetings Caltrain presented, they are still defining the scope of what their two-year corridor study will be. They are not at the point to know when they could interface on any particular thing, because they haven't figured out the limits of their entire process. That could include things like what order do grade separations get built or how do they get funded. The Committee might consider if a report is done about how they got to this point, if there are very specific suggestions for things that could be helpful from Caltrain going forward. She advised the Council meeting on June 23 will have the AECOM contract amendment and the packet will be coming out very soon. That will show how much will work is potentially scoped for the what the XCAP has done through the time that might be needed.

6. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:52 P.M.